

Flowing from Roger Dudman Way Review

In attendance: Michael Crofton Briggs, Niko Grigoropoulos

The independent review confirms that the City Council met its statutory obligations in handling the planning application. However, there are recommendations on embedding best practise. There are six principal sets of recommendations:

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Action / Programme</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Milestone</b> Not started/ In hand/ Complete/Tested	<b>Progress/Achievement</b>
<b>I. Planning Procedures</b>				
Improving the clarity of the informal and formal liaison arrangements and the documentation of the pre-application process;  Para 56. SLA with University strengthened – clear documentation what material presented and what comments made. Improving clarity of the informal and formal liaison arrangements and the documentation of the pre-application process	A1. Review of current Service Level Agreement with the University of Oxford.	MHancock	A1. Complete April Testing by Sept	A1. System established for agendas for meetings with University Estates Office to be circulated in advance and Note circulated and agreed afterwards.  Standard Operating Procedure(SOP) completed,
	A2. New SLA overall / Handbook	MCrofton Briggs	A2. In hand - Target by Sept	A2. Protocol with University being reviewed. Likely to be called a Handbook and overseen by a joint University, College and City C task Group.

	<i>A3. Review of current internal procedure guidance, to confirm documentation of pre-app process. PPA – to be picked up in the protocol.</i>	C Golden	A3. Complete June Testing by Sept	<i>A3. Pre-app validation and allocation process has been reviewed and updated. Reflected in new SOP for pre-apps.</i>
	<i>A4. Include in internal guidance the process to secure Design Review by the Oxford Design Review Panel.</i>		A4. Complete June Testing by Sept	A4. Internal guidance note produced for Officers about how to get applications to the Oxford Design Review Panel..
	<i>A5. Consider a triage stage: with each pre-app request allocate a category or type which determines level or amount of resource, audit, clarity, processes</i>	C Golden A Murdoch	A5. Complete June Testing by Sept	A5. A pre-application Triage form has been drafted to be used for all Major and Minor pre-application enquiries.
<p>Providing a clearer auditing regime of the submitted documents against the requirements in the published guidance in the registration process on major applications;</p> <p>Para 58. Clear audit at validation of documents submitted for major applications against requirements.</p>	<p><i>B1. New Internal procedure guidance on validation processes</i></p> <p><i>Take what we do already and document this, so it can be in idox to be seen. If a discretionary document explain this.</i></p> <p><i>B2. Training and implementation</i></p>	MHancock& CGolden	<p>B1. Complete.June Testing by Sept</p> <p>B2. Complete. July</p>	<p><i>B1. Reviewed and updated.</i> New validation form to be completed and added to the file &amp;to be available to view online. This will then be kept on the public file. SOP prepared.</p> <p>B2. Local List Checklist rolledout</p>

	<p><i>B3. Also process to go back and keep audit up to date as other information is submitted.</i></p> <p><i>B4. Carry out a review as to whether any further minor change is required to procedure.</i></p>		<p>B3. Complete July Testing by Sept</p> <p>B4. In hand Target by Sept</p>	<p>to Officers at officer training forum</p> <p><i>B3. See above re. SOP.</i></p> <p><i>B4. Review the SOP and then decide if any minor changes required after implementation.</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--

<p>A review of the EIA-related procedures</p> <p>Para 66. Review EIA procedure i. advice in pre-application, ii. Quality of forms and documentation used, iii. Training and briefing of officers in respect of Screening process.</p>	<p>C1. Review EIA procedure i. advice in pre-application, ii. Quality of forms and documentation used,</p> <p>C2. Training and briefing of officers in respect of Screening process</p> <p>C3 Plain English version. (The FOE 2005 campaigners' guide is helpful in this respect )</p> <p>C4. Legal Advice on screening and scoping</p>	<p>MMorgan</p>	<p>C1. Complete June Testing by Sept</p> <p>C2. Commenced July Target Sept</p> <p>C3. Not started Target Sept</p> <p>C4. Not started Target Sept</p>	<p>C1. Initial improvements made autumn 13. Full review produced. Just needs some editing.</p> <p>C2. Further training to be completed in July/Aug.</p> <p>C3. To do</p> <p>C4. <i>Legal advice required on Screening and Scoping Opinions, to inform basis of determination.</i></p>
<p><b>EXTRA:</b> external validation or accreditation of improvements and procedures</p>	<p><i>D1 Investigate which planning authorities have done this and what advice is available from national organisations such as PAS or POS..</i></p> <p><i>D2 Scope out project, what help needed. Agree Action with Steering Group</i></p>	<p>N Grigoropoulos/L Godin</p>	<p>D1. Complete July</p> <p>D2. Complete July</p>	<p>D1 MCrofton Briggs received proposal from Planning Officer Society Enterprises for a formal Review.</p> <p>D2. Agreed to ask V Goodstadt to review this</p>

	<i>D3. Implement agreed action</i>		D3. In hand for Oct/Nov	Improvement Plan actions when complete and evidence of 'testing' can be provided.  D3. To do
<b>EXTRA:</b> Review of how we organise the electronic application file. Data management	<i>E1. Devise guidance on data management, initially for application files. To aid audit, retrieval and clarity.</i>  <i>Proposal could be to put data in sub-sections that relate to the stages in the process in IDOX (pre-app; submission, consultation, negotiation, changes, committee report, decision, compliance with conditions.). And label each piece of data better. To include all sections including Heritage, photos,</i>	L Godin/C Golden  Support from L Godin and ICT	E1. In hand Target Sept	E1. Meet up with ICT to understand capability of uniform and idox. Future upgrades will help too  Still to prepare guidance for officer and training.  Also discuss with NW to ensure consistency with Heritage decisions.
<b>II. Consultation Processes.</b>				
A Further development of pre-application guidelines: Para 91. Best practice – resource intensive, so most appropriate for majors.  Para 98. 1.Allow more time between project inception and the proposed commencement date 2.Engage other appropriate parties (including members) in pre-application discussions, and not just officers;	<i>A1. Workshop or brainstorm to explore options and best approach. Scoping of pre-application guidance on consultation</i>  <i>A2. Prepare internal procedure guidance -</i>	M Hancock  C Golden	A1. Complete April  A2.complete June Test by Sept	A1. Discussed at Officer forum and team meetings  A2. Internal procedure guidance note produced for pre-application consultation best practice.  <i>A2. Early internal case conferencing of all</i>

<p>3. Provide opportunities for presentations and briefings to members;</p> <p>4. Encourage a two-stage consultation on major applications ; and</p> <p>5. Set down clearer guidelines on the desired documentation.</p>	<p><i>A3. External applicant protocol. Consider how best to persuade prospective applicant the value of initial consultation while scheme is still at option or conceptual stage and capable of change in response to consultation. Linked to</i></p> <p>A protocol/guidance note for developers on the consultation they need to do for different sized developments.</p> <p><i>A4. Work with Members on greater participation at this stage</i></p>		<p>A3. Complete June Test by Sept</p> <p>A4. In hand. Sept</p>	<p><i>potentially sensitive cases.</i></p> <p><i>A3. Advise applicants via pre application protocol to undertake 2 rounds of public consultation, and Ox Design Review presentation in significant cases.</i></p> <p>Options considered and a guidance note produced for applicants to be attached to email and letter correspondence and a section for the website written.</p> <p><i>A4. Pre application briefing for members.</i></p>
<p><b>B EXTRA:</b> Review of Statement of Community Involvement Current SCI was adopted in 2006 and does not reflect the most up to date regulations in relation to policy documents so there was a case for review in any event but RDW adds to this.</p> <p><i>EXTRA.</i> A question to Council on 3<sup>rd</sup> Feb asks that Council review the methods it</p>	<p><i>B1. SCI review would, covers pre-application consultation. Starts with PID, scope and public engagement/involvement</i></p> <p><i>B2. Review of SCI through statutory process</i></p>	M Jaggard	<p>B1. Started July Target by Sept</p>	<p>B1 Lindsay Beveridge Start with PID and scope of review.</p> <p>B2. Part of B1 above</p>

uses to consult the public on planning applications				
<p>C. Post-application guidance on planning processes.</p> <p>Para 99</p> <p>1. A more structured approach to the weekly lists to enable the ready identification of major developments;</p> <p>2.A more effective provision of Site Notices;</p> <p>3.Additional means for communicating the scale and massing of major developments;</p> <p>4.Consultation on revised drawings;</p> <p>5.The provision of feedback to respondents on planning decisions; and</p> <p>6. The planning processes to be more integrated with other regulatory processes.</p>	<p><i>C1. Ensure all actions documented in internal procedure guidance –weekly list, Site notices, consultation on revised drawings,</i></p> <p><i>C2. Provision of post-application guidance notes for applicants/page on our website. Major developments, feedback on planning decisions</i></p> <p><i>C3. Clarification about what is/isn't an NMA/MMA.</i></p> <p><i>C4. Integrate planning process with other regulatory processes by; Use pre-commencement conditions less, where important sort out before decision made. Already there with contamination</i></p>	C Golden	<p>C1. In hand some complete. July Target by Sept</p> <p>C2Target Aug Test by Sept</p> <p>C3. Target Aug Test by Sept</p> <p>C4. Not started Target Sept</p>	<p>C1. Weekly list template being changed to make it easier to spot Major planning applications. Protocols written for all. Means of documenting each action explained in the protocol.</p> <p>C2. Post-application guidance notes for applications as a page on our website – drafted – not on our website yet.</p> <p>C3. Guidance notes and information on our website – drafted – not on our website yet.</p> <p>C4. Guidance note to prepare</p>

<b>D. EXTRA:</b> Application of project management procedures to applications.	D1. Consider merit of treating a major application as a 'project' with associated, but proportionate, project management? e.g. (as a minimum) set up a project plan with key stages and milestones that covers pre-and post-app stages.	N Grigoropoulos	D1. In hand Target Sept	D1. Agreed with F Byrne to pilot project management procedure as part a major application (PPA)
<b>E. EXTRA:</b> Produce a full list of all Standard Operating Procedures (SOPS)	E. Bring together all existing procedure notes SOPS , plus a list of those in preparation. Undertake a gap analysis. Review all to ensure fit for purpose. Consider how to make available for easy use by all officers.	L Godin	E1. In hand Target Sept	E1. Confirmation reached on what processes documented following BPI of application processes.
<b>III. Visual Impacts &amp; Quality of Design</b> It is recommended that existing initiatives to improve the design capacity of the Council should be complemented by action to enhance the use of in-house expertise and to provide members with greater support in their considerations of design issues and visual impacts by:	Para 145 – expanded below			
Developing greater technical capacity (IT and skills) to take advantage of the rapidly evolving potential for interpreting design and integration with established GIS systems;	A1. Prepare guidance or a requirement spec. for applicants based on current technology to improve visualisation of proposed development. Verified views, digital imagery, computer generated 'fly through'.  Importance of Verified views. Encourage applicants to produce models Have hard copies of the plans on boards from applicants for Members to view before the committee meeting.	C Golden	A1. In hand Target Sept	A1. Prepare guidance, publish and use



	<p>Confirm that 'wire line' drawing no longer acceptable.</p> <p>Exploring more immediate and site specific options, such as the use of Google Sketch Up to help understanding of scale and massing.</p> <p><i>A2. Feasibility study to understand what is possible.</i></p> <p><i>Scope out project, what help needed</i></p> <p><i>Business case</i></p> <p><i>Project plan</i></p> <p><i>Action Plan</i></p>	<p>L Godin</p> <p>Support from MCB</p>	<p>A2. In hand But Target 2015</p>	<p>A2. Westgate BLD have a BIM model that has been seen at their London offices</p> <p><i>Contact made with Mr Gaskin at Brookes, discussed a proposal for a 3D virtual model of the City.</i></p>
<p>Improving the advice on the design evidence used to support application, in particular in the preparation of Design and Access Statements</p>	<p><i>B1. Review of our current advice and assessment of DAS, to include understanding of latest Gov guidance.</i></p> <p><i>B2. Internal procedure guidance</i></p> <p><i>B3. To check latest Government Guidance and our Validation Checklist.</i></p> <p><i>B4. Potential to have a Design section on the planning</i></p>	<p>C Golden</p>	<p>B1. Complete June Test by Sept</p> <p>B2. Complete June Test by Sept</p> <p>B3. Complete June</p> <p>B4. Complete June Test by Sept</p>	<p>B1. Completed.</p> <p>B2. Written. To be tested, reviewed and given to Officers.</p> <p>B3. Done.</p> <p>B4. Section for the website</p>

	<i>pages of our website. This could include guidance on how to complete a good Design and Access statement as well as information on latest schemes and the Oxford Design Review Panel.</i>			written. A guidance note for applicants also written.  Design section for the website written.
Enhancing member 'training' on design and planning;	<p>C1. Explore with Members how they would like to achieve this.</p> <p>C2. <i>Potential role of Oxford Design Review Panel or its members</i></p> <p>C3. <i>Set up post development site visits to help Members review decisions – good examples and also where improvements could have been made.</i></p>	N Grigoropoulos	<p>C1. In hand. June Complete Sept/Oct</p> <p>C2. In hand June Complete</p> <p>C3. Not started Target Sept</p>	<p>C1. Post elections training been provided on probity and the planning system and SHLAA and SHMA and housing provision. Meeting arranged for July with lead Cllrs to discuss Member training for the year.</p> <p>C2. Date set</p> <p>C3. Set a date</p>
Investigating and adopting the best new field-based approaches to assessing the visual impact of new development <i>This is reference to poles, balloons or scaffolding.</i>	D1. Run a pilot on a Council own scheme. Evaluate pilot Options paper for future scope and operation, with opportunities and risks.	N Grigoropoulos	D1. In hand Target Sept	D1. "Swiss poles" pilot carried out and an evaluation to be included with Elsfield Hall report. Following 2 <sup>nd</sup> phase of pilot amendments being considered to Elsfield Hall scheme and further

	D2. Importance of plans showing the context of a proposal, i.e. neighbouring properties, for smaller applications.		D2. In hand July Target Sept	consultation and use of poles. Amendments received. Application awaiting determination  D2. Dialogue with Cllrs. Guidance to be written and included as part of validation process.
<b>EXTRA:</b> Design Review	<p>E1. In partnership with Cabe establish the Oxford Design Review Panel.</p> <p>E2. Work with case officers to introduce the appropriate proposals to Design Review and how to make best use of the Panel's report. Templates for use with each project</p> <p>E3. Leaflet to explain to developers and to inform the public</p>	M Crofton Briggs	<p>E1. Complete April</p> <p>E2. Complete May</p> <p>E3. Complete June</p>	<p>E1. Completed</p> <p>E2. Cabe met case officers to review initial reviews. Quarterly meeting with Chair of ODRP and David E on 20 May</p> <p>E3. Leaflet and Document about the Service drafted and published on Website.</p>
<b>EXTRA:</b> Improve internal design expertise	<p>F1. Skills audit and schedule, L&amp;D opportunities <i>(could include a parallel design panel then compare and contrast with the panel's conclusions)</i></p> <p><i>Options paper to 'fill' gaps to include possibility of employing a permanent urban designer.</i></p>	C Golden & AMurdoch	F1. In hand June Target Sept	F1. Discuss what level of design skills DC Planners should have so that can write up the Skills Audit.

	<i>F2. Internal design charettes - design workshops for the DC teams to focus on more daily design issues.</i>		F2. Not started Target Sept	
<b>IV. Committee Reporting</b> It recommended that the presentation of the planning issues of major applications to committee should be strengthened by				
A systematic documentation of the policy evaluation including clarification of the extent and nature of any departure from policy  Para 167 systematic record of evaluation against all policies that seen as material	A1. Internal meeting to explore and scope out <i>Internal procedure guidance to explain how officers should record evaluation against all policies</i>  A2. Understand issue of Departure and greater level of explanation necessary.  A3. <i>Advice note prepared.</i>	M Armstrong  Policy Team       Policy Team. A Roche/ L Goddard	A1.In hand Target Sept      A2. Not started Target Sept   A3. Not started Target Sept	Agreement to hold policy surgeries weekly. To clarify and explain policy context. Need to draft standard text in reports.  Discussed with LH and AR to scope -to be drafted.  A2.   A3.
A more evidenced-based approach to the presentation of the choices before committee, and the impact of mitigation through conditions in reports	B1. Review of report writing guidelines, to provide extra guidance to authors on such matters as evaluation, analysis of choices and weight.	N Grigoropoulos	B1. Not started Target Sept	B1.

<p>Para 187 report could have been clearer in evaluation and analysis of the choices that were put before committee.</p> <p>Eg report asserted need for student accommodation but could have gone further to explain why and give current achievement against 3,000 policy,</p>	<p>To include a dialogue with key members.</p> <p><i>B2. Workshop or brainstorm to explore options and best approach.</i></p> <p><i>B3. Internal procedure guidance based on review of existing report template. Augment to include advisory notes to report writers.</i></p> <p><i>B4. Lead policy officer assigned to majors in an advisory capacity; to flag up other sources of information; to be sounding board for discussions about choices and weight to be attached to different policy objectives</i></p>		<p>B2. Not started Target Sept</p> <p>B3. Not started Target Sept</p> <p>B4. Not started</p>	<p>B2.</p> <p>B3.</p> <p>B4.</p>
<p>The use of alternative means of addressing design considerations (e.g. in terms of visualisations and where necessary site visits).</p> <p>Relates to section 3 above, and how illustrate and communicate design considerations to Members.</p>	<p>C1. Better visualisation for Members: Augment power point with other means such as models and exhibition boards (favoured method of the Design Panel) See <b>III. Visual Impacts &amp; Quality of Design</b> above</p> <p><i>C2. Internal procedure guidance. Publish external guidance and standard to be followed such as verified views.</i></p>	C Golden/ N Worlledge	<p>C1. In hand Target Sept</p> <p>C2. Not started Target Sept</p>	<p>C1.</p> <p>C2.</p>
<p><b>V. Planning Conditions</b> It is recommended that enforcement procedures and coordination (on conditions) should be strengthened through:</p>				

<p>An auditable process for determining the appropriate enforcement action Para 205 Review with legal of current process. Eg. Is there the discretion to take no action absolute?</p> <p>Eg. need clear decision process to decide to take no action.</p>	<p><i>A1. Necessity to document decision especially when no action, and formally to secure sign off by a senior reviewer.</i></p> <p><i>Internal report template and procedure guidance</i></p>	M Morgan	A1. complete Test by Sept	<p>A1.. Re- introduction made of proforma to provide audit trail.</p> <p>Proforma also to write off enforcement cases</p>
<p>A review of the use of standard planning conditions, and updating of them where necessary</p>	<p><i>B1. New schedule of standard conditions,</i></p> <p><i>B2. Structure decision notices to set out conditions in four categories (no additional submission, pre-commencement, pre-occupation, post completion)</i></p>	M Armstrong /M Hancock	<p>B1. In hand Target Sept</p> <p>B2. Not Started Target Sept</p>	<p><i>B1. Updated standard conditions to be finalised.</i></p> <p><i>B2. Need to amend recommendation and decision screens in Uniform accordingly</i></p>
<p>Inter-agency co-ordination to address the issues set out in the main report</p> <p>Review how much is left to pre-commencement conditions and what is agreed before decision made.</p> <p>Eg. Assess importance of issue and when needs to be agreed before consent given</p>	<p><i>C1. Internal discussion to understand issue, explore options and agree guidance to officers.</i></p> <p><i>C2. Confirm approach with agency partners</i></p>	N Grigoropoulos	<p>C1. In hand Target Sept</p> <p>C2. Not started Target Sept</p>	<p>C1.</p> <p>C2.</p>
<p>The use of a range of media should be considered to provide accurate and</p>	<p><i>D1. Open a running list of 'complex' issues that might</i></p>	L Godin with help from	D1. In hand	D1. Prepare a draft a

<p>accessible information that addresses these concerns ( to the general public)</p> <p>Planning involves complex issues. Consider how we explain and communicate these. Consider briefing notes or similar for the general public, eg distinction between contaminated land and land containing contaminates.</p>	<p><i>benefit from lay explanation.</i></p> <p><i>Use of section on Web for general planning guidance</i></p> <p><i>D2. Check whether explanation is available somewhere else, if we can link to all the better.</i></p>	C Golden	<p>Target Sept.</p> <p>D2. In hand. Target Sept</p>	<p>'Planning Terminology Explained' list. This list has been started and is being updated.</p> <p>D2 Link to the Planning Portal's A-Z Glossary to be put on the website.</p>
<p><b>EXTRA:</b> Monitoring of pre-commencement conditions</p>	<p><i>E1. Assess role for AIs and BC to report on impending commencement.</i></p> <p><i>Correlation with needs for CIL monitoring?</i></p> <p><i>See conditions above : Structure decision notices to set out conditions in four categories (no additional submission, pre-commencement, pre-occupation, post completion)</i></p> <p><i>E2. Review means of communication to applicants their responsibility?</i></p>	M Armstrong	<p>E1. In hand Target Sept</p> <p>E2. Not started Target Sept</p>	<p>E1. Use CIL re commencement</p> <p>Extra code on conditions relating to threat to health and safety issues eg land contamination</p> <p>Use of informatives</p> <p>Proactive Enforcement</p> <p>E2</p>

VI. Wider Planning Issues				
<p>Enhancing the planning service in terms of planning process, policy and strategy</p> <p>Para 214, 215, 216</p>	<p>A1. Improve clarity on 'departure' from the plan.</p> <p>A2. Is the City full? Lack of space leads to pressure to build higher with impact on urban form and views.</p> <p>Consider when appropriate to review the capacity of the City to absorb growth. –associated to issue below.</p> <p><i>Would tie into 3D virtual model of the City in 3 above.</i></p> <p>A3. <i>Need to have answer to question 'when will Core Strategy be reviewed?' (agree not an option NOT to do a review )</i></p> <p><i>Consideration relates to SHMA output Universities dialogue, SEP, Growth Fund and wider Oxford Growth Strategy matters.</i></p> <p>The imminent publication of the SHMA and the work that flows from that under the duty to cooperate (including discussions that we are instigating with the Planning Inspectorate) will help to inform decisions on the timing of any review of our own Core Strategy</p>	<p>M Jaggard</p>	<p>A1. In hand Target Sept</p> <p>A2. In hand Target in part Sept</p> <p>A3. In hand Target decision on ? post national election 2015</p>	<p>A1. Draft note for DC officers</p> <p>A2. City own SHLAA, assistance from consultants As below</p> <p>A3. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment review (March) provides clarify on the capacity to absorb growth and the pressures on building higher. Now agreed this to be independently assessed to reassure other Oxford LAs. Consultant appointed</p>



<p>Progressing and formalising a more strategic approach to the future development needs and engagement with the Universities and Colleges</p> <p>Para 219 Work with the Universities and colleges towards a 15 yr business plan. The future of the Universities depends on the City it is in as much as on global competitiveness.</p> <p>Help the Universities and Colleges take community engagement seriously.</p>	<p><i>B1. Hold a College and University workshop and Prepare a brief to go out with invitation to same Proposition:</i></p> <p><i>B2. Joint commissioning of consultants - Where next for Oxford, the University and Colleges over a 5 to 15 yr horizon? / Oxford Growth Strategy?</i></p> <p>B3 Evaluate strategy produced and use to feed into consideration of the Core Strategy and Oxford Growth Project.</p> <p>B4. Guidelines for University and College community engagement</p>	<p>M Crofton Briggs</p>	<p>B1. Complete March</p> <p>B2, In hand Target Dec</p> <p>B3 not started</p> <p>B4 Not started Target Dec</p>	<p>B1. Initial meeting with colleges and University 17 Mar</p> <p>B2 Agreed to form a task group, to: * Commission consultants for the Framework * Compile the Handbook.</p> <p><i>B3. Can only start when B2 complete</i></p> <p><i>B4. Work with the Task Group</i></p>
<p>c. <b>EXTRA:</b> 1990 Act: impact of development on a Conservation Area</p> <p>Argument to the review that even development in the foreground of a long distance view of a conservation area has an impact on that conservation area even though that development itself is not in close proximity to the CA.</p>	<p>C1. Assessment of this challenge and what this means for Planning Policies.</p> <p>Bring this into the preparation of the Design and Heritage SPD?</p>	<p>M Jaggard and N Worlledge</p>	<p>C1. In hand Target Spring 15</p>	<p>C1.</p>

### Overview consideration by the Steering Group, *once Actions stated as complete and tested*

1. Has there been an Integrated Approach?

The Action Plan above deconstructs the report into components but there is also an exercise to put the parts back together.

Key Matters overlap such as:

- i. pre-application process, developer consultation/ involving elected councillors
  - ii. embedding of the design process/visualisation/techniques/policy/independent review by ODRP and internal expertise
  - iii. all procedures are documented; transparent and audited
2. Has the Improvement Action Plan do the job – has it optimised on the opportunity ?
  3. Is there a clear Vision or Strategy for Growth of the City emerging from the work with the University and major partners in the sub-region? – a vision for the City region feeding into the review of Local Plan (Core Strategy)

92

#### **Name and contact details:-**

Name:	M Crofton Briggs
Job title:	Head of City Development
Service Area / Department:	City Development
Tel:	01865 252360
e-mail:	<a href="mailto:mcrofton-briggs@oxford.gov.uk">mcrofton-briggs@oxford.gov.uk</a>
Version:	7 10 <sup>th</sup> July 2014

M/Planning/Pln\_shared/Planning Services Improvement