


**Report of: Planning Services Business Manager**

**To: Executive Board**


**Date: 19<sup>th</sup> March 2007**


**Item No:**


**Title of Report : Oxford 2026; the Oxford Core Strategy Preferred Options document**



**Summary and Recommendations**




**Purpose of report:** To approve, for public consultation, the Preferred Options document for Oxford's Core Strategy. 



**decision:** No


**Portfolio Holder:** Councillor John Goddard

**Scrutiny Responsibility:** Environment




**rd(s) affected:** All


**Report Approved by:**



Christopher Kaye- Financial and Asset Management




De Chirnside – Legal and Democratic Services



Sharon Cosgrove – Strategic Director


**Policy Framework:**




production of this document fulfils a commitment of the Local Development Scheme. The Core Strategy will help achieve the strategic aims in the City Council's vision, and will also help deliver the key themes and priorities for the City as set out in the Community Strategy.

**Recommendation(s):**

Executive Board is recommended to:



1. Approve the Preferred Options document for Oxford's Core Strategy for public consultation; and
2. Authorise the Planning Policy Manager to make any necessary minor editorial corrections to the Core Strategy Preferred Options document.



## **Introduction**

1. Members may recall consultation on the earlier 'Issues and Options' stage of the Core Strategy at Area Committees in July 2006. The Core Strategy has now reached the 'Preferred Options' stage, which is the second of the three main stages in its production. The third stage will be submission to the Secretary of State in January 2008. The timetable towards adoption of the Core Strategy is set out later in this report.
2. The Environment Scrutiny Committee considered an interim report on the Core Strategy Preferred Options at its meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2007. That report sought the Scrutiny Committees' views on how the Core Strategy should deal with the key strategic planning issues facing Oxford. The comments of the Environment Scrutiny Committee are attached to this report at [Appendix 1](#).

## **Purpose of the Core Strategy**

3. The Core Strategy will be a key document within Oxford's Local Development Framework (LDF). It will set out the key elements of the planning framework for the City, including which broad areas are suitable for housing and other strategic development needs. Essentially it will be a replacement for the Oxfordshire Structure Plan, but only relating to the City. It will also replace some of the higher-level strategic policies in the Oxford Local Plan. The 20-year timeframe of this document corresponds with SEERA's emerging South East Plan.
4. The Core Strategy will set the policy context for future Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs). Once the Core Strategy is adopted, all subsequent DPDs and SPDs must be in conformity with the Core Strategy.
5. An important aspect of the new planning system is the change to 'spatial' policies. This means that the Core Strategy and future planning documents are no longer restricted to land-use considerations, and need to take account of the plans and strategies of other agencies. Spatial planning policies can be delivered in a variety of ways and are not solely reliant on being implemented through development control decisions.

## **Policy Context**

6. The Core Strategy has to be consistent with national planning policy and be in general conformity with the policies of the South East Plan. However, one of the challenges of spatial planning is to ensure that policies are locally distinctive and do not simply repeat national and regional guidance. The Core Strategy should also identify the main priorities that deliver the spatial aspects of the Community Strategy.

## **Research and evidence base**

7. The Core Strategy Preferred Options document has been informed by a wide range of published research and evidence, including the following studies in particular; the Housing Requirements Study (2004); the Housing Viability Study (2004); the draft Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2007), which will be published for consultation alongside the Core Strategy Preferred Options; the draft county-wide Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2007); the Employment Land Study (2006); the Retail Needs Study (2004); and the Green Space Study (2005).
8. Work is currently underway on updating the Retail Needs Study and on two further pieces of research: the Role of Education and Health Sectors in Oxford's Economy; and the Hotel and Short-Stay Accommodation Study. In addition, it is intended to shortly commission a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment of the whole of Oxford. These studies will be completed in time to inform production of the submission version of the Core Strategy, as well as future Development Plan Documents, such as the Site Allocations DPD.

## **Previous consultation**

9. One of the main principles of the new planning system is that local communities and stakeholders should be involved from the outset in the preparation of planning policy documents. In line with this principle, the City Council conducted an extensive public consultation exercise last summer to coincide with the publication of Oxford 2026; the Core Strategy Issues and Options paper. The purpose of this first stage of public consultation was to seek views on how Oxford should plan for, and manage, change and development over the next 20 years.
10. The consultation aimed to involve the whole community by sending a questionnaire to each household in Oxford. In addition, specific letters were sent to a wide range of organisations, including statutory bodies, interest groups, and developers. Twelve staffed exhibitions were held in locations across Oxford.
11. A brief summary of the main findings of the consultation exercise is contained in Appendix 2. A much fuller report is available to view on the City Council's website at [www.oxford.gov.uk/corestrategy](http://www.oxford.gov.uk/corestrategy).
12. Officers also held a series of meetings with key partners and stakeholders during 2006 in order to understand fully the needs and aspirations of those organisations and to inform preparation of the Preferred Options document.

## **The Preferred Options document**

13. Preferred Options is a key stage in the new development planning system, and perhaps the stage that differs most from the previous system of Structure and Local Plans. The purpose of the Preferred Options stage for a Core Strategy is to set out and consult upon the preferred spatial strategy, without becoming unduly preoccupied with detailed policy wording.
14. The Preferred Options document is attached at [Appendix 3](#). It can be divided into three main sections. The first section is the introduction and spatial strategy. This starts with a general introduction to the document, and provides some background information about Oxford (the spatial portrait). It then sets out the main issues and challenges facing the City, which leads onto the spatial vision and objectives. The proposed spatial strategy includes a set of key principles, which provide the framework for the options that follow later in the document.
15. The second main section of the document is grouped into themes, such as supporting prosperity and creating safe, active and healthy communities. Within each theme are topic-based options, which cover a range of issues e.g. housing numbers; affordable housing; employment provision; the retail hierarchy; student accommodation; flooding and transport.
16. Where a number of options have been identified, the pros and cons of each of the alternative options are set out alongside the City Council's preferred option. Where only one option seems appropriate, this has been put forward as a preferred approach. It will still be possible for consultees to object to a preferred approach, or to suggest amendments to the approach suggested.
17. The third main section of the document, entitled strategic locations for development, focuses on particular areas that are of strategic importance to the future growth and development of Oxford. It deals with the difficult choices that need to be made about future development within the City, including options relating to the identification of strategic greenfield sites to accommodate housing and employment growth.
18. The document ends with a short section on implementation and monitoring, which will be expanded at submission stage, and the key diagram.

## **Tests of Soundness**

19. A key feature of the new development planning system is the requirement for DPDs to pass nine 'tests of soundness', which are set out in PPS12: Local Development Frameworks and attached to this report at [Appendix 4](#). The new system is still bedding down, and a

number of local planning authorities have run into difficulties in the preparation of their Core Strategies. Some Core Strategies have been rejected as unsound and others have had to be withdrawn before reaching Examination. Even those Core Strategies that have so far passed the tests of soundness have not been held up as examples of best practice.

20. The attached Preferred Options document has a similar format to the West End Area Action Plan, which received positive feedback at the Preferred Options stage. Nevertheless, in the absence of any definitive guide to best practice on Core Strategies, officers will be seeking to obtain informal views from the Government Office for the South East (GOSE) and the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) prior to the meeting. If any significant issues are raised by either of those bodies, they will be reported orally to Members.

### **Sustainability Appraisal**

21. The City Council has undertaken a Sustainability Appraisal (SA), which includes a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). This considers the social, economic and environmental effects of the document, and ensures that, as far as possible, it accords with the principles of 'sustainable development'. Each of the preferred options has been developed, refined and assessed against sustainability criteria. The various alternative options have also been assessed against the same criteria.
22. The Sustainability Appraisal report (SA/SEA) will be published for consultation alongside the Preferred Options document. Since the SA/SEA report is a lengthy technical document, a short Non-Technical Summary has been prepared and is attached to this report at [Appendix 5](#). A full copy of the SA/SEA report is available for Members to view in each of the Party rooms.

### **Relevant Council Resolutions of 20<sup>th</sup> November 2006**

23. At the Council meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> November, two resolutions were passed which are of relevance to the Core Strategy. The first concerned social housing provision, as follows:

*"This Council notes that the requirement for new housing developments is that social housing should make up 50% on sites with more than 10 dwellings. Implementation of policy has been subject to flexible interpretation both in terms of the location and number of resultant social housing units built. There is a particular concern that developers can effectively circumvent the 50% rule by proposing student accommodation for the majority of a windfall site, with the 50% rule then only applying to the remaining minority of the site.*

*This Council resolves to invite the Executive to request the relevant officers to review policy (more specifically but not restricted to the following Local Plan policies:-*

- *HS.4 – General Requirement to provide Affordable Housing*
- *HS.5 – Proportion and Mix of Affordable Housing to be provided*
- *HS.6 – On-Site Provision of Affordable Housing*
- *HS.7 – Affordable Housing and Commercial Development),*

*with the intention of tightening its formulation so as to ensure that housing development in the City reflects the need for a substantial increase in social housing units.”*

24. Officers have reviewed the affordable housing policies in the Local Plan, and the Core Strategy Preferred Options document sets out four different options in relation to affordable housing from residential development, together with a preferred approach regarding affordable housing from commercial development. The Core Strategy also aims to increase the supply of social housing units by increasing the overall housing growth target above the current Local Plan/Structure Plan level.
25. However, in relation to the specific issue of student accommodation, it would not be reasonable to require affordable housing from such developments. Student accommodation is not self-contained housing, and is not in the same Planning Use Class as residential dwellings. The Core Strategy includes a preferred option that seeks to continue to progressively reduce the number of students at both universities living outside of university-provided accommodation, so as to release more housing in the City for other types of residential use. This will be very challenging for the universities to achieve, and requires further increases in purpose-built student accommodation. To require a proportion of affordable housing from student accommodation would make it highly unlikely that new student accommodation would come forward in the quantity required to meet the proposed targets.
26. The second resolution concerned climate change, as follows:

*“This Council has:-*

- *On many occasions stated its commitment to tackling climate change.*
- *Introduced progressive planning policies, such as the Natural Resources Impact Assessment (NRIA), to try and ensure that new buildings use less energy and are responsible for fewer carbon dioxide emissions.*

*However, this Council notes that even if new buildings meet the stringent standards set out in the NRIA they will still draw on off-site energy supplies that are unlikely to be from renewable sources.*

*The Council therefore asks the Executive to ask officers to develop a comprehensive planning policy response to climate change, starting*

*with the Core Strategy Preferred Options Development Plan document, including an additional climate change obligation to secure developer contributions towards off-site measures which might mitigate climate change.”*

27. The Core Strategy Preferred Options document highlights climate change as a major issue, and constitutes the beginning of a comprehensive planning policy response to climate change as requested in this resolution. Climate change features prominently in the proposed Spatial Vision and Objectives for the Core Strategy, together with the Spatial Strategy. The Core Strategy Preferred Options also develops relevant Local Plan policies, such as those relating to flooding and energy and natural resources.
28. Once the strategic planning framework set by the Core Strategy has been confirmed, we will be able to further review how to take forward our policy work on climate change. However, it is not currently within the scope of relevant guidance and legislation to collect developer contributions towards off-site climate change mitigation measures other than in bespoke circumstances, e.g. where a particular development might benefit from an area-wide Combined Heat and Power scheme. The type of obligation proposed in the resolution would not be appropriate as a general policy because there is a need to demonstrate that any mitigation measures for which contributions are sought are directly relevant to the development in question.

### **Financial and Staffing Implications**

29. The production of the Core Strategy is a commitment in the Local Development Scheme (LDS). The LDS sets out key milestones, against which the City Council's performance will be monitored and which may affect future level of Planning Delivery Grant. The costs of consultation and further work on the Core Strategy will be met from existing budgets.
30. The City Council is a significant landowner and some options within the Core Strategy may affect land within the Council's ownership. However, it is not appropriate to consider the potential financial implications for the Council in assessing the planning merits of particular land-use and development options.

### **Core Strategy timetable**

31. Following consideration by Executive Board, the Preferred Options will be subject to a 6-week public consultation period from 30<sup>th</sup> March to 11<sup>th</sup> May 2007. During that time, all Members will have a chance to consider the document, as it will be reported to the April cycle of Area Committees. There will also be three area-based workshops/planning events, which will be spread geographically by grouping the six Area Committees into pairs.

32. Comments and responses collected from public consultation will help inform the submission Core Strategy document. This will be reported to Executive Board and Council, and submitted to the Secretary of State in January 2008. An Examination by an independent Inspector is currently programmed for summer 2008, with adoption anticipated to be in March 2009.

**Name and contact details of author:**

Adrian Roche, 252165, [aroche@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:aroche@oxford.gov.uk)

**Background papers:**

None for this covering report but the Core Strategy Preferred Options document contains references to other strategies and sources of information.

**List of Appendices:**

Appendix 1	Environment Scrutiny Committee comments
Appendix 2	Summary of Issues & Options consultation
Appendix 3	Core Strategy Preferred Options document
Appendix 4	Tests of Soundness from PPS12
Appendix 5	Sustainability Appraisal Non-Technical Summary



**Appendix 1 – Environment Scrutiny Committee comments**  
**(extract from draft minutes of meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2007)**

The Planning Business Manager submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended).

Adrian Roche and Mark Jaggard introduced the report and answered Members questions. During the discussion a number of points were raised as follows:

In relation to Housing, the Committee agreed that the preferred housing option would be that which resulted in the highest number of housing units being achieved, including family accommodation and affordable dwellings. However, the declining availability of suitable land was recognised with many brownfield sites now accounted for. Development in future years may have to take place on greenfield land. That said, the Committee supported the option of building more than 550 units a year to meet housing need. They also supported a limitation on flat conversions.

In relation to Climate Change, the Committee again confirmed its commitment to a 3% annual reduction of carbon emissions and felt that the document should reflect the council's commitment to this. In addition, other businesses, organisations and individuals in Oxford should achieve this ambition. The document should reflect this aim.

The Committee acknowledged the pressures for further retail development in the city centre, but endorsed the idea of greater emphasis being placed on local retail centres, such as the development of a mixed-use district centre in Blackbird Leys.

The Committee didn't come to a consensus on whether there should be a moratorium on development within flood zone 3a. Members suggested that reference was made to the Environment Agency flood map so that members of the public and area committees would be aware of the size of the affected area. Members did accept that tough decisions on the use of protected land may have to be taken to realise Oxford's development plans.

Resolved to ask the Head of Planning to refer the Committee's comments to the Executive Board to consider when it discusses the Core Strategy Preferred Options report.

## **Appendix 2 – Summary of Issues and Options Consultation**

### **Consultation response**

1. At the close of the consultation, 2,205 questionnaires had been received (2,147 leaflets and 58 stakeholders questionnaires). In addition, a further 40 letters were received from stakeholders. Age groupings of respondents were fairly even apart from the under 25 group, which accounted for only 4% of responses. More women than men responded in each age group. Responses were relatively evenly distributed between the OX2, OX3 and OX4 postcodes, with a minor advantage from OX4. The City centre area (OX1) only accounted for 10% of the responses, which is to be expected given that this postcode covers a smaller area than the other three.
2. Whilst the consultation proved to be generally very successful, there was clearly an under-representation of younger people in the survey and the results therefore need to be read with that in mind. In addition, despite contacting representatives of many community and hard to reach groups, and selecting venues for the exhibitions ranging from the staff canteen at BMW to the Asian Cultural Centre in East Oxford, it is acknowledged that there was limited meaningful engagement with hard to reach groups.

### **Results of the public questionnaire**

3. These are the main findings of the questionnaires sent to residents and completed at exhibitions. Results have been combined in order to give a general impression of the issues raised.

#### *Housing*

4. Providing more housing was the least popular choice when asked how to improve quality of life in Oxford, although a significant minority considered it the most important factor. In terms of housing requirements, family housing was considered to be the greatest need with purpose built flats and housing for the elderly also enjoying good support. Conversions, student accommodation and live/work units were thought of as the least important dwelling types for the City. Respondents felt that new developments should be built to higher densities and concentrated on brownfield land, whilst the options of building on Safeguarded Land and reviewing the Green Belt also enjoyed some support. Perhaps unsurprisingly, residents strongly opposed building on greenfield land such as playing fields within the City.

#### *Employment*

5. Creating more jobs was also an unpopular choice in terms of improving quality of life. In terms of employment uses, the top priorities given by

the respondents were high-tech research and development, and the education and health care/hospital sectors. Tourism had some support but is not a priority, while industrial and office development were considered the least suitable options.

### *Transport*

6. There is a large consensus to reduce traffic congestion in order to improve quality of life; transport was also the top priority that the public would like to see change by 2026. Improving facilities for pedestrians and cyclists was considered a priority, whilst providing more car parking facilities was not. The idea of congestion charging was clearly disliked. Improving roads and junctions for all traffic and developing a rapid mass transit system had dispersed values, gaining both positive and negative support.

### *Leisure and Retail*

7. The highest priority for improving the attractiveness of the City centre to shoppers was the promotion of greater choice and more specialist shops while one of the less popular options was simply for more shops. Improving the appearance of the shopping environment was also considered relevant but the provision of more car parking attracted little support. In terms of leisure facilities, an indoor arena gained the greatest support, whilst new and improved parks and indoor sports facilities were also considered necessary. Cultural attractions were deemed to be the lowest priority.

## **Results of the stakeholder questionnaire**

8. The majority of stakeholders agreed with the Core Strategy's spatial issues, suggested list of visions and objectives, but added other issues/objectives etc to be considered alongside them. They also concurred very closely with the results of the public questionnaire regarding types of housing, transport, employment, leisure, shopping and the location of future development. The only major difference between the two questionnaires was the results of the improving quality of life issue, where many stakeholders believed that providing more housing would be of positive benefit.
9. Both sets of respondents were in agreement about the kind of city they would like to see and what is most important to preserve. They would like Oxford to be perceived as an environmentally aware, historic and cultural city, with relatively little support for the car-free and high-tech city options. Unsurprisingly, there was consensus that it is most important to preserve Oxford's character, history and culture, together with its natural and built environment. Likewise, there was agreement across both questionnaires that transport is the most important thing to change in Oxford over the next 20 years.

## **Results of the workshops**

10. Whilst the stakeholders workshop was reasonably well attended, the public workshop was poorly attended. This may have been due to the hot weather, insufficient advance publicity, or the fact that at this early stage the Core Strategy had not generated any significant local press coverage.
11. Both workshops sparked interesting debate across a range of topics, including housing, economic growth, transport, the natural and built environment and wider quality of life issues. Although there was some agreement about the key issues facing Oxford, no consensus emerged in terms of the strategic planning framework; i.e. some people supported a policy of managed growth, whereby further expansion takes place within and adjoining the City, whereas others favoured a policy of containment with growth being directed towards the County Towns.

## **Appendix 4 – Tests of Soundness from PPS12**

1. The DPD (Development Plan Document) has been prepared in accordance with the Local Development Scheme
2. It has been prepared in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), or with the minimum requirements set out in the Regulations where no SCI exists
3. The plan and its policies have been subjected to Sustainability Appraisal
4. It is a spatial plan which is consistent with national planning policy and in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy for the region or, in London, the spatial development strategy and it has properly had regard to any other relevant plans, policies and strategies relating to the area or to adjoining areas
5. It has had regard to the authority's community strategy
6. The strategies/policies/allocations in the plan are coherent and consistent within and between development plan documents prepared by the authority and by neighbouring authorities, where cross-boundary issues are relevant
7. The strategies/policies/allocations represent the most appropriate in all the circumstances, having considered the relevant alternatives, and they are founded on a robust and credible evidence base
8. There are clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
9. It is reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances

Note: In recent Core Strategy Examinations, Test 4 has been sub-divided as follows:

- 4a. It is a spatial plan
- 4b. It is consistent with national planning policy
- 4c. It is in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy

## **Appendix 5 – Non-Technical Summary for the Core Strategy Preferred Options Sustainability Appraisal**

### Introduction

The purpose of Sustainability Appraisal is to promote sustainable development through the integration of social, economic and environmental considerations in the preparation of planning policy documents. The preparation of the SA of the Oxford Core Strategy involved two key stages:

- The production of a Scoping Report setting out what the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal would be, which was published in September 2005.
- The production of the Sustainability Appraisal Report, which is being published with this Non-Technical Summary to accompany the Core Strategy Preferred Options document.

The Scoping Report identified the following key sustainability issues in Oxford:

- Significant residential areas are at risk of flooding;
- Lack of affordable housing;
- Need to make adequate provision for health care and reduce inequalities in health;
- Pockets of poverty, social exclusion and deprivation;
- Poor air quality measured in central Oxford;
- High levels of traffic flow and congestion across Oxford;
- Reliance on energy generated from fossil fuels with low levels coming from renewable energy;
- Protecting/ enhancing open spaces and areas of conservation interest in the face of strong development pressures.

These key sustainability issues, through a careful assessment of issues raised by the public, stakeholders and technical advice, were used to inform the selection and refinement of the Core Strategy Preferred Options.

Each of the preferred options and alternative options has been assessed against twenty-five sustainability objectives. The effects were assessed with reference to the available baseline information. The preferred options are generally representative of the options with the most positive and least negative impacts. Measures aimed at mitigating negative impacts and strengthening positive impacts were also identified.

This Non-Technical Summary identifies the key findings of the appraisal process. It does not discuss options where there were no significant sustainability issues.

## Summary of Key Findings

### **Housing Numbers:**

Given the high level of need for affordable housing the preferred option (550 dwellings a year) was considered most suitable, as it would result in the highest provision of units that would be possible without being likely to have significant adverse impacts on the built environment and countryside.

### **Timing of Housing Delivery:**

The findings of the SA led to a reassessment of the weighting of the options. The original preferred option was to allow housing to be delivered on identified sites as soon as they become available, but this was found to have potential longer-term adverse effects in terms of service provision and infrastructure. The SA indicated that there were significant but differing benefits from both options, and they are now given equal status.

### **Affordable Housing:**

The SA found there to be little variation between the options, other than the fact that the option for 50% affordable housing based on floorspace rather than units may be slightly more likely to help deliver sustainable communities.

### **Economy:**

The preferred approach for building on Oxford's economic strengths was altered to take account of the SA and now incorporates a sentence on the provision of supporting infrastructure.

The preferred option of managed growth was found to be more beneficial against economic objectives than minimal growth, but less likely to have adverse environmental impacts than the higher growth options. The higher growth options are not currently deliverable as they involve land outside the City, and would need to be matched by additional housing to be sustainable.

### **Retail:**

The three retail options were all assessed as being sustainable options. The preferred option of creating a new district centre at Blackbird Leys was considered to have significant sustainability benefits in terms of local job provision and improving accessibility to retail services for local residents.

### **Health and the Hospitals:**

Each of the three options has significant sustainability benefits and drawbacks. As such, no preferred option was selected.

### **Education:**

There was no clear difference in sustainability terms between the two options for the University of Oxford. As such, no preferred option was selected.

### **Flooding:**

The SA found that the preferred option for flooding was very sustainable. The SA also highlights sustainable drainage as an important issue.

**Biodiversity:**

The SA highlighted that there is the potential for the level of development to have a significant impact on biodiversity unless strong emphasis is given to conserving existing features of interest and creating new areas as part of new developments.

**Transport, Accessibility and Traffic Generation:**

The SA highlighted potential conflicts between the impact of higher levels of housing in Oxford on the City's road network, and the fact that locating more housing in Oxford would be likely to reduce in-commuting. Likewise, the concentration of services in a particular area, such as the hospitals in Headington, is likely to reduce overall mileage and emissions but there could be significant localised transport impacts.

The SA found the preferred option on short-term transport infrastructure to be sustainable, but identified the need for more innovative longer-term improvements to accommodate additional development in the City. This helped to develop the preferred approach on long-term transport infrastructure, which was found to have a number of potential positive impacts.

**Strategic Locations for Development:**

The SA found the preferred approaches relating to the City centre and District centres to be sustainable as they encourage development in sustainable locations. The preferred approach relating to regeneration areas was found to be sustainable as it would meet social inclusion objectives.

**Green Belt**

The SA helped to refine the preferred approach. It found that a review of the inner boundary of the Oxford Green Belt would be unlikely to provide much land for development because nearly all of this land has value for biodiversity or recreational reasons, and/or helps to preserve the landscape setting and character of Oxford, and/or is in the flood plain. The preferred approach is now for the North Oxford Gateway AAP and the Site Allocations DPD to consider the potential for any small-scale review of the Green Belt.

**Peartree/ Northern Gateway Safeguarded Land**

The land at Peartree was not considered to be a sustainable location for residential development due to noise and air pollution from the surrounding roads. The SA considered that the site performed strongly against the economic objectives, but unless significant transport mitigation measures were implemented, would be unlikely to be a completely sustainable location.

**Summertown Safeguarded Land**

The SA considered that this land would be a sustainable location for residential development, although care would be needed to avoid any adverse impacts on the adjacent Cherwell Valley green wedge.



### **Barton Safeguarded Land**

The SA found that residential development would be positive in relation to meeting Oxford's housing needs. Options relating to hospital/ university and employment uses would be likely to have positive impacts on Oxford's economic prosperity. There are likely significant effects on road congestion and pollution associated with employment and commercial/ retail development. This is due to the likelihood that they would generate more car journeys. There are less significant traffic generation impacts associated with medical research linked to the Headington hospital sites.

### **Southfield Golf Course**

Although a very sustainable location in terms of location (close to District centres and bus routes to the City centre), the SA found that there was likely to be significant adverse impacts on biodiversity including potential impacts on the Lye Valley SSSI. The golf course and the surrounding area are considered to have a high landscape quality. There could be positive impacts in terms of increased public access, but the adverse impacts on biodiversity arising from any large-scale development would be difficult to mitigate.