

## A Regeneration Framework for Oxford to 2026

### Note to accompany report to the City Executive Board – 14<sup>th</sup> October 2009

Members are aware that the main framework document and covering report has been considered at all the Area Committees in the September/October cycles and the Partnership and Communities Scrutiny Committee. The following table sets out the draft minutes/ action sheets of those meetings together with additional suggested changes to the Framework where appropriate. It also includes a late comment received from the Leader of Oxfordshire County Council and an initial summary of the County Council comments. The Partnership and Communities Scrutiny Committee will submit a separate report but comments on the Committees recommendations are included in this note.

The draft responses to comments made are circulated at this stage to allow members at least 3 days prior to the meeting to consider them – the actions proposed are subject to agreement by the Lead Member (Councillor Antonia Bance) in consultation with the Executive Director.

**The City Executive Board are asked to consider the recommendations of the Area Committees and Scrutiny Committee as set out in the table below plus the further changes suggested by officers.**

**Table of comments received from committee consultation and comment from the County Council**

Committee/ organisation making comment	Summary of comment	Suggested change to document in response to comment (if needed)
<b>Central, South &amp; West Area Committee 8.9.09</b>	<p><b>Draft minute: resolved to:-</b></p> <p><b>(1) Support the Regeneration Framework set out in the report, emphasising that the Framework and Action Plans under it needed to be living documents, actively progressed;</b></p> <p><b>(2) Note that the points raised in consultation (summarised in Appendix 3 to the report) had already resulted in changes to the Framework and would be included and pursued in action plans.</b></p> <p><b>Particular comments by members requiring changes to the Framework:</b>  <b>Cllr Susannah Presse!</b></p>	<p>Change already included in Action Plan – Infrastructure, congestion and accessibility – reduce car dependency on adding reference to support for car sharing clubs. Also <b><i>Amend</i></b></p>

	<p>Add to Paul Cullens comment (Appendix 3, page 23) (Oxford Pedestrian Assn) re using the streets as a sense of place</p>	<p><b>Framework – page 50 amend ‘Lead Partner &amp; Partners Column’ to read ‘Key community groups including Oxford Pedestrians’ Association’ and add to ‘Target Milestones &amp; Outcomes’ column ‘Increase number of car sharing schemes in local communities and other initiatives to increase the contribution the streets make to local communities’.</b></p>
<p><b>North East Area Committee</b> 15.9.09</p>	<p><b>Draft minute:</b> During discussion, the Committee emphasised the need to recognise existing relationships so that efforts were not wasted, nor overlap with existing provisions which might be available elsewhere through other partnership arrangements.</p> <p>Members asked questions about proposals to relate to various organisations across the area and in connection with local conditions. Mr Barrett confirmed that all of these issues would be addressed in what would be a holistic approach to building the Framework.</p> <p>Members also suggested that the way that the information was presented was quite dense and complicated and that a simpler style of presentation might make the issues easier to understand during wider consultation.</p> <p><b>Particular comments by members requiring changes to the Framework:</b> <u>Cllr Ruth Wilkinson</u> Include Citizens Advice Beureau as a partner in any advice work in the action plan (e.g pg 57)</p> <p>Focus on "value added" at schools and in the education system as well as educational attainment (Cllr Brighthouse suggested links to organizations such as the Fisher Family Trust)</p> <p>Explore use of empty shops for cultural activities e.g. arts and crafts centres / exhibitions</p>	<p><b>Amend Framework – People section – improved family support, healthcare &amp; related services section to refer to ‘Citizens Advice Bureau’ in lead partner and partners column p57 &amp; 58</b></p> <p><b>Amend Framework – People section – low education attainment – add reference in action column to “value added’ at schools &amp; in the education system as well as educational attainment’ and add to partners column ‘ Oxfordshire County Council &amp; School partnerships’ page 60</b></p> <p><b>Amend Framework – Economy section p66 – supporting growth in the creative and cultural sector - amend ‘Actions’ column’ to read ‘Support appropriate actions coming out of</b></p>

	<p><u>Cllr Joe McManners</u> Include working with the PCT on reducing teenage pregnancies in the Action Plan</p> <p>Include regulating private landlords in action plan (e.g. licensing)</p> <p>Include action on balance of dwellings in the city. (Discussion also raised issues of involvement of independent and private schools, importance of community development and regeneration, and use of Local Area Agreement reward funding).</p>	<p><i>the Oxfordshire Creative and Cultural Economic Impact Study including investigating use of empty shops for cultural activities’.</i></p> <p><i>Amend Framework – People section – improved family support, healthcare &amp; related services – p57 – add to Action column ‘reducing teenage pregnancies’.</i></p> <p><i>Amend Framework – add as new issue – Infrastructure section – insufficient supply of market and affordable housing - page 51 - refer to project in Corporate Plan to launch accreditation scheme for landlords in the private sector to drive up standards in rental housing by March 2010</i></p> <p>The City Council has a Balance of Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document that is applied to all planning applications to ensure an appropriate mix of dwelling types is maintained in the various city areas. No change to the Framework.</p>
<p><b>East Area Parliament</b> 16.9.09</p>	<p><b>Draft minute:</b> <b>(1) note all comments made;</b> <b>(2) thank Mel Barrett for his interesting presentation, and ask him to take note of all points made.</b></p> <p>Members of the Area Parliament made the following comments:-</p> <p>(a) Concern was expressed about growth in the economy. It was felt that there is a need to provide housing before providing jobs. The current population should be sustained rather than grown. There is not sufficient space for more employment opportunities;</p> <p>(b) The West End development would be a chance to provide more affordable housing. It should have a high proportion of houses and not just offices;</p> <p>(c) East Oxford cannot absorb more housing;</p> <p>(d) Doubts were expressed about the Northern Gateway, as it was felt that there was little point in having jobs in the north</p>	<p>The West End Area Action Plan includes provision to accommodate about 600-800 new dwellings.</p> <p>Paragraph 313 (pages 20-21) of Framework refers to investigating orbital bus routes to improve links between housing</p>

	<p>of the City and housing in the south. Some essential services (such as the Fire Service) should remain within the city;</p> <p>(e) Concern was expressed about tourism – in particular that staff numbers at the Information Centre have been reduced and the most experienced staff made redundant;</p> <p>(f) Concern was also expressed about school standards within Oxford. It would be helpful to encourage parents back into education so that they were better equipped to help their children;</p> <p>(g) It was suggested that sustainable agriculture be explored further, in particular projects to grow more food locally. It was felt that many people would like to work on the land, and it would be good to bring into use agricultural land in or close to the city, so that local people could be involved in growing local food. Land that the Council owned within the city could be used as community gardens for the provision of food. (It was confirmed that the City Council owned several farms but that they were almost wholly let to third parties. However, there was no reason why the city could not talk to its agricultural tenants about various ideas and projects.)</p> <p>(h) It was suggested that jobs and houses should be co-located. Consideration should also be given to environmental concerns. Housing provided should be low emission, and consideration should be given to energy costs and fuel poverty. There was a need to integrate social and environmental challenges;</p> <p>(i) Disappointment was expressed that there was little in the report about health. This was an important issue because of the disparity in life expectancy between parts of the City.</p>	<p>&amp; the business parks.</p> <p><b><i>Amend Framework – People section – Improved family support, healthcare &amp; related services – p59 add action ‘to investigate possible food security initiatives on City Council owned agricultural land leased to tenant farmers for small/medium enterprises’</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Amend Framework – Infrastructure section – Insufficient supply of market and affordable housing – p51 - add reference in Action column to ‘fuel efficient construction standards of homes’</i></b> (advice on fuel poverty – see p58 of Action Plan)</p> <p>Health issues are considered paragraph 3.2.5 (pages 29-32) of the Framework, involvement of Oxfordshire Primary Care Trust (paragraph 4.1 – page 39) &amp; Action Plan – improved family support, health care &amp; related services (pages 57-59).</p>
<p><b>North Area Ctte</b> 1.10.09</p>	<p>Draft minutes – <b>Following the debate, the Committee agreed:</b></p> <p><b>(a) To note the following comments made by members of the Committee and the public:</b></p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>It is premature to approve a Regeneration Framework while the Council is awaiting the Inspectors report on the Core Strategy, as the result would have an impact on the Regeneration Framework;</b></li> <li>• <b>Should request the City Executive Board and Council to defer consideration until the Inspectors report is produced;</b></li> <li>• <b>If the Core Strategy is not sustained in its constituent parts, then it should be looked at again;</b></li> <li>• <b>If Policy CS6 is deleted from the Core Strategy, then the Northern Gateway proposals should be deleted from the Regeneration Framework;</b></li> <li>• <b>Local residents etc. said that they were not consulted and that at a recent public meeting there was no mention that the Northern Gateway was included in the Regeneration Framework;</b></li> <li>• <b>While the voluntary sector is mentioned in the Framework, there is nothing in the Action Plan to support this sector;</b></li> <li>• <b>Not enough emphasis on working with other individuals and organisations;</b></li> <li>• <b>The sharing of information should be an objective in the Action Plan;</b></li> <li>• <b>Tourism is not included in the list covering key sectors, inward investment and business retention, but is listed in the section on visitor economy, value and capacity, the Framework should include tourism;</b></li> <li>• <b>No clear analysis of why businesses close after 3 months in poorer areas of Oxford;</b></li> <li>• <b>Growth figures for jobs in the area, should be a</b></li> </ul>	<p>If the Northern Gateway was deleted as a development area in the Core Strategy Inspectors report, it would not form part of the Framework, no action would be taken on the references to the Northern Gateway &amp; those references would be deleted when it was next revised.</p> <p>See comment to first bullet point above</p> <p>Northern Gateway is allocated in the Core Strategy. It is only cross referenced in the Regeneration Framework. It is incorrect to consider that objections to the Northern Gateway in the Framework would delete the allocation of the site in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>By working with the voluntary sector on initiatives in the Action Plan, the aim would be to share resources for the benefit of all partner groups.</p> <p>See para 4 of Framework on Roles of Partners (p39-42) &amp; Lead Partner &amp; Partners column of Action Plan</p> <p>References to tourism in Cultural &amp; Creative Sector para 3.3.3 of Framework (p35) – Visitor economy:value &amp; capacity (p36-38) &amp; Action Plan – Improve visitor experience (p67-68).</p>
--	---

	<p><b>maximum not a minimum;</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Statistics etc. dated before 2006 are out of date as the current economic climate would not have been taken into account;</b></li> <li>• <b>The statistics on the educational achievement need to be updated;</b></li> <li>• <b>Little emphasis on how the cycle of deprivation is broken in the report;</b></li> <li>• <b>Unclear on what the partnerships were to achieve;</b></li> <li>• <b>Evidence to support the targets/milestones was required;</b></li> <li>• <b>To many actions were not defined correctly in the outcomes;</b></li> <li>• <b>Would like to see Oxford City Council, through the partnership structure encourage its partners to look towards particular issues, such as children’s issues;</b></li> <li>• <b>Need to house the current population of Oxford adequately and the Framework does not go far enough on providing this;</b></li> <li>• <b>Providing housing is not enough to regenerate an area;</b></li> <li>• <b>Oxford is already over developed, there is an imbalance between jobs and housing and that this Framework is a De-regeneration Framework rather than a Regeneration Framework;</b></li> <li>• <b>Extra challenges facing Oxford such as traffic congestion, pollution, and housing need;</b></li> <li>• <b>No mention of traffic problems caused by inward commuting;</b></li> </ul>	<p>Evidence is the most appropriate &amp; up to date info. available. Evidence base will be refreshed every 3 years.</p> <p>See para 3.2.5 of Framework (p29-31)</p> <p>If adopted, the next stage is to work with partner groups to develop the actions listed – hence the reason for some lack of detail at this stage.</p> <p>Regeneration is formed by a combination of physical, social and economic improvements as set out in the themes of the Action Plan.</p> <p>See Action Plan – congestion &amp; accessibility (page 49-50) of</p>
--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Rough sleepers are also citizens of Oxford and should be included;</b></li> <li>• <b>It is vital that the focus is not just on people aged 16 years and over, need to include pre-school children and work with the County Council;</b></li> <li>• <b>Recognising that climate change could have serious implication for Oxford, and that both mitigation and adaptation must be given priority if we are to truly regenerate the City.</b></li> <li>• <b>The Framework is not a strategy, when a strategy is needed;</b></li> <li>• <b>The report has not been subjected to expert criticism;</b></li> <li>• <b>The document is too long and does not inspire confidence;</b></li> <li>• <b>Unreasonable and undesirable to rush through the report;</b></li> <li>• <b>Unfortunate that there was a failure to consult with other District Council's in Oxfordshire and the MP's in Oxford;</b></li> <li>• <b>While it was valuable to have the debate/discussion at the North Area Committee as part of the consultation process, concerns were raised that it was happening rather late;</b></li> <li>• <b>Unacceptable that the report is going to Council and a disgrace to Oxford it is adopted;</b></li> <li>• <b>The aims of the document were supported, but not the document itself;</b></li> </ul> <p><b>(b) To support a Regeneration Framework for Oxford to 2026;</b></p>	<p>Framework.</p> <p>See para. 14 of covering report.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>(c) To note the comments received so far in response to consultation and the changes made to the document as a result;</p> <p>(d) To submit to the City Executive Board all of the comments made by individual Members of the North Area Committee and members of the public;</p> <p>(e) To request the City Executive Board to amend the timetable so that the Regeneration Framework for Oxford to 2026 is considered only after the Inspectors Report, following the Examination in Public of the Oxford Core Strategy, has been received and digested by the City Council and the public;</p> <p>(f) To request the City Executive Board, that if the Inspectors report, following the Examination in Public of the Oxford Core Strategy, removes parts of the Core Strategy, that consideration of the Regeneration Framework for Oxford 2026, be delayed to allow for further amendments in the light of the Inspectors report;</p> <p>(g) That the Regeneration objectives for Oxford, paragraph 1.4 of the report headed ‘The Regeneration objectives can be summarised as follows’ – be amended as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(1)The first bullet point is amended to read “<i>grow the economy of central Oxfordshire to provide sustainable jobs for a well housed population and maximise opportunities for all</i>”</p> <p>(h) That the Regeneration objectives for Oxford, paragraph 1.4 of the report headed ‘We will meet these objectives by’ – be amended to include the following additional bullet points:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(1) By engaging with the community and supporting the voluntary sector, to ensure that community lead groups</p>	<p>See comment on first bullet point of resolution (a) above</p> <p>Amend section 1.4 as suggested</p> <p>Amend section 1.4 as suggested</p>
--	--	--



	<p><b>have the resources and practical encouragement to address local needs;</b></p> <p><b>(2) Striving to break the cycle of deprivation, by concentrating on the life experiences of the first 7 years of children</b></p> <p><b>(3) Providing an effective and sustainable transport infrastructure.</b></p> <p>Record of debate: Graham Jones felt that the Regeneration Framework linked to the Oxford Core Strategy and that the City Council should wait until the Inspectors report following the Examination in Public of the Core Strategy had been received.</p> <p>Councillor Goddard felt that the discussion was premature as we did not know the outcome of the Inspectors report and that any discussion should wait until the Inspectors report was received as its contents would be binding on the Council. Councillor Campbell agreed with Councillor Goddard and said that the relationship between the Core Strategy and the Regeneration Framework had to be understood.</p> <p>Councillor Goddard added that there should be no further discussion of the northern gateway proposals.</p> <p>Tony Joyce asked what the status of the document in real terms was.</p> <p>Mrs Harris from Woodstock Road felt that the North Area Committee should comment that if Policy CS6 was deleted then the northern gateway should be deleted from the Regeneration Framework. She added that people were not consulted and that at a recent public meeting there had been no mention that the northern gateway would be included in the Regeneration Framework.</p> <p>Graham Jones said he appreciated the hard work of the officers, and re-iterated his earlier comment that no decisions should be</p>	<p>In response Mark Jaggard said that there was a link between the Core Strategy and the Regeneration Framework. However the Regeneration Framework was not just about physical measures. He said that if the Inspectors report disagreed on the northern gateway proposals there was still enough in the Core Strategy to go forward. With regeneration, the Council are looking at a whole range of regeneration benefits and that the Homes and Communities Agency had said that this was the right document to do this with. He further added that should the northern gateway not be supported the Council could still adopt the Core Strategy minus the elements concerned with the northern gateway.</p> <p>In response Mark Jaggard said that it cut across many Council departments and allowed for joined up thinking and a commitment to work in partnership. No one organisation could tackle all of the problems facing Oxford and it was a commitment rather than an inspirational document.</p> <p>In response Mark Jaggard said that if Policy CS6 was deleted then the northern gateway would also be removed. He said that the Core Strategy was a primary document and highlighted/allocated sites for future development. The Regeneration Framework was not about allocating sites for development.</p> <p>Mark Jaggard said that it was important that all organisations worked together and did not agree that the Core Strategy had a</p>
--	---	---

	<p>taken until the Inspectors report on the Core Strategy had been received and that the City Executive Board and Council should be asked to defer consideration.</p> <p>Councillor Goddard said that there was a lack of emphasis on how you broke the cycle of deprivation. You need to start at the beginning not just when people needed housing or were already in education. It was also lacking in emphasis on working with others.</p> <p>Councillor Armitage said that tourism was included in one part of the document, but not elsewhere in the document. With regard to Neighbourhood Action Groups, the sharing of information was very important and this should be included in the objectives. While the voluntary sector was mentioned, there was nothing in the Actions that engaged or supported this sector.</p> <p>Paul Blay said that there were very important problems facing Oxford and there was no clear diagnosis of why it was that businesses in poorer areas tended close after 3 months. He said that the Action Plan was about large projects and generalities and there needed to be a link between the problems and the actions to tackle them. A strategy was required and the Regeneration Framework was neither a framework nor a strategy.</p> <p>Evan Harris MP, said that if the Core Strategy was not sustained in its constituent parts, then it should be looked at again. The growth figure for jobs in the area should be a maximum figure not a minimum figure. The Framework made no mention of traffic problems caused by inward commuting to the City. He said that the two MP's for Oxford were not consulted and he could not see whether Cherwell District Council, West Oxfordshire District Council or South Oxfordshire District Council had been consulted, key partners. The Framework did not go far enough on housing need and that the current population needed to be adequately housed first. Also any data before 2006 was now out of date due to the current economic climate. He closed by stating that he did not object to the aims of the document, but felt that it was seriously flawed.</p>	<p>fundamental impact on the Regeneration Framework.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Mr Feaney felt that if the North Area Committee did not comment on the Framework, it would be committing mal-administration. He felt that the Committee should support the first recommendation detailed in the report and that comments should be passed to the City Executive Board on recommendation 2. He felt that the Regeneration Framework as more of a de-generation policy and that there was an imbalance between jobs and housing in the city. Oxford already was over developed and that he wanted to see an upgraded City Centre.</p> <p>Tony Joyce said that the report had not been subjected to expert criticism and that more careful analysis was required. He said that the current jobless did not have the qualifications required for the new jobs that would be created.</p> <p>Councillor Fooks also highlighted the imbalance between jobs and housing and that traffic had not been highlighted in the document. She also said that the northern gateway was not a major existing regeneration project and this should be corrected. She was pleased to see the culture and creative sectors included. The figures on educational achievement also required updating and it needed to be acknowledged that rough sleepers were also citizens of Oxford. She felt that the document overall was too long and did not inspire confidence.</p> <p>Councillor Campbell felt that the consultation at the North Area Committee had been valuable but was concerned that it was happening rather late.</p> <p>Councillor McCready supported the aims of the document, but could not support the document itself. It did not provide a strategy and he was unclear on what the various partnerships were to achieve. Evidence that the targets/milestones were achieved also needed adding. Too many actions were not defined correctly in the outcomes.</p>	<p>Mark Jaggard again said that the document was not a planning/physical development document. It was an evolving document that would be reviewed every 3 years.</p>
<p><b>South East Area Ctte</b> 5.10.09</p>	<p>Extract from Action sheet: agreed to:-</p> <p>(1) Note all comments made and extra information given;</p> <p>(2) Support the Regeneration Framework and welcome its</p>	

	<p>presentation at City Executive Board and Council in due course.</p> <p>(Discussion included clarification of difference between the Core Strategy and the Framework, concern housing development close to areas of high population density, the Framework puts us in a good position in the 'single conversation', proposed new job opportunities and improved orbital bus routes to link people to jobs)</p>	
<p><b>Cowley Area Ctte</b> 7.10.09</p>	<p>Draft minute - <b>The Committee agreed:</b></p> <p><b>(a) To support the Regeneration Framework for Oxford to 2026;</b></p> <p><b>(b) To note the comments received in response to the consultation and the changes made to the document as a result;</b></p> <p><b>(c) To inform the City Executive Board of recommendation (a) above and to submit to the City Executive Board the following further comments:</b></p> <p><b>(1) That there was a real need for community facilities in the area covered by the Cowley Area Committee, as there were no Council provided facilities since the former Cowley Community Centre had been closed and demolished;</b></p> <p><b>(2) Consultation, some local Groups may not have been consulted on the Framework.</b></p> <p><b>(d) To request the Area Co-ordinator to discuss further with James Groat the immediate need for youth facilities and community support in the Cowley Area Committee area and to submit a report to a future meeting of the Area Committee.</b></p> <p>Record of the debate: James Groat addressed the Committee and said that there were many good things happening in Cowley and in the Ark-T Centre and this became apparent when the Ark-T Centre coordinated</p>	

the Cowley Feast Event. This involved working with 45 different organisations, many of whom had been providing valuable services to the community for many years. Some of the organisations received help from the City Council, either from central funding or from devolved funding via the Cowley Area Committee. He said that while the Ark-T ran the Cowley feast for 3 years, it failed during that time to successfully bring people together and develop a sense of community, where people were able to cross over into different age, cultural and interest groups. During this time when the Cowley Community Planning meeting was being held, the issue was addressed and it was concluded that Cowley lacked a sense of identity and further discussions were held.

James Groat said however that the discussions were not followed through due to the Cowley Community Planning Meeting and its coordinator had come to an end. The Ark-T Centre has taken the initiative in a number of small projects, but the task is greater than what the Centre is able to respond to. The Centre was asked if it would consider coordinating the Cowley Community Planning Meeting again, but was not able to do so due the resources not being available.

James Groat said that Cowley had no youth working, community workers or a community centre, unlike other areas such as East Oxford, Rose Hill etc. He asked the Council to consider appointing a Community Development Worker for the area, to begin building a sense of community and to consult with local people on what sort of community facility they would want, now that the former Cowley Community Centre had been demolished. He added that the voluntary sector in the area would work with this person and the Ark-T Centre was willing to provide office accommodation and support. He concluded by asking that a small group be appointed to consider a way forward for investing some community resources in Cowley.

Councillor Keen said that as part of the redevelopment of the former Cowley Community Centre site, any developer would have to provide a minimum of 250sqm of community accommodation.

	<p>Councillor Timbs agreed with James Groat on the need for community facilities in the area and he expressed concern at the future of the Lord Nuffield Club which was currently in administration.</p>	
<p><b>Partnership &amp; Communities Scrutiny Committee</b> <b>6.10.09</b></p>	<p><b>General Recommendations</b></p> <p>(a) The Action Plan in its current form is not adequate to provide a robust mechanism to monitor and demonstrate improved outcomes. This should be redrafted to provide a more focused framework that clearly outlines priorities, expected outcomes and effects that can be evaluated</p> <p>(b) Before the Framework is finally drafted and adopted by Council CEB should consider all suggestions from Area Committees and Scrutiny and either include them or explain why they do not wish to do so.</p> <p><b>Specific Recommendations</b> <b><i>Balance within Regeneration</i></b> Committee statement: The Framework prioritises economic regeneration with insufficient attention to other aspects of regeneration.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>(c) To place greater emphasis on physical, social and environmental regeneration.</p> <p><b><i>Affordable Housing</i></b> Committee statement: Affordable housing is key to a sustainable long term future for Oxford and its communities. The Framework does not highlight or prioritise this adequately</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>(d) To link the provision of affordable housing and improvements within the private rented sector stock with all elements within the Framework and reprioritise this within action planning.</p> <p><b><i>Jobs</i></b> Committee statement:</p>	<p>Action Plan includes target milestones, outcome &amp; timeframe and as stated in the Framework – introduction section – it will remain an evolving document with the Action Plan updated on an annual basis.</p> <p>Agreed – this is the process.</p> <p>The Action Plan is divided into Place/Infrastructure &amp; People sections as well as economy section to represent a balance of initiatives contributing to regeneration.</p> <p>Issue addressed – see para. 3.1.2 of Framework Housing: affordability &amp; shortage and pages 51-53 of Action Plan</p>

	<p>The Framework emphasises the importance of high tech jobs in the context of economic regeneration. This is only part of the picture for Oxford communities. The availability of “entry level” jobs in terms of providing regeneration within our deprived communities is important.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>(e) To redraft the Framework so it recognises the importance of entry level employment in providing regeneration within deprived communities</p> <p><b>Community Participation and Engagement</b> Committee statement: An effective and living strategy has to engage with and produce real outcomes for communities</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>(f) To bring forward at the earliest opportunity both: - The detail of how we will communicate our ambitions to our communities in a shared dialogue; and - A blue print for community participation to be used as a basis for all actions and projects</p> <p>(g) To ensure full participation of Area Committees in all projects relating to their area</p> <p><b>General Statement</b> The Committee recognises that this is a valuable piece of work that is well evidenced. It represents a significant improvement to strategic planning for regeneration and has the potential to move Oxford and its communities forward in a positive and collaborative way. The committee accepted the principles of the Framework but felt it needed to be rebalanced along the lines of the recommendations</p> <p><b>Balance within Regeneration</b> Councillor Simmons How does the document address environmental decline Councillors Simmons &amp; Rundle The Framework is balanced too much in favor of economic regeneration at the expense of other areas Councillor Muirray</p>	<p>This is recognized in the Action Plan with initiatives such as the retail skills programme (page 54).</p> <p>Development of the document to date has involved a wide range of consultation – see para 8 of covering report; and implementation of the action plan will involve the community as the partner organizations involved – see p45-47 of Action Plan</p> <p>See para 14 of covering report &amp; comment on East Area Parliament – recommendation (h) above</p> <p>See comment on Scrutiny recommendation above on balance within regeneration</p>
--	---	---

	<p>The focus is too much on economic regeneration and worklessness needs to be looked at alongside physical, social and environmental issues  We should be asking the PCT and Police to focus more on prevention and detection around “hard drugs”. These are the basis of much crime and anti-social behavior  What are the plans for education and skills particularly for young vulnerable people? Would we reconsider a Foyer  What if Grenoble Road doesn’t happen? What is plan B</p> <p>Councillors Murray and Altaf-Khan  There are pockets of deprivation in other areas. The concentration on super output areas for deprivation misses these. How can we ensure we won’t do this</p> <p>Councillor Rundle  The regeneration objectives at 1.4, even if not in any particular order, do suggest a hierarchy. Both sets should be written the other way round. In particular engagement and participation of communities should always be first. This should be reflected throughout the document and isn’t  This is a living document but the vision and aims need to remain stable. As written they will age quickly. These needs to be reconsidered  Councillor Royce  Why wasn’t Evan Harris consulted?</p> <p><b>Affordable Housing</b>  Councillor Murray  The delivery of affordable housing is not prominent enough within the Framework. Just delivering on the recommendations of the OSP Affordable Housing Review is not ambitious enough  The quality of housing in the private sector is not addressed along with plans for regulation to ensure standards. How about the outcomes from the Strategic paper done on this subject a while ago</p>	<p>See Action Plan – page 57</p> <p>See Action Plan – pages 59-60</p> <p>There are no easy Plan B options. In the short term, allocated sites for future development included in Core Strategy and housing land allocation addressed in Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. At the same time, continue to work sub-regionally to allocate land for at least 4,000 homes to assist the need of Oxford.</p> <p>The Action Plan – People &amp; Economy sections are theme based to bring regeneration improvements for the benefit of the city as a whole and para 1.6 of the Framework provides for other evidence based need projects.</p> <p><b><i>Amend Framework – re-order bullet points as suggested.</i></b></p> <p>It is intended to revise the document on a regular basis.</p> <p>Oxford’s MPs have now been consulted.</p> <p>See comment to Scrutiny recommendation above plus recommended addition to the document to refer to landlord accreditation scheme from North East Area Committee and recommendation (g) of North Area Committee on para 1.4 – the Regeneration objectives..</p>
--	---	---



	<p>What is the allocation policy review? Details and relevance Why is there no mention of Rosehill Phase 2</p> <p><b>Jobs</b> Councillor Murray How about jobs for 16year olds in the City with low levels of qualification. No emphasis is placed on this The diversity of our economy is not mentioned. How about our manufacturing base What are we to do to help employers to provide better diversity in our economy Councillor Royce Focus needs to be kept on tourism. Not only is this important to the economy of the City and region but it provides many of the entry level jobs we need</p> <p><b>Community Participation and Engagement</b> Councillor Murray How do we increase community capacity to engage with this work Councillors Smith &amp; Rundle We should take from this what suits our areas. One size does not fit all Councillor Altaf-Khan Ordinary people cannot engage or participate with a document like this. How will we ensure participation Tenant representatives Engagement and participation of ordinary people should be a priority throughout this. Disappointed that it is not Tenant representatives Need to be clear how some of these things are going to happen and what difference they will make Councillor Simmons To be a living document we must see engagement and participation with our communities. Disappointed not to see a blue print for this in the Framework</p>	<p>See Action Plan p56 &amp; p59-60</p> <p>See Action Plan p67 on tourism</p> <p>See comment on Scrutiny recommendation above.</p> <p>This document is aimed at key partner organizations who work together to regenerate Oxford, such as an aid for the Homes and Communities Agency in their investment decisions. It is not intended to be read by all citizens of Oxford. As detailed action plans for areas eg Barton are brought forward, these will be consulted on/produced with full community input.</p>
<p><b>Councillor Keith Mitchell, Leader, Oxfordshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Concerned about reference to accuracy of school attainment in the city. Provided data from education officers on the performance of city schools relative to Oxfordshire and nationally. Asked to review statement in the Framework. We have work to do in the whole county on school attainment. Progress has been made and this remains a very high priority for the County.</p>	<p>The figures used come from the Department for Children Schools and Families, and are the GCSE results of children who live in Oxford (as opposed to the results of children who attend school in Oxford). The results relate to children in the academic year 2006/07 and these remain the most up to date figures (for results by location of residence) - figures for 2007/08 are due to be released next month. These figures show that there was a</p>

		<p>gap of 15.2% between the Oxford and England figures for pupils attaining five or more A* to C grades. However, the figures also show a smaller gap of 9.4% between Oxford and England for pupils attaining five or more A* to C grades including English and Maths.</p> <p>So the figures are correct, they are the most up to date currently available, and the most appropriate to use as the figures for children who live in Oxford is our primary constituency.</p> <p>The figures supplied by the County Council relate to results in Oxford schools, rather than children who live in Oxford. Also the Oxford average have been produced by a simple average of the four secondary schools - and does not take into account that the number of children attending each school may be very different, which could skew the statistics.</p> <p>No change to the Framework except to correct an error in the text on page 23 of the full document. <b><i>Under 'labour supply' where it says 'this compares to a national average of 60%', the figure quoted should be '46%'.</i></b></p>
<p><b>Oxfordshire County Council Initial summary response received on 25<sup>th</sup> August 2009. County has stated further detailed comments are to follow but these have not been received to date</b></p>	<p><b>General comments</b></p> <p>Oxfordshire County Councils welcomes the Oxford City Council's Regeneration Framework as a useful starting point for developing effective joint working with partners to improve outcomes for people in Oxford.</p> <p><b>Priority Areas</b></p> <p>The County Council recognises the need for improved joint working to improve outcomes in all the areas of significant deprivation, particularly Blackbird Leys, Barton and Rose Hill, but also other wards where high deprivation may be partly masked by other factors. The Oxfordshire Joint Strategic Needs Analysis 2008 indicates that Blackbird Leys and Barton are the most deprived with high needs on several indices. However Blackbird Leys already has high levels of services compared to Barton. Deprivation in Rose Hill is masked by the relative</p>	

	<p>affluence of Iffley Village. There are other deprived wards such as St. Mary's, Cowley and Iffley Fields but this is masked by the high number of students in rented accommodation.</p> <p><b>Growth and Jobs</b></p> <p>The approach to regeneration which focuses on raising the skills of the existing population and tackling health inequalities and deprivation is welcomed.</p> <p>However, there are some significant resourcing and other issues for the County Council implied in this approach whose views will need to be taken into account through consultation.</p> <p>The Framework is as much a strategy for growth as regeneration. The Framework states that "there is a need for continued development and growth to support a growing population". It is not clear that the draft strategy takes sufficient account of the LGIU briefing that forms appendix 1, which stresses that "not all activities that promote economic development are regeneration, and economic growth does not necessarily benefit everyone", nor indeed with the South East Plan which stresses the need to "protect the setting and character of Oxford" (Policy CO1) and states that "in Oxford, development for employment uses will be expected to take place primarily on previously developed land and former safeguarded land or in conjunction with development schemes for mixed uses incorporating housing town centre or other facilities" (Policy CO2). It is not clear how well the objective at paragraph 1.4 on page 9 to "grow the economy to provide jobs for a growing population and maximise opportunities for all" fits with the fact that there is already a mismatch between labour demand and labour supply. Given that "the number of jobs in Oxford is larger than the size of the working age population" (paragraph 3.2.1, page 21) promoting further employment growth risks exacerbating this imbalance, and it is not clear whether the text on page 34 is advocating the release of yet more employment land.</p>	<p>Revised national guidance was issued in May 2009 – see section 1.2 of Framework and as a consequence the briefing on transforming places that originally formed Appendix 1 has been deleted.</p> <p>It is right that the Framework needs to sit within the existing regional and local frameworks. Oxford and Central Oxfordshire is identified as a 'diamond for growth and investment' in the adopted Regional Economic Strategy as well as a regional hub. Clearly the Oxford Sustainable Community Strategy maintains a cross-cutting theme of the economy as well as the five flagship issues. The South East Plan makes it clear that Oxford has a dual role. Firstly in fulfilling its own role within the local economy and secondly by contributing to that of the wider sub-region. Paragraph 22.5 explains in more detail that "Oxford itself will be expected to grow physically and economically in order to accommodate its own needs, contribute to those in the wider sub-region and help maintain its world-class status." In particular, as highlighted by the County Council, the Regional Spatial Strategy identifies the safeguarded land at Peartree (ie Northern Gateway) for employment development. The Census of Population clearly shows that the trend in the ratio of Oxford's jobs to the resident workforce has significantly improved over the three decades from 1971 to 2001. In 1971 the ratio was 1.76 whilst by 2001 it had improved to 1.44. It is never expected that any city at the heart of a region will be totally self-sufficient. The aim is to maintain, and preferably improve the balance which exists. The Inspector at the Core Strategy examination was</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Some specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• page 10- map of regeneration areas: Northern Gateway and (to a lesser extent) Barton are about growth as well as regeneration. In addition there is some inconsistency as to what the City Council considers to be areas for regeneration: e.g. the areas listed differ between sections 1 and 2 of the framework, which are different again in the LDF core strategy.</li> <li>• page 14: "diamonds for growth" should be "diamonds for investment and growth".</li> <li>• page 19: there appears to be a difference over population forecasts with the City Council viewing the higher figure as more realistic. More work on forecasting could be done with the Oxfordshire Data Observatory.</li> <li>• page 47: under the "evening economy" there is no mention of the City Centre Manager, an exciting new initiative jointly funded by the County and City Councils.</li> <li>• page 49: the "allocation of growth space within the local development framework" should be viewed within the South East Plan policies quoted above.</li> <li>• page 49-50: on both on "congestion and accessibility" the County is the lead authority rather the City, and the City is not the lead authority on rail improvements.</li> <li>• page 50-51: there is reference to "complementary investment in Central Oxfordshire Sub Region". Again, this needs to be seen in the context provided by the South East Plan which states at paragraph 22.9 "within Oxford the overall aim will be to achieve a broad balance between housing and jobs" and "land should not be released for employment to the north of Oxford that could adversely affect the future economic buoyancy of Bicester, Kidlington or Witney or undermine the opportunities to integrate the south of Oxford urban</li> </ul>	<p>clear on this, and in his summary one day confirmed that he thought the balance was due to improve over the plan period.</p> <p>The City Council has been consistent – both the Core Strategy &amp; Regeneration Framework refer to the same areas for regeneration plus the contribution the Northern Gateway will make to regeneration as a development.</p> <p><b><i>Amend Framework – page 14, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph as suggested.</i></b></p> <p>The Oxfordshire Data Network is involved</p> <p><b><i>Amend Framework – Action Plan – p47 add ‘City Centre Manager’ to Lead Partner &amp; Partners column</i></b></p> <p>See comment above on South East Plan</p> <p><b><i>Amend Framework – Action Plan – p49 to list Oxfordshire County Council first &amp; p50 to list the rail authorities first</i></b></p> <p>The South East Plan Panel concluded, and the Secretary of State concurred, that land at and in the vicinity of Peartree at the northern edge of Oxford could contribute to the city's roles without adversely affecting other areas. Although the South East Plan recognises that the location, level and form of development, including Peartree, will be a matter for local determination. Paragraph 22.5 goes on to recognise that whilst not directly competing with Oxford, other centres such as Bicester would be encouraged to increase its social and</p>
--	---	--

	<p>extension into the wider southern urban area".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• page 57 and elsewhere: there are resource issues for the County Council which need to be explored through consultation (for example, children's centres).</li> <li>• (former Appendix A): recognising that Oxford lies within a sub region with a strong economy, the approach should be "to encourage people in deprived areas to benefit from nearby employment hubs - whether through transport connections, improving skills, raising aspirations, or addressing health issues".</li> </ul> <p><b>Population</b></p> <p>The City has a younger age profile than the rest of the county. The numbers of older people in the city are likely to marginally reduce rather than increase over the next 5 years. However, their health and social care needs are likely to increase. We anticipate increasing numbers of disabled people and these are not mentioned in the Framework.</p> <p><b>The role of others</b></p> <p>Page 33: It would be appreciated if the County Council's roles, for example, lead authority on Local Area Agreement, county sustainable community strategy and strategic partnership framework, statutory lead on the economic assessment were recognised. There is no mention of the roles of others such as the Oxford Economic Partnership or organisations such as transport operators.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to say more about the vital role of the voluntary, community and faith sectors in helping to take forwards the priorities. For example, developing an approach to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting community groups</li> <li>• Capacity building for the sector - encouraging a more</li> </ul>	<p>economic containment. Para 22.10 confirms that "at Bicester every opportunity should be taken to promote the town, as a new location for higher value and knowledge-based business, separately and in association with the Oxford to Cambridge Arc." Consultants (Ove-Arup) working for the County Council concluded that knowledge based firms would not be attracted to Bicester but would instead look to other parts of the UK/Europe.</p> <p>The former Appendix has been deleted.</p> <p>Will be able to assess if further amendments are needed to Section 4 – Roles of Partners when the detailed comments of the County Council are received.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>robust and sustainable sector</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A framework for active engagement</li></ul> <p><b>Governance and representation</b></p> <p>There is a need to develop clear governance frameworks for regeneration projects and initiatives to reduce inequalities and break the cycle of deprivation that recognise the various statutory roles and responsibilities of partners including the County Council.</p>	<p>Each regeneration project will need their own governance structure, which must be fit for the purpose. This is just good project management. An existing example is the West End project.</p>
--	--	--