

**To:**  
**Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee – 16<sup>th</sup> November 2009**  
**City Executive Board - 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2009**      **Item No:**

**Report of:** Head of City Development

**Title of Report:** Annual Monitoring Report 2008/09

### **Summary and Recommendations**

**Purpose of report:** To approve the Annual Monitoring Report for submission to the Secretary of State.

**Key decision?** No

**Executive Lead Member:** Councillor Colin Cook

**Report Approved by:**

**Chief Executive:** Peter Sloman

**Finance:** Anna Hedges

**Legal:** Jeremy Thomas

**Head of Environmental Development:** John Copley

**Head of City Development:** Michael Crofton-Briggs

**Spatial and Economic Development Manager:** Mark Jaggard

**Policy Framework:** Production of the Annual Monitoring Report is a government requirement of all local planning authorities. The Annual Monitoring Report enables an assessment to be made of the performance of the planning policies of the Local Development Framework.

**Recommendation(s):**

That the City Executive Board is asked to:-

1. approve the Annual Monitoring Report for submission to the Secretary of State;
2. authorise the Head of City Development to make any necessary editorial corrections to the document prior to publication.

## Introduction

1. The City Executive Board is asked to consider the Annual Monitoring Report (Appendix 1) before it is submitted to the Secretary of State. This is the City Council's fifth monitoring report to assess the effectiveness of planning policies of the Local Development Framework. It covers the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2008 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2009 and is, by and large, a factual document.
2. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (Section 35) requires every local planning authority to submit an annual monitoring report to the Secretary of State containing information on the implementation of the Local Development Scheme and the extent to which policies set out in Local Development Framework are being implemented.

## Why Monitor?

3. Monitoring is essential to establish what is happening now, what may happen in the future and then compare these trends against existing policies and targets to determine what needs to be done. It provides a crucial feedback loop and information on the performance of policy and its surrounding environment. As the delivery of sustainable development and sustainable communities is a key focus of planning, monitoring provides a check on whether those aims are being achieved. Monitoring will also enable the City Council to respond more quickly to changing priorities and circumstances.
4. Development plan documents are assessed at independent examination on whether the policies are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and whether there are clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring.

## Report content

5. The report includes sections setting out key facts about Oxford and assesses the implementation of the Statement of Community Involvement. The report covers the following key areas:

**Local Development Scheme (LDS) monitoring:** this reviews actual plan preparation progress against the milestones set out in the LDS. The main documents/events in the monitoring year were:

Core Strategy – the proposed submission document was published and following consultation, the Core Strategy was submitted to the Secretary of State. Subsequently, the hearing sessions of the examination into the Core Strategy were opened in July 2009. In the light of legal challenges to the South East Plan (which forms part of the Development Plan for Oxford), the Planning Inspector has decided to

suspend the Core Strategy examination until the legal challenges are concluded.

West End Area Action Plan (AAP) – following an examination, the Inspectors report was received in April 2008 and the AAP was adopted in June 2008.

Northern Gateway Area Action Plan – a consultation by letter and questionnaire took place November – December 2008.

Streamlined Contributions Supplementary Planning Document - initial consultation by letter and questionnaire was undertaken in August 2008. The City Executive Board approved the draft document for public consultation in January 2009. (However, progress has subsequently been delayed due to further consultations with Oxfordshire County Council and the production of a viability study to support the document).

The City Council has shown a strong commitment to delivering the first phase of the Local Development Framework and has met many of the challenging targets it set itself. Whilst there have been some occasions when the planned timetable has had to be reviewed, these amendments have not had any significant effect on the overall programme.

**Monitoring policies:** in accordance with government guidance, the City Council has adopted an 'objectives-policies-targets-indicators' approach to ensure relevant and effective monitoring. The indicators used include core output indicators, which have been set nationally for all local authorities in order to provide data in a consistent format. Local output indicators and contextual indicators have also been used to highlight key characteristics of Oxford, and to show the baseline position.

## Key Findings

6. A traffic light approach has been applied to this years report to more accurately reflect policy targets against objectives. Where appropriate, the report shows how policy monitoring links to national targets and corporate objectives.

7. Of the 27 indicators monitored, 2 indicators have not been given a score as targets have not been identified. The table shows that the majority of the indicators are on target:

	Green (on-target or progressing towards it)	Amber (new indicator or policy needs close attention next year)	Red (under performance against target)
National core indicator	9	3	0
Local/ contextual indicator	10	1	2

8. The 08/09 monitoring year needs to be assessed in the context of the economic downturn. Nationally, the downturn has seen reduced economic output and an increase in numbers of people out of work with an adverse impact on the construction industry in particular. Whilst Oxford has been clearly affected by the recession with, for example, an increase in jobseekers allowance claimant count from 1,630 in October 2008 to 2,914 in April 2009, Oxford has not been as badly affected as other areas. This is demonstrated by the many positive findings in this years report:

- 665 net additional dwellings were completed in 08/09 (over 50% above the Regional Spatial Strategy and emerging Core Strategy target of 400 dwellings per year).
- Overall, Oxford has already exceeded its first 5-year requirement for housing provision (target 2,000 dwellings) after only 3 years because the cumulative total of the 3 years from 2006/7 to 2008/9 totals 2,015 dwellings. 95.1% of the development sites have been identified in the Strategic Housing Land Assessment update to meet the 5 year rolling supply of deliverable sites. This excludes dwellings from windfall sites.
- 231 affordable dwellings were completed in 2008/09, above the Corporate Plan target of 150 dwellings a year.
- 15,412 m<sup>2</sup> of completed development for employment use was achieved, 48% less than 07/08 and has been decreasing each monitoring year. However, the development achieved still adds to the range & type of employment land available and is still an increase in the recession.
- all developments of 10 or more dwellings or 2,000 m<sup>2</sup> or more floorspace approved in 08/09 complied with the requirements of the Natural Resource Impact Analysis to provide a minimum of 20% of their energy requirements by on-site renewables.

9. There are 2 indicators not performing against target:

**Students and purpose built student accommodation** – The Oxford Local Plan sets a target of no more than 3,000 students to be living in accommodation not provided by each university. Policy ED.6 states that permission will not be granted for additional teaching/administrative accommodation where the number of full-time students at each respective university living outside of university provided accommodation does not exceed 3,000. Similar policies have been included in the emerging Core Strategy. In 08/09, the University of Oxford has reported they are over this limit by 619 students and Oxford Brookes by 795 students. However, there are a number of student accommodation schemes currently under construction (348 study rooms for University of Oxford and 842 for Oxford Brookes) plus planning permission was granted in the monitoring year for a further 132 new student units for University of Oxford. Other student accommodation schemes are in the pipeline. These planned developments should help to reduce the deficit next year. Planned growth in student numbers is expected to be about 1% per year for each university and development sites have been allocated with the capacity for approximately 3,100 units of student accommodation. Major development is planned by both the University of Oxford and Oxford Brookes University. It is critical that the development is only permitted where the City Council is satisfied that by the time new developments are operational, there will be a correct amount of purpose built student accommodation.

**Compliance of non-residential development to cycle standards** – Of the 50 monitored non-residential completions, 58% were considered to be compliant with the cycle parking standards. Whilst this is a significant improvement on 07/08 of 43% compliant, it is still far from the 80%+ rate of compliance that might be hoped for. This indicator was identified last year as one that required careful monitoring, and this still remains the case. Officers will need to pay careful attention to ensure appropriate cycle parking is secured in the planning application process and in monitoring compliance with conditions on cycle parking provision. It is also an issue members will wish to highlight in determining planning applications.

10. The indicators shown as amber are indicators such as the Building for Life Criteria and the new section on monitoring the policies of the West End Area Action Plan. These are new indicators, and in the case of the West End, there has not been sufficient development to make an assessment of policies and performance.

### **Level of risk**

11. A risk assessment has been undertaken and the risk register is attached (Appendix 2). All risks have been mitigated to an acceptable level.

### **Climate change/environmental impact**

12. A section of the report assesses environmental issues.

### **Equalities impact**

13. Equality issues are addressed in the appropriate indicators on quality of housing and parking standards.

### **Financial implications**

14. There are no direct financial implications in the report.

### **Legal implications**

15. It is a statutory requirement for all local authorities to produce Annual Monitoring Reports.

### **Conclusion**

16. As with the previous monitoring reports this report should be viewed in the context of providing an important evidence base on the effectiveness of planning policies. The report draws attention to various key issues and includes comparison data with previous years.

### **Recommendation(s):**

17. That the City Executive Board is asked to:-
  1. approve the Annual Monitoring Report for submission to the Secretary of State;
  2. authorise the Head of City Development to make any necessary editorial corrections to the document prior to publication.

**Name and contact details of author: Lyn Lawrence 252166**

**[llawrence@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:llawrence@oxford.gov.uk)**

**Background papers: None**

**Version number: 1**

## Risk Register

Risk Score **Impact Score:** 1 =Insignificant; 2 = Minor; 3 = Moderate; 4 = Major; 5 = Catastrophic    **Probability Score:** 1 = Rare; 2 = Unlikely; 3 = Possible; 4 = Likely; 5 = Almost Certain

No.	Risk Description Link to Corporate Obj	Gross Risk		Cause of Risk	Mitigation	Net Risk		Further Management of Risk: Transfer/Accept/Reduce/Avoid		Monitoring Effectiveness				Current Risk	
		I	P			I	P	Action: Action Owner:	Outcome required: Milestone Date:	Q 1 ☹	Q 2 ☹	Q 3 ☹	Q 4 ☹	I	P
1	Failure to make appropriate editorial corrections or amendments to the report requested by the City Executive Board prior to submission to the Secretary of State or Secretary of State asking for amendments	2	2	Mis-interpretation of instructions from City Executive Board or information submitted not in accordance with the requirements of the Secretary of State	If City Executive Board requested amendments prior to submission or Secretary of State requested changes, amendments would be undertaken in consultation with Lead Member if appropriate. Level of Effectiveness: H	2	2	Action: Accept Action Owner: Michael Crofton-Briggs  Mitigating Control: Control Owner:	Outcome required:  Milestone Date:						

