

PLANNING REVIEW COMMITTEE

16 December 2019

Application number: 18/02065/OUTFUL

Decision due by 20 November 2018

Extension of time Not agreed

Proposal Hybrid planning application comprising:

(i) Outline application (with all matters reserved save for "access"), for the erection of up to 87,300 m² (GIA) of employment space (Use Class B1), up to 550 m² (GIA) of community space (Use Class D1), up to 2,500 m² (GIA) of Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 floorspace, up to a 180 bedroom hotel (Use Class C1) and up to 480 residential units (Use Class C3), installation of an energy sharing loop, main vehicle access points from A40 and A44, link road between A40 and A44 through the site, pedestrian and cycle access points and routes, car and cycle parking, open space, landscaping and associated infrastructure works. Works to the A40 and A44 in the vicinity of the site.

(ii) Full application for part of Phase 1A comprising 15,850 m² (GIA) of employment space (Use Class B1), installation of an energy sharing loop, access junctions from the A40 and A44 (temporary junction design on A44), construction of a link road between the A40 and A44, open space, landscaping, temporary car parking (for limited period), installation of cycle parking (some temporary for limited period), foul and surface water drainage, pedestrian and cycle links (some temporary for limited period) along with associated infrastructure works. Works to the A40 and A44 in the vicinity of the site.
(Amended plans and additional information received)

Site address Oxford North (Northern Gateway) Land Adjacent To A44, A40, A34 And Wolvercote Roundabout, Northern By-Pass Road – see **Appendix 1** for site plan

Ward Wolvercote Ward

Case officer Nadia Robinson

Agent Mr Robert Linnell, Savills **Applicant:** Thomas White (Oxford) Ltd

Reason at Committee Major application

1. RECOMMENDATION

1.1. The Planning Review Committee is recommended to:

1.1.1. **approve the application** for the reasons given in the report and subject to the required planning conditions set out in **appendix 3** of this report and grant planning permission, subject to:

- the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other enabling powers to secure the planning obligations set out in the recommended Heads of Terms which are set out in **appendices 4** and **10** of the report;
- the agreement of appropriate arrangements with Oxfordshire County Council and the applicant about the use of Community Infrastructure Levy payments; and

1.1.2. **agree to delegate authority to the Head of Planning Services to:**

- finalise the recommended conditions as set out in **appendix 3** of this report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Head of Planning Services considers reasonably necessary;
- finalise the recommended legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other enabling powers as set out in this report, including refining, adding to, amending and/or deleting the obligations detailed in the Heads of Terms set out in **appendices 4** and **10** of the report (including to dovetail with and, where appropriate, reinforce the final conditions and informatives to be attached to the planning permission) as the Head of Planning Services considers reasonably necessary;
- complete the Section 106 legal agreement referred to above; and
- issue the planning permission.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Summary of application

2.1. This report considers a hybrid planning application for a 26-hectare site in the north of Oxford comprising an outline application with all matters reserved except access, and a detailed or 'full' application for part of the overall site.

2.2. The site, referred to in the application as 'Oxford North', falls into three, fan-shaped parcels of land to the north and north-west of the Wolvercote roundabout through which run the A44 and A40. The northern boundary of the site is formed by an elevated section of the A34. The site forms the most part of the 'Northern Gateway' which is a site allocated in the Core Strategy and which has its own Area Action Plan (AAP).

- 2.3. The Northern Gateway is a key strategic site which has been allocated in the Core Strategy and through the AAP for 90,000 square metres of employment space for the knowledge economy – science and technology, research, bio-technology and spin-off companies from the universities and hospitals. One of the objectives of the Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (OxLEP) Strategic Economic Plan for Oxfordshire 2016 is to deliver flagship gateway developments and projects that stimulate growth; Northern Gateway is identified as such a project. The AAP allocation also includes up to 500 housing units and other related uses that would support the employment use.
- 2.4. The red line of the planning application does not include all of the AAP area. Peartree Park and Ride, the Peartree services, the existing built form in the south of the site (garage, service station, BT station and hotel) and two parcels of land (in the south-west owned by Oxford City Council, and in the north owned by Merton College) are not included within the red line.
- 2.5. The planning application follows a constructive and collaborative period of pre-application discussions between the City Council and the applicant beginning in 2014, with close involvement from the County Council and Highways England.
- 2.6. In order to assist the Northern Gateway site to come forward for development, £5.9 million of Local Growth Fund money was allocated to improve transport in the north of the city by OxLEP. It has been agreed this will be used to complete the A40 works that form part of this planning application, with the work to be carried out by the County Council.
- 2.7. Oxford City Council applied for £10 million of Homes England's Housing Infrastructure Funding (HIF) (Marginal Viability) to use for infrastructure to support delivery of housing at Northern Gateway. The funding will be used at the start of the development, should permission be granted, to provide the infrastructure, such as internal roads, needed to deliver homes on site.
- 2.8. The application is a hybrid application comprising an outline application for the whole site, and a detailed application for an element within the overall site. All matters, except for access, are reserved from the outline application. This means that development of the rest of the site, besides the detailed application, would come forward as reserved matters applications with details of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. The full details of what is included in the application are set out in **section 6** of the original committee report (**appendix 7**).
- 2.9. In summary, the outline application seeks permission for 87,300 square metres of employment space and 480 residential units. This falls just short of the overall AAP allocation because the site red line omits two parcels of land (in the south-west owned by Oxford City Council, and in the north owned by Merton College) that could accommodate the shortfall. The application also includes significant works to the A40 and A44 to calm traffic speeds and transform them into urban boulevards with upgraded

cycle and bus lanes. It also details the access proposal from these two main roads to the three parcels of development land.

- 2.10. The detailed part of the application is for a parcel of land in the centre of the site, close to the A40, on which are proposed three employment buildings totalling 15,850 square metres: two Workspace buildings clad in clay tiles with gabled open ends facing the A40 are proposed as well as a building known as the Red Hall which is proposed as an incubator space for small enterprises and hub of the development. The adjacent link road between the A40 and A44, and the majority of the central park known as The Green are also proposed in detail. The whole of the A40 improvement works are included in the detailed application, as well as a temporary junction from the link road onto the A44.
- 2.11. The application falls within the parameters of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 and is Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) development. The application was submitted with an Environmental Statement which was supplemented with further information at the request of the City Council. Having assessed the submitted application, officers are satisfied that the Environmental Statement and further information provided complies with the EIA Regulations and that sufficient information has been provided to assess the environmental impact of the proposal.
- 2.12. The report sets out that, taken as a whole, the proposals align with the vision of AAP and accord with the Development Plan. The key issues are summarised below.
- 2.13. The quantum of Affordable Housing proposed is 35 per cent with a tenure split of 80 per cent social rented and 20 per cent intermediate housing. This follows a detailed and thorough period of viability appraisal between the Council's viability consultants and the applicant's viability consultants to seek to improve value and viability of the scheme and maximise the quantum of Affordable Housing the development can afford. The applicant's proposal of 35 per cent Affordable Housing at a 80:20 tenure mix is the maximum that the development could justifiably support at this point. The legal agreement would include a review mechanism so that, if the development proves to be more viable than expected, this can be captured for the benefit of Affordable Housing.
- 2.14. Transport and highways issues are central to the scheme. Extensive consultation with the County Council and Highways England has been carried out to get the highways proposals right. These are based on robust and heavily tested traffic modelling to predict the impact of development. The approach has been conservative; this modelling does not include some planned improvements as part of demand management measures the County Council is undertaking. The 'humanising' of the A40 and A44, low levels of car parking for the employment uses and the various upgrades to bus, cycle and pedestrian infrastructure are anticipated to support a shift towards sustainable transport.

- 2.15. Less than substantial harm has been identified to two heritage assets (the setting of both Wolvercote with Godstow Conservation Area and the Manor and Church Farmhouses), at low and moderate levels respectively. The balancing exercise required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for less than substantial harm to heritage assets concluded that the public benefits of the development significantly outweigh the harm. As such, the proposal would meet the test of paragraph 196 of the NPPF and would accord with Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- 2.16. The outline application sets the design parameters, based on the AAP Design Code, while the full application provides more detailed proposals for one parcel of development within these parameters. The illustrative masterplan and details within the Design and Access Statement: Masterplan demonstrate the proposal's high-quality urban design. The overall landscape proposals and public spaces further assure that the development would be well-designed. The proposals have been reviewed on three occasions by the Oxford Design Review Panel (ODRP) and have received support from the panel, particularly in respect of the site-wide masterplanning and the architecture of the Red Hall and Workspace buildings.
- 2.17. A fundamental part of the energy strategy for the proposed scheme is a site-wide energy sharing loop network. High efficiency water to water heat pumps would provide space heating and cooling for all buildings, as well as domestic hot water. These heat pumps will be linked to the site-wide energy sharing loop connected to ground source energy boreholes. The proposed energy loop network is innovative and offers a low carbon energy solution with no harmful air quality impact. BREEAM Excellent is being targeted for the buildings in the detailed part of the application, which is welcome.
- 2.18. Officers have weighed up the benefits and dis-benefits of the proposed development relative to all material considerations. Overall, the proposed development would bring significant public benefits that accord with the three strands of sustainable development (economic, social and environmental) as set out in the NPPF.

West Area Planning Committee

- 2.19. The application was considered by West Area Planning Committee on 24 September 2019. A copy of the officer's committee report is included in **appendix 7** of this report and the minutes of the meeting are included in **appendix 8** of this report.
- 2.20. The committee resolved to defer consideration of the application pending further information on the following:
- a) Further modelling work around scenario G that looks at the level of affordable housing that could be provided if both cost and value inflation is included; and

- b) A clear review mechanism that captures future improvements in value across the development.
- 2.21. Since the application was considered by the West Area Planning Committee on 24 September 2019 and in accordance with the committee resolution, further viability work was carried out and further detail provided about the review mechanism. The assessment of the impact of inflation on viability was carried out by Jones Lang Lasalle (JLL), the Council's independent viability consultants for the proposed development and is summarised in their October 2019 report (**appendix 9**). The structure of the review mechanism is included in **appendix 10**. Both the inflation study and review mechanism were discussed in the report to the 27 November 2019 West Area Planning Committee (**appendix 11**) and considered by the committee as noted in the meeting's minutes (**appendix 12**).
- 2.22. The JLL report on the impact of inflation on costs and values (**appendix 9**) concluded that, because inflation on build costs is forecast to outstrip inflation on sales and rental values, the viability picture for the development worsens if inflation is taken into account in the period projected. The findings support the officer recommendation to approve the application with a level of Affordable Housing at 35 per cent.
- 2.23. The review mechanism would involve three viability reviews, at early, mid and late stages of the development. At each review there is an examination of whether values have increased more than costs. It would be an upwards only review so that the 35 per cent Affordable Housing would be the minimum provided by the development. The proposed approach adopts a model pioneered by the Mayor for London. Depending on the stage of the review the whole or part of any surplus in the scheme would be converted to on-site Affordable Housing units or a financial contribution.
- 2.24. West Area Planning Committee on 27 November 2019 resolved to approve the application in accordance with the officer recommendation.

Call-in to Planning Review Committee

- 2.25. The decision of the West Area Planning Committee has been called in to the Planning Review Committee by Cllrs Wade, Goddard, Gotch, Henwood, Harris, Gant, Landell Mills, Haines, Simmons, Wolff, Roz Smith, Garden and Altaf-Khan.
- 2.26. Eight issues were given by Cllr Wade as reasons for the call-in. Cllr Wolff added four further issues through the call-in process, some of which overlap with reasons given by Cllr Wade. All the issues are relevant planning considerations and are summarised as follows:
- On-site link road capacity – to take A40-A44 and A44-A40 through traffic
 - Affordable Housing quantum and robustness of viability assessment

- Impact on setting of heritage assets – setting of Wolvercote with Godstow Conservation Area
 - Impact on view cones
 - Design – urban design quality, in particular Red Hall in relation to gateway location and Wolvercote with Godstow Conservation Area
 - Energy efficiency – maximising solar panel use
 - Air quality – adequacy of air quality modelling
 - Review mechanism – level of detail
- 2.27. The detailed call-in reasons are set out and addressed in this report, referring where appropriate to the two committee reports to West Area Planning Committee.

Consideration of the planning application

- 2.28. Officers would clarify that the Planning Review Committee’s consideration of the application must be based on the assessment set out in this report and its appendices, and the two committee reports to West Area Planning Committee (24 September 2019 and 27 November 2019).
- 2.29. In accordance with the Development Plan, and having taken account of the policies in the NPPF, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, officers are recommending approval of the application subject to the planning conditions set out in **appendix 3** and a Section 106 legal agreement whose Heads of Terms are set out in **appendices 4** and **10**.

3. LEGAL AGREEMENT

- 3.1. This application is subject to a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure the following planning obligations:
- **Affordable Housing:** on-site provision, Affordable Housing adjustment, viability review mechanism as set out in **appendix 10**
 - **Public realm:** public open space, children's play space, public art, management plan
 - **Transport and highways:** corridor works – A44 and A40, on-site infrastructure, Peartree interchange improvements, car parking management plan, travel plans, travel plan monitoring contribution (£6,000), variation of Traffic Regulation Order in relation to crossings to create safe routes to school (£5,000), contribution for local bus service enhancements (£2.88 million) – all financial contributions to be index-linked to maintain the real value of the payments
 - **Other financial obligations:** carbon offset contribution should targets not be reached, off-site biodiversity enhancements

- **Restricted use:** employment space for occupiers within relevant knowledge economy sector
 - **Employment initiatives:** community employment plans
 - **Non-financial obligations/other:** notices, housing mix, accessibility, energy loop, health and sustainability, sustainable drainage, facilitating comprehensive development, mortgagee's consent, interest
 - **Oxford City Council obligations:** spending of contributions, CIL agreement with Oxfordshire County Council, infrastructure in lieu of CIL, external funding, seeking contributions, neighbouring land obligations
 - **Oxford City Council fees:** monitoring costs, legal fees
- 3.2. The Heads of Terms of the legal agreement, under the above headings, are set out in more detail in **appendix 4**. **Appendix 10** sets out the Affordable Housing viability review mechanism in more detail and forms part of the Heads of Terms of the legal agreement.
- 3.3. A separate agreement, which is referred to within the Heads of Terms (**appendix 4**), is to be made between the City and County Councils regarding the use of CIL money for infrastructure to reflect the City Council's City Executive Board (CEB) resolution to apply CIL receipts generated from future strategic scale development at Northern Gateway/Oxford North in order to fund investment in highways/transport infrastructure provision to support the delivery of the Northern Gateway strategic site allocation. The applicant will be funding through the planning agreement works directly and proportionately related to the development. CIL will be used to fund additional works that benefit development in the wider allocation area, and the community at large.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

- 4.1. The relevant planning policies set out in the committee report to 27 November West Area Planning Committee remain pertinent.
- 4.2. The emerging local plan (the Local Plan 2036) remains at examination stage. The hearing commenced on 3 December 2019 and is expected to run until 19 December 2019. Although the emerging policies are gathering weight, they can still only be afforded very limited weight, particularly where there are objections to them.

5. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 5.1. The officers' reports (**appendices 7 and 11**) provide details of the public consultations that were undertaken with respect to the application, and summarises all the responses received in relation to the application within the reports.
- 5.2. Additional comments received following publication of the 24 September 2019 committee report but prior to the committee meeting were provided as

verbal updates to committee and are included in the meeting's minutes (**appendix 8**).

- 5.3. Full copies of all consultation responses are available to view on the Council's public access website and have been taken into consideration within the officers' reports.
- 5.4. There are no further material planning considerations from consultation responses to report.

6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1. While this report addresses the reasons for the call-in to Planning Review Committee, it should be read as a supplement to the two committee reports to West Area Planning Committee. These three reports and the appendices to this report should form the basis for members' consideration of the planning application.
- 6.2. The two West Area Planning Committee reports are included in the appendices of this report, in addition to all additional information needed for members to make an assessment of the application.
- 6.3. The appendices to this report are summarised below:

Appendix 1	Site location plan
Appendix 2	List of addresses of public commenters
Appendix 3	Recommended conditions
Appendix 4	Heads of Terms of Section 106 legal agreement
Appendix 5	JLL viability report August 2019 (general)
Appendix 6	Oxford Design Review Panel letters
Appendix 7	Committee report to 24 September 2019 West Area Planning Committee
Appendix 8	Minutes of 24 September 2019 West Area Planning Committee
Appendix 9	JLL viability report October 2019 (inflation)
Appendix 10	Review mechanism structure
Appendix 11	Committee report to 27 November 2019 West Area Planning Committee
Appendix 12	Minutes of 27 November 2019 West Area Planning Committee

- 6.4. Please note that, for reference, the appendix numbers for both the previous committee reports to West Area Planning Committee are included in the table in paragraph 9.1 of this report.
- 6.5. As noted above, the decision of the West Area Planning Committee to approve the application in accordance with the officer recommendation has been called in to the Planning Review Committee by Cllrs Wade, Goddard, Gotch, Henwood, Harris, Gant, Landell Mills, Haines, Simmons, Wolff, Roz Smith, Garden and Altaf-Khan.
- 6.6. Eight issues were given by Cllr Wade as reasons for the call-in. Cllr Wolff added four further issues through the call-in process, some of which overlap with reasons given by Cllr Wade.
- 6.7. The detailed call-in reasons as summarised in paragraph 2.27 are quoted in full in this section under the relevant topic area:
- a) Transport and highways
 - b) Affordable Housing and viability
 - c) Impact on heritage assets and views
 - d) Design
 - e) Energy efficiency
 - f) Air quality
- 6.8. Officers would make members aware that the eight call-in reasons given by Cllr Wade are presented as criteria that must be met for the application to be granted permission. The call-in reasons are preceded with the phrase, “[Planning permission] should only be granted if...” This is not the correct approach to determining this or any planning application.
- 6.9. The application must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise (Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004). Within a framework set by the development plan, and having taken account of the National Planning Policy Framework, this involves weighing up the benefits and dis-benefits of the proposed development relative to all material considerations.
- 6.10. The NPPF represents up-to-date government planning policy and is a material consideration that must be taken into account where it is relevant to a planning application. This includes the presumption in favour of sustainable development found at paragraph 11 of the Framework, which requires approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay.
- 6.11. The call-in reasons from Cllr Wolff also suggest that the West Area Planning Committee had given insufficient consideration to some of the key

policy requirements for the proposals. Officers would advise members that this is not correct.

- 6.12. The committee reports cover all material planning considerations and examine the application against all relevant planning policies. There was extensive debate of the application at both meetings of the West Area Planning Committee. In total, there were five and a half hours of questions, debate, deliberations and presentations. At both meetings, there was adequate time and opportunity for all members of the committee to ask questions and raise issues of concern.
- 6.13. The call-in reasons also contain a number of inaccuracies which are corrected in the following sections of the report for members of the committee.

a. Transport and highways

Call-in reasons

- 6.14. From Cllr Wade: *“Planning permission should only be granted if it is supported by appropriate infrastructure at a timely stage’ Core Strategy CS17. In this case the absence of a road across the site with sufficient capacity to take A40-A44 through traffic and hence mitigate the impact of Oxford North on the A40 and A44 (as required by the AAP, in the absence of the Loop Farm Link Road) will worsen already severe congestion near Wolvercote roundabout. And see TR1: ‘Planning permission will be granted if the City Council is satisfied that adequate and appropriate transport measures will be put in place’. The removal of the Loop Farm Road from the County’s current plans must bring this into question.”*
- 6.15. From Cllr Wolff: *“Compliance with AAP policy NG4 was not examined in the WAPC. This requires “Provision of high quality pedestrian and cycle links from the site to nearby residential areas and facilities.” However, connectivity via (an improved) Sustrans route NS5 (a direct route, and part of the national cycle network) to nearby Yarnton appears to have been rejected as a necessary condition for approval, and instead priority has been given to a route across the Pear Tree Roundabout which will not be able to satisfy current ‘cycle super highway’ design standards.”*
- 6.16. From Cllr Wolff: *“Compliance with Area Action Plan Policy NG5 was not examined by the WAPC.*
- a) *This policy requires “Provision of a new on-site link road between the A40 and A44 towards the northern edge of the development site” i.e. on the edge of the development not within it, and connecting to the A40 west of the development (but just east of the A34 flyover). This is in accordance with a key objective of the development, namely, to reduce traffic congestion. The application, however, is for a link road to go through the middle of the central panel. At the time of the AAP, the central panel of the application site was designated only for employment use but in the submitted application it is for mixed employment and*

residential use, making the presence of the link road through the centre even more problematic. (page 8, Sustainability Appraisal).

- b) The detailed part of this hybrid application is for an A40-A44 link 'street' with cycle priority (in the words of the officer's report para 6.71 "analogous to Broad Street") running through the middle of the development not along the northern edge. A question was submitted to highways officers in advance of the WAPC meeting regarding projected figures for traffic using this link 'street', but no satisfactory evidence was offered and it was stated that figures for A34-bound traffic were unavailable. The officer's report only refers to the 'street' handling additional traffic generated by the development itself and ignores the fact that this will be an A40-A44 link road carrying a lot of existing traffic. (It is suggested that a weight restriction might be applied to this 'cycle-friendly link street' in order to "discourage" its use by HGVs — see officer's report para 10.110) .*
- c) The officer's report (para 6.69) states that a "four-lane (dual carriageway) link road was an option, but not the preferred option, in the sustainability appraisal that was carried out for the AAP". However, it neglects to say that the sustainability appraisal's stated preferred option was for a proper link road to the west of the A34 from Dukes Cut to Loop Farm roundabout. This would be outside the application area in Cherwell District and so WAPC was instructed to discount this possibility and assess the claim that the Oxford North development is acceptable without the Loop Farm link road.*
- d) A key objective of the development is to reduce traffic congestion. Unless this 'cycle-friendly link street' serves as a link road there will be no additional carriageway to reduce congestion, meaning that a key objective cannot be met.*
- e) Without an adequate evidence base for link-traffic movements through this 'cycle-friendly street' it is not possible to agree that it is compliant with NG5.*
- f) Declaring the proposed 'street' inadequate as a link road and therefore non-compliant with Policy NG5 does not of itself prevent the application as submitted being approved, but it would mean that a link road that did fulfil the purpose would be required within the area of the outline application but outside the detailed part of the application. (Unless, in the meantime, the County had delivered a link road to the west — but committee was required to rule out this possibility). Therefore, a condition would probably need to be applied to this outline application requiring the construction of a proper link road toward the northern edge of the site, as required by NG5."*

6.17. From Cllr Wolff: "Amendment required to Condition 50. A Framework Travel Plan is required (Condition 50 to the submitted application), which requires "improved modal targets for sustainable transport modes". WAPC ascertained through questioning that the Highways officers have rejected

under- or over-passes of the A40 in favour of toucan crossings. Highways officers observed that priorities can be determined by the phasing of the lights on such crossings. Therefore the condition should be modified to include specific reference to phasing of toucan crossing lights to encourage modal shift to cycling and walking i.e. to reflect priority for cycling and walking over A40 traffic. This would be in keeping with the aspirations expressed in the report for a transformed street scene along the A40, and would not necessarily introduce delays to through traffic at peak times when traffic is queueing through the application site anyway. In the absence of such a condition the City Council would not be in a position to enforce the priority required under Core Strategy policy CP1, CP10 and emerging policy M1.”

Officer response: Loop Farm link road

- 6.18. The question of the A40-A44 link road west of the A34, known as the Loop Farm link road, was covered in the addendum report (**appendix 11**, see paragraphs 6.66 to 6.68) and discussed at the 24 September committee meeting and extensively at the 27 November committee meeting.
- 6.19. It is a matter of fact that there is no policy within the Development Plan – either in the AAP or elsewhere – that requires the provision of the Loop Farm link road in order to deliver the development. The traffic modelling for the application has been undertaken on the basis that there will be no Loop Farm link road. This has been understood by all parties including the statutory consultees on highways matters (Oxfordshire County Council and Highways England). They are satisfied with the overall mitigation package proposed with this application. The application has demonstrated that, with the sustainable measures being provided and a robust travel and car parking strategy, which are to be secured by legal agreement, the impact of the development can be encompassed within the existing network capacity.
- 6.20. The Sustainability Appraisal referred to in the call-in reasons was carried out to inform the AAP. However, the Loop Farm link road was not taken forward as a preferred option to adoption stage. The planning application must be considered against the adopted policies in the AAP. The other documents are material but of limited, if any, weight.
- 6.21. For these reasons, and as set out clearly to the West Area Planning Committee, there are no grounds to refuse the application on the lack of a Loop Farm link road, nor are there grounds to make amendments to the proposed on-site link road.
- 6.22. Notwithstanding this, it should be noted that there is a wider strategy to manage the traffic capacity on the A40 and A44. The wider strategy outlined in the County Council’s Local Transport Plan 4 provides sustainable travel alternatives for those commuting into the city centre. This will release some capacity on the A40 and A44 which can be given over to the longer distance journeys.

- 6.23. The suggested condition to require an additional link road on the site would not be necessary or reasonable and would therefore not satisfy the NPPF tests for a condition or a planning obligation.

Officer response: Joe White's Lane, National Cycle Network Route 5

- 6.24. Highways officers and City officers explained at the 27 November committee that the significant improvements to cycle routes on the A40 and A44 were prioritised above the Joe White's Lane route because they provide significantly wider and greater public benefits, including for commuters travelling in and out of Oxford. These routes can be used all year round and would be well overlooked cycle routes. It should be noted that the cycle routes would be part of the wider traffic calming and redesign of these main roads, which in themselves contribute to making cycling more attractive on these routes.

- 6.25. Paragraph 10.104 of the original committee report (**appendix 7**) sets out that the improvement of Joe White's Lane and the canal towpath could be delivered should sufficient funding become available.

- 6.26. The Highways Authority as statutory consultee is satisfied with the approach taken to this aspect of the development.

Officer response: Compliance with AAP policy NG5

- 6.27. The compliance with all AAP policies, including NG5, is included in the original committee report (**appendix 7**). There was significant discussion of transport matters in relation to policy NG5 at both committee meetings.

- 6.28. There is no conflict between the design of the proposed link road running through the central parcel of the site and this policy. This is set out in more detail in the addendum report (**appendix 11**) in paragraphs 6.69 to 6.71.

- 6.29. At committee on 27 November, the baseline number and percentage of journeys from the A40 to the A44 and vice-versa (and therefore journeys likely to route along the proposed on-site link road) were given in answer to a question from committee. The information is taken from figures 3.5 to 3.8 in the transport assessment submitted with this planning application:

- 6.30. In the AM peak (3 hours, 0700-1000)

- 554 of 3,898 (14%) vehicle movements from the A44 north of Wolvercote, turn right onto A40 west in the AM peak period
- 329 of 2,482 (13%) vehicle movements from the A40 west of Wolvercote, turn left onto A44 north in the AM peak period

- 6.31. In the PM peak (3 hours, 1600-1900)

- 438 of 2,867 (15%) vehicle movements from the A44 north of Wolvercote, turn right onto A40 west in the AM peak period

- 360 of 1,920 (19%) vehicle movements from the A40 west of Wolvercote, turn left onto A44 north in the AM peak period
- 6.32. This data is only a part of the transport assessment, which itself informs and underpins the overall mitigation package proposed. This package is a result of extensive consultation and collaboration with the Highways Authority and Highways England. Both statutory consultees have assessed the application and are satisfied with the mitigation package, raising no objection on highway grounds.
- 6.33. Within the call-in reasons it is stated that, “a key objective of the development is to reduce traffic congestion”. The focus of Objective 3 of the AAP (see page 9), “Improve the local and strategic road network and other transport connections” is on sustainable transport. The mitigation package including travel plan seeks to encourage people to use sustainable transport – for example by using the bus and cycle lanes on the A40 rather than using the private car.
- 6.34. The spatial vision presented in Figure 3 of the AAP indicates that the central parcel would have an employment focus (rather than a housing focus). Having an employment focus would not necessarily restrict uses to employment only. Parameter Plan 02: Land use submitted with the outline part of the planning application is consistent with the AAP spatial vision in this respect.
- 6.35. The application demonstrates that the link road as designed is sufficient mitigation, as part of the overall highways and transport mitigation package, to deal with the traffic impact of the development and existing traffic. No additional link road between the A40 and A44 within the site or outside the site is required to mitigate the impact of this development or to comply with any development plan policy.
- Officer response: travel plan*
- 6.36. The amendment proposed to condition 50 as part of the call-in reasons is not consistent with the tests for conditions in the NPPF.
- 6.37. The travel plan must be robust and deliverable. It would include targets for modal shifts to sustainable transport using methodologies within the applicant's control; the targets will be monitored. In this way, and in addition to the comprehensive transport mitigation package proposed, compliance with policy can be secured.
- 6.38. The question of timings of the toucan crossings is a detailed matter that would need to be dealt with by the Highways Authority since they have responsibility for the safe operation of the highway. The timing of the signals would need to be reviewed to ensure priority to one road user does not severely impact on congestion and air quality.

Officer response: summary

- 6.39. The transport and highways matters raised in the call-in reasons have been addressed within the previous officer reports to West Area Planning Committee (**appendices 7 and 11**) and within this report. The proposal is acceptable in highway terms and is supported by the local highways authority and Highways England.

b. Affordable Housing and viability

Call-in reason: viability

- 6.40. From Cllr Wade: *“Planning permission should only be granted if there is 50% affordable housing. Residential developments are required to ‘provide generally a minimum of 50% of the proposed dwellings’, CS24 and HP3. The developers have not ‘robustly demonstrated’ (HP3) through their viability assessment, that the affordable housing contribution of 50% makes the site unviable. Local Plan Policy HS4 contains a general requirement to provide affordable housing. 35% does not meet the requirement for 50% set out in the Northern Gateway AAP, to which the developers subscribed.”*

Officer response

- 6.41. The issue of viability and Affordable Housing was discussed extensively at both West Area Planning Committee meetings with questions put to officers and the Council’s independent viability consultants, JLL. At the 24 September meeting, the committee requested further viability work to test the robustness of the viability evidence. This was duly undertaken.
- 6.42. Affordable Housing and viability are discussed in the 24 September committee report (**appendix 7**) in paragraphs 10.39 to 10.75, and in the addendum committee report to 27 November committee (**appendix 11**) in paragraphs 6.4 to 6.64.
- 6.43. It has been stated both at committee and in the committee reports that the adopted and emerging Affordable Housing policies have a cascade approach and therefore, if robustly demonstrated through viability evidence, a proposal with less than 50 per cent Affordable Housing can be policy compliant.
- 6.44. Emerging policy H2 includes the same cascade approach to the adopted policies, stating that, “If an applicant can demonstrate particular circumstances that justify the need for a viability assessment, and through an open book exercise demonstrate the affordable housing requirement to be unviable, a cascade approach should be worked through with the City Council until development is viable”.

- 6.45. The cascade approach is the same as that used in the adopted policies and is set out below:
- Firstly, reduce the percentage of affordable housing provided (to a minimum of 40% of all homes) by reducing the intermediate housing element only;
 - Secondly, at 40% affordable housing, reintroduce an element of intermediate housing incrementally up to a maximum 8% of all homes;
 - Thirdly, make a financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision, to be calculated using the approach set out in [the relevant appendix].
- 6.46. In view of the large number of homes proposed, officers have sought to ensure that the development's Affordable Housing contribution is made as on-site provision, not a financial contribution. This is consistent with policy CS24.
- 6.47. Contrary to what is stated in the call-in reason, the AAP does not have a requirement for 50 per cent Affordable Housing; the AAP in paragraph 5.17 states, "The city's affordable housing policy contains a cascade approach that can be used when this policy requirement can be shown through open-book evidence to make the site unviable."
- 6.48. The AAP in paragraph 1.4 states, "It is important to read this document alongside policies within the Development Plan as a whole. Policies contained in other relevant documents of the Development Plan (specifically the Core Strategy, Sites and Housing Plan and saved policies of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016) will continue to apply at the Northern Gateway except where there is a site specific policy set out in the Northern Gateway AAP".
- 6.49. It has been robustly demonstrated by the original JLL report, further robustly justified via JLL's impact of inflation work prepared for the 27 November West Area Planning Committee (**appendix 11**), that 35 per cent Affordable Housing is the most that can justifiably be provided with this development.
- 6.50. No evidence has been put forward that would justify a higher percentage of Affordable Housing to counter the viability evidence we have from independent assessors. The assertion that the scheme has been undervalued in the viability appraisal is not substantiated. Predicted sales values for the development, as discussed at the 27 November 2019 committee meeting, are higher than developments in the Oxford area including Wolvercote Paper Mill.
- 6.51. The council has robust evidence that 35 per cent Affordable Housing is the most that can justifiably be provided with this development. As such the application complies with policies HP3 of the Sites and Housing Plan and CP24 of the Core Strategy, as well as the AAP. There is no conflict with emerging policy H2, albeit that this policy has limited weight. In complying

with local planning policies on Affordable Housing, the development would be consistent with paragraph 62 of the NPPF.

Call-in reason: review mechanism

- 6.52. From Cllr Wade: *“Planning permission should only be granted if there is a robust Review Mechanism: currently this lacks clarity.”*

Officer response

- 6.53. A structure for the review mechanism was set out and discussed in the addendum committee report to 27 November 2019 (see paragraphs 6.47 to 6.52 and **appendix 10** to this report). This goes into considerable detail as to how the review mechanism would operate and is based on a model already in operation at the Greater London Authority.

- 6.54. A number of questions were raised and answered at the 27 November 2019 committee meeting in relation to the review mechanism which provided further detail and clarification. It was noted that the proposed review mechanism is based on the Mayor of London’s approach. This is an approach which has been used in many developments and endorsed by the Secretary of State on appeal. It is a robust approach.

- 6.55. Officers would urge members to take the opportunity to secure a review mechanism in addition to the quantum of Affordable Housing proposed at this point. The review mechanism would be secured via legal agreement.

c. Impact on heritage assets and views

Call-in reasons

- 6.56. From Cllr Wade: *“Planning permission should only be granted if the development ‘preserves or enhances the special character and appearance of the conservation area or its setting.’ This development affects the setting of the Wolvercote Conservation Area, being visible from Wolvercote village, and from Wolvercote Common and Port Meadow SSSI, HE7.”*

- 6.57. From Cllr Wade: *“Planning permission should only be granted if the proposed buildings do not detract from the views of Oxford established in the View Cones Policy, HE10, which they do (see the developers’ impressions of the view from Port Meadow).”*

Officer response

- 6.58. The development does not lie within or close to the view cones or affect views protected by policy HE10. Numerous views have been assessed through the Landscape Visual Impact Assessment included in the Environmental Statement. This is discussed in the original committee report (**appendix 7**) in paragraphs 10.204 to 10.208.

- 6.59. The impact of the application on designated heritage assets including Wolvercote with Godstow Conservation Area has been assessed and

consideration is set out in detail in the original committee report (**appendix 7**) in paragraphs 10.169 to 10.189. The report identifies that there would be less than substantial harm to the affected designated heritage assets. This harm would be sufficiently mitigated through careful design and the separation of the development from Wolvercote and would be heavily outweighed by public benefits.

- 6.60. As such, the proposal would meet the test of paragraph 196 of the NPPF and would accord with Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and policy HE7 of the Oxford Local Plan.

d. Design

Call-in reasons

- 6.61. From Cllr Wade: *“Planning permission should only be granted if the development is of ‘good urban design ...appropriate for the site and the surrounding area’,CP7. And where it ‘enhances and does not detract from the character of the area’,CP8. This development (in particular, in Phase 1: the Red Barn) fails to address the character of the Wolvercote Conservation Area and of North Oxford, to which it expects to act as a gateway.”*

Officer response

- 6.62. Policy CP7 is not a saved policy of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 and is therefore no longer in force. The relevant development plan design policies against which this application must be considered are set out in paragraph 10.196 and 10.197 of the original committee report (**appendix 7**).
- 6.63. The proposals have been reviewed on three occasions by the Oxford Design Review Panel (ODRP) and have received support from the panel, particularly in respect of the site-wide masterplan and the architecture of the Red Hall and Workspace buildings which are included in the detailed part of the application. Paragraph 129 of the NPPF states that, “in assessing applications, local planning authorities should have regard to ... any recommendations made by design review panels”.
- 6.64. Paragraphs 10.179 and 10.233 of the original committee report (**appendix 7**) assess the visual impact of the proposed Red Hall building. This notes that the building will only be prominent in views within the site; there will only be some glimpsed views from outside the site and during the construction phase. As such, the building will be largely screened in views from the south-west (and the Wolvercote with Godstow Conservation Area) by development along the A40 (including the Workspace buildings).
- 6.65. The original committee report contains a comprehensive assessment of the design of both the detailed and outline elements of the proposal in paragraphs 10.200 to 10.244. The report examines how the design relates to its context, including the setting of Wolvercote with Godstow

Conservation Area and North Oxford. It is incorrect to say that the development fails to address the character of its context.

- 6.66. The design of the proposed development is found to comply not only with the design policies of the Development Plan, but also with the AAP's vision for a new high-quality, distinctive part of the city.

e. Energy efficiency

Call-in reasons

- 6.67. From Cllr Wade: *“Planning permission should only be granted if it ‘optimises energy efficiency’. There is inadequate evidence of this e.g. buildings are not positioned to allow/maximise solar panel use, CP15.”*

Officer response

- 6.68. Policy CP15 is not a saved policy of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 and is therefore no longer in force. The relevant Development Plan policies relating to energy efficiency are Core Strategy policy CS9 and AAP policy NG9.
- 6.69. The issue relating to positioning of solar panels was discussed at both West Area Committee meetings and covered specifically in the addendum committee report (**appendix 11**) in paragraphs 6.83 to 6.84. At the 27 November meeting, officers showed examples of how buildings can be designed to maximise solar panel use.
- 6.70. The position of just three buildings (the Red Hall and two Workspace buildings) would be fixed if planning permission were granted; they form part of the detailed application. The positioning and roof orientation of other buildings on the site would be determined, if planning permission is granted, through reserved matters applications.
- 6.71. It should be noted that solar panels are only one form of renewable or low carbon energy that can be used. The energy loop is a form of renewable energy too, gathering energy from the ground. The “fabric first” approach and energy sharing loop are major parts of the renewable energy and energy efficiency strategy proposed for this development. As is set out in paragraphs 10.331 to 10.342 of the original committee report (**appendix 7**), the detailed proposal complies with policies CS9 and NG9. Each reserved matters application would be assessed for its compliance with energy policies adopted at that time.

f. Air quality

Call-in reasons

- 6.72. From Cllr Wade: *“Planning permission should only be granted if air quality is managed – this is a major concern on the approach roads to the Wolvercote and Cutteslowe roundabouts – CP23 provides that planning permission will not be granted for developments which would have an*

adverse effect on air quality. The AQ effect of this development has not been adequately modelled.”

6.73. From Cllr Wolff: *“WAPC was unable to examine compliance with AAP policy NG7: Air quality.*

a) Notwithstanding the above [regarding the link road], the lack of a proper link road round the northern edge of the development has important implications for air quality, since it means that all current traffic plus additional traffic generated by the development must pass through the heart of the site. In response to questions, officers confirmed that air quality projections were based on theoretical assessments which predicted a drop in future traffic levels and cleaner vehicles; and that they did not relate to such actual air quality measurements as exist. (None have been taken on the site itself).

b) In order to assess claims for the application’s compliance with policy NG7, committee would have needed to see traffic projection figures. These were not provided.

c) Condition 81 in the officers’ report relates to the applicant’s ongoing responsibility for air quality. However, since the level and type of traffic passing through the site would be beyond the control of the applicant, this condition is unenforceable and therefore meaningless.”

Officer response

6.74. Officers are satisfied with the way in which the air quality assessment has been carried out. The model is robust; its predictions were the result of a series of conservative approaches. For example, it was assumed that total traffic emissions would not reduce over time during the development period as a result of more electric vehicles and vehicles with cleaner engines.

6.75. The air quality model was verified against Oxford City Council’s air quality monitoring data. This found a good level of agreement between the modelled and actual nitrogen dioxide, with all the verified monitoring locations within ± 10 per cent, which is significantly below the ± 25 per cent maximum recommended limit for the model to be considered robust.

6.76. The air quality model uses the application’s traffic modelling data which predicts future traffic impacts with the development in place. It is not possible to have actual measurements of air quality with the development built out for obvious reasons.

6.77. In answering questions at the 27 November committee, officers confirmed that air quality projections did not take into account a drop in future traffic levels; they used the predicted traffic levels from the traffic modelling. They did not take into account the likelihood that vehicles would be ‘cleaner’ in the future. They did however relate to actual air quality measurements as existing because the model was verified against actual data sourced from air quality diffusion tubes on and around the site.

- 6.78. The air quality assessment has taken a conservative approach and is based on traffic modelling results which the Highways Authority has stated should be seen as a worst-case scenario. The air quality modelling has been verified using actual data, and officers therefore find no reason to doubt the adequacy of the model.
- 6.79. It should be noted that the full assessment of air quality is found in the original committee report (**appendix 7**) in paragraphs 10.275 to 10.291.
- 6.80. Recommended condition 81 does not give responsibility to the applicant for air quality. It is in place to prevent homes being built where air quality is below standards. If the applicant provides evidence to show that the air quality meets standards, then residential development can be allowed in that location. If not, it cannot. The location and use of buildings would be determined at reserved matters stage. The condition meets the six tests for imposing planning conditions as set out in paragraph 55 of the NPPF.
- 6.81. The air quality model is robust. It demonstrates that, subject to recommended condition 81, the development would not lead to any exceedances of the current UK legal limit values for the concentration of major air pollutants. As such it would comply with national and local planning policy including policy CP25 of the Oxford Local Plan.

7. OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Equalities Act

- 7.1. The application has been assessed against the relevant sections of the Equalities Act 2010, and it is not considered that the application discriminates against people with protected characteristics specified in the Act. The protected characteristics are:

- age
- gender reassignment
- being married or in a civil partnership
- being pregnant or on maternity leave
- disability
- race including colour, nationality, ethnic or national origin
- religion or belief
- sex
- sexual orientation.

Human Rights Act 1998

- 7.2. Officers have considered the implications of the Human Rights Act 1998 in reaching a recommendation to approve this application. They consider that the interference with the human rights of the applicant under Article

8/Article 1 of Protocol 1 is justifiable and proportionate for the protection of the rights and freedom of others or the control of his/her property in this way is in accordance with the general interest.

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

- 7.3. Officers have considered, with due regard, the likely effect of the proposal on the need to reduce crime and disorder as part of the determination of this application, in accordance with Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. In reaching a recommendation to grant planning permission, officers consider that the proposal will not undermine crime prevention or the promotion of community.

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1. Having regards to the matters discussed in this report and committee reports to 24 September and 27 November 2019 West Area Planning Committee (**appendices 7 and 11**), officers would make members aware that planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the Development Plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004). Officers consider the proposals to accord with the development plan.
- 8.2. The National Planning Policy Framework represents up-to-date government planning policy and is a material consideration that must be taken into account where it is relevant to a planning application. This includes the presumption in favour of sustainable development found at paragraph 11 of the Framework, which requires approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay.
- 8.3. Section 2 of the NPPF lists the three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These roles are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways to achieve sustainable development. These roles will now be considered in weighing up the benefits and dis-benefits of the proposed development relative to all material considerations discussed in this report.

Economic impacts

- 8.4. The Northern Gateway is a key strategic site which has been allocated in the Core Strategy for employment space focussed on Oxford's key strengths in the knowledge economy – science and technology, research, bio-technology and spin-off companies from the universities and hospitals. One of the objectives of the OxLEP Strategic Economic Plan for Oxfordshire 2016 is to deliver flagship gateway developments and projects that stimulate growth. Northern Gateway is identified as such a project.
- 8.5. This application would bring significant economic benefits through provision of employment space tailored to the needs of the city, supporting economic growth, underpinned by the necessary infrastructure to deliver the site.

Over 4,000 jobs are anticipated to be provided on the site, with the construction work providing jobs during the build phase. Paragraph 80 of the NPPF states that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity and therefore this economic benefit of the proposal is afforded significant weight.

Social impacts

- 8.6. The application would provide up to 480 new homes including 168 affordable homes of which 135 units would be social rented and targeted to those in greatest housing need. The urgent need for more homes and the constrained supply in Oxford is well documented and understood; therefore this contribution on an employment-led development would be significant in addressing the shortfall in housing and of clear social benefit. It would support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes as set out in paragraph 59 of the NPPF.
- 8.7. The illustrative masterplan and details within the Design and Access Statement: Masterplan demonstrate the proposal's high-quality urban design. The overall landscape proposals and public spaces further assure that the development would be well-designed, thereby providing high-quality public realm and supporting social well-being. As required by the NPPF, officers have had due regard to the supportive comments of the ODRP in assessing the design quality of the proposed scheme.
- 8.8. The overall sustainable transport benefits that the development would bring include significantly improved cycle and bus infrastructure on transformed stretches of the A40 and A44 within the application site. Improved bus services via the Eastern Arc would be delivered, and an obligation to work collaboratively to create a cycle link northwards to Oxford Parkway would be secured. These improvements to sustainable transport bring social benefits by offering healthier travel options and increasing connectivity and accessibility of facilities.
- 8.9. The main dis-benefit of the development in social terms is the impact on heritage assets (the setting of both Wolvercote with Godstow Conservation Area and the Manor and Church Farmhouses). The balancing exercise required by the NPPF for less than substantial harm to heritage assets concluded that the public benefits of the development significantly outweigh the harm. As such, the proposal would meet the test of paragraph 196 of the NPPF and would accord with Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Environmental impacts

- 8.10. The social benefit of the transformation of the A40 and A44 in slowing traffic, greening, and improving bus and cycle infrastructure would also deliver significant environmental benefits, transforming what is currently a hostile environment and providing much improved sustainable travel options.

- 8.11. Similarly the high-quality urban design and landscape proposed would bring environmental as well as social benefits.
- 8.12. As set out in the report, air quality, vehicular traffic, noise and drainage can all be appropriately managed to prevent any harmful impact and the proposals comply with the relevant local and national planning policies.
- 8.13. The proposed energy loop provides a significant environmental benefit in bringing power to the development without the need for gas or to produce emissions. The system would be modular allowing each phase to connect to the loop, and has the potential to grow beyond the site.
- 8.14. In ecology terms, there would be a gain in linear habitats on site but a net loss of biodiversity within the site. The latter is a dis-benefit which is to be mitigated through the creation of off-site habitats in nearby Cutteslowe Park. This is anticipated to result in an overall net gain in habitats, as required by the NPPF. Any shortfall would be dealt with through financial contributions to an appropriate scheme, secured by legal agreement.
- 8.15. Overall, the proposed development would bring significant public benefits that accord with the three strands of sustainable development set out in the NPPF. Having taken into account the provisions of the Development Plan, the policies in the NPPF, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is recommended for approval subject to the planning conditions set out in **appendix 3** and a Section 106 legal agreement whose Heads of Terms are set out in **appendices 4 and 10**
- 8.16. It is recommended that the Committee resolve to grant planning permission for the development proposed subject to the satisfactory completion (under authority delegated to the Head of Planning Services) of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

9. APPENDICES

- 9.1. For reference, the appendix numbers for both the previous committee reports to West Area Planning Committee are included in the table below, with the appendices to this report listed in the final column.

	WAPC report 24 September	WAPC report 27 November	Planning Review Committee report
Site location plan	Appendix 1	Appendix 1	Appendix 1
List of addresses of public commenters	Appendix 2		Appendix 2
Recommended conditions	Appendix 3	Appendix 5	Appendix 3
Heads of Terms of Section 106 legal agreement	Appendix 4	Appendix 6	Appendix 4
JLL viability report August 2019 (general)	Appendix 5		Appendix 5
Oxford Design Review Panel letters	Appendix 6		Appendix 6
Committee report to 24 September 2019 West Area Planning Committee		Appendix 2	Appendix 7
Minutes of 24 September 2019 West Area Planning Committee		Appendix 3	Appendix 8
JLL viability report October 2019 (inflation)		Appendix 4	Appendix 9
Review mechanism structure		Appendix 7	Appendix 10
Committee report to 27 November 2019 West Area Planning Committee			Appendix 11
Minutes of 27 November 2019 West Area Planning Committee			Appendix 12