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1. Introduction

The Council ran Public a consultation as part of the development of the new Oxford City Centre Action Plan (CCAP) in parallel with the consultation of the Economic Strategy and Delivery Plan. This report follows the same structure as Appendix 3, and this report summarises the responses received as part of that Public Consultation. The Consultation was open between 22nd November 2021 and 31st January 2022. The consultation was publicised to a broad range of stakeholders through:

* One to one meetings, including – Oxford Brookes University, Oxford Bus Company, Old Fire Station, amongst others
* Workshops – including the Joint Economic Strategy and City Centre Action Plan, Business Workshop
* Consultation Events – including Talk of the Town
* Online Portal Survey – with 389 responses

This summary report is structured in three parts. After setting out some broad details about the demographics of respondents who engaged as part of the Public Consultation, the first half of the document takes each of the consultation questions in turn and draws out the key themes, issues and ideas that were put forward. The second part of the document sets out the responses that were received outside of the Public Consultation survey. The third part of the report sets out the response themes and wider themes that emerged through an analysis of the data, through a variety of engagement methods such as Workshops, 1-1 Meetings with key partners, presentations to forums and networks and email responses.

1. **Demographics of respondents**

The Public Consultation survey was completed by **389** respondents via the E-Consult consultation portal. **Nine** representations were made by email, largely comprised of organisational responses, community groups and businesses.

Of those **respondents who accessed the consultation portal** and who chose to declare their gender identity, there was a fairly equal split between females and males, though slightly more females, as can be seen in Table 1.

**Table 1 – Gender and identity of consultation portal respondents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Female | 184 | 47.30% |
| Male | 176 | 45.24% |
| In another way | 1 | 0.26% |
| Prefer not to say | 14 | 3.60% |
| Not Answered | 14 | 3.60% |

**The age breakdown of respondents** is shown in Table 2, the majority of responses are generally spread across the age range 25-59. However, there was a good spread across all age groups. Although, the 16-19 range was the smallest age range, with only 1 response which represents 0.26% overall.

**Table 2 – Age ranges of the consultation portal respondents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| 16-19 | 1 | 0.26% |
| 20-24 | 13 | 3.34% |
| 25-34 | 64 | 16.45% |
| 35-44 | 73 | 18.77% |
| 45-54 | 90 | 23.14% |
| 55-59 | 45 | 11.57% |
| 60-64 | 22 | 5.66% |
| 65-74 | 30 | 7.71% |
| 75+ | 21 | 5.40% |
| Prefer not to say | 20 | 5.14% |
| Not Answered | 10 | 2.57% |

**With respect to the ethnic background of respondents** The vast majority of those who responded to the consultation via the portal, 70.95%, stated that they were from a ‘*White British*’ ethnic background (see Table 3).

**Table 3 – Ethnic background of individuals who responded via the consultation portal**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| White British - English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish | 276 | 70.95% |
| White Irish | 5 | 1.29% |
| White Gypsy or Irish Traveller | 0 | 0.00% |
| Any other white background | 48 | 12.34% |
| Black or Black British - Carribean | 1 | 0.26% |
| Black or Black British - African | 0 | 0.00% |
| Any other black background | 0 | 0.00% |
| Asian or Asian British - Indian | 4 | 1.03% |
| Asian or Asian British - Pakistani | 0 | 0.00% |
| Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi | 0 | 0.00% |
| Any other Asian background | 2 | 0.51% |
| Mixed or Multiple Ethnic Group - White and Black Caribbean | 1 | 0.26% |
| Mixed or Multiple Ethnic Group - White and Black African | 0 | 0.00% |
| Mixed or Multiple Ethnic Group - White and Asian | 4 | 1.03% |
| Any other Mixed background | 4 | 1.03% |
| Arab | 1 | 0.26% |

We also asked respondents to state whether they considered their day to day activities to have been limited because of a **health problem, or disability**, which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months. As can be seen in Table 4, the majority of responses were no (around 79%), however just under 13% answered yes, either a little or a lot.

**Table 4 – Extent of limitations to daily activity reported by respondents via the consultation portal**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Yes, limited a lot | 9 | 2.31% |
| Yes, limited a little | 47 | 12.08% |
| No | 307 | 78.92% |
| Prefer not to say | 15 | 3.86% |
| Not Answered | 11 | 2.83% |

**Consultation Process:**

Where Consultation is undertaken during the delivery of the strategy, a focus on targeting responses from the following cohorts would be recommended given the low response rates for these groups:

* young 16-24 years cohorts
* non-white ethnicity cohorts
* as well as further resident engagement in project and initiative development

If Covid restrictions allow, face to face events or forums would also enhance the opportunity to respond for many groups, especially the digitally excluded, those speaking English as a second language and those facing other barriers to completing written or online responses.

1. **Public Consultation Survey response summaries**

The 389 responses to the Public Consultation’s online survey are collated in the table below.

**Participants were asked to indicate which part of the community their response came from.** As can be seen in Table 5, the majority indicated that they were responding to the consultation as a *resident* (c.62%). It is notable that only 5% identified their response as coming from a ‘*business owner’*. This might suggest that the group name ‘business owner’ was too narrow and it might have been more appropriate to refer to comments as from a ‘*business perspective’*. In this way bringing ‘*business perspective*’ more in line with those from a resident, employee, student and visitor perspective.

**Table 5 – which part of the community are you from**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Resident | 240 | 61.70% |
| Business owner | 21 | 5.40% |
| Employee | 40 | 10.28% |
| Student | 9 | 2.31% |
| Visitor | 60 | 15.42% |
| Other | 19 | 4.88% |
| Not Answered | 0 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Consultation Survey Question** | **Response Rate** | **Summary of Responses** |
| **Q1: Name** | **372/389** | **Data Protected-personal data** |
| **Q2. Email Contact** | **352/389** | **Data Protected-personal data** |
| **Q3. Organisation** | **95/389** | **Data Protected-personal data** |
| **Q4: Which part of the community are you from** | **389/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Resident | 240 | 61.70% | | Business owner | 21 | 5.40% | | Employee | 40 | 10.28% | | Student | 9 | 2.31% | | Visitor | 60 | 15.42% | | Other | 19 | 4.88% | | Not Answered | 0 | 0.00% | |
| **Q5: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Strengths listed below...?**  **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - International brand that attracts business and visitors** | **385/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 163 | 41.90% | | Agree | 151 | 38.82% | | Neither agree or disagree | 44 | 11.31% | | Disagree | 24 | 6.17% | | Strongly disagree | 3 | 0.77% | | Not Answered | 4 | 1.03% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Strong business confidence** | **377/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 17 | 4.37% | | Agree | 103 | 26.48% | | Neither agree or disagree | 179 | 46.02% | | Disagree | 69 | 17.74% | | Strongly disagree | 9 | 2.31% | | Not Answered | 12 | 3.08% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - A globally renowned and recognised city** | **384/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 263 | 67.61% | | Agree | 103 | 26.48% | | Neither agree or disagree | 13 | 3.34% | | Disagree | 3 | 0.77% | | Strongly disagree | 2 | 0.51% | | Not Answered | 5 | 1.29% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Major local landlords driving new opportunities** | **382/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 10 | 2.57% | | Agree | 22 | 5.66% | | Neither agree or disagree | 175 | 44.99% | | Disagree | 113 | 29.05% | | Strongly disagree | 62 | 15.94% | | Not Answered | 7 | 1.80% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Well-established sustainable travel** | **384/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 20 | 5.14% | | Agree | 88 | 22.62% | | Neither agree or disagree | 83 | 21.34% | | Disagree | 129 | 33.16% | | Strongly disagree | 64 | 16.45% | | Not Answered | 5 | 1.29% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Important to the regional and national economy** | **381/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 84 | 21.59% | | Agree | 197 | 50.64% | | Neither agree or disagree | 74 | 19.02% | | Disagree | 19 | 4.88% | | Strongly disagree | 7 | 1.80% | | Not Answered | 8 | 2.06% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - High quality open space and waterways** | **386/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 57 | 14.65% | | Agree | 171 | 43.96% | | Neither agree or disagree | 62 | 15.94% | | Disagree | 81 | 20.82% | | Strongly disagree | 15 | 3.86% | | Not Answered | 3 | 0.77% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - A strong cultural and creative sector** | **385/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 111 | 28.53% | | Agree | 179 | 46.02% | | Neither agree or disagree | 46 | 11.83% | | Disagree | 39 | 10.03% | | Strongly disagree | 10 | 2.57% | | Not Answered | 4 | 1.03% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Attractive evening economy with broad offer** | **386/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 29 | 7.46% | | Agree | 133 | 34.19% | | Neither agree or disagree | 102 | 26.22% | | Disagree | 88 | 22.62% | | Strongly disagree | 34 | 8.74% | | Not Answered | 3 | 0.77% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Partnership working** | **373/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 10 | 2.57% | | Agree | 41 | 10.54% | | Neither agree or disagree | 252 | 64.78% | | Disagree | 52 | 13.37% | | Strongly disagree | 18 | 4.63% | | Not Answered | 16 | 4.11% | |
| **Q6: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Weaknesses listed below...?**  **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - High levels of congestion resulting in poor air quality** | **384/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 207 | 53.21% | | Agree | 93 | 23.91% | | Neither agree or disagree | 41 | 10.54% | | Disagree | 38 | 9.77% | | Strongly disagree | 5 | 1.29% | | Not Answered | 5 | 1.29% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Little publicly accessible green space** | **385/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 83 | 21.34% | | Agree | 96 | 24.68% | | Neither agree or disagree | 63 | 16.20% | | Disagree | 129 | 33.16% | | Strongly disagree | 14 | 3.60% | | Not Answered | 4 | 1.03% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Lack of residential accommodation acts as a barrier for diversifying the city centre** | **385/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 128 | 32.90% | | Agree | 128 | 32.90% | | Neither agree or disagree | 64 | 16.45% | | Disagree | 51 | 13.11% | | Strongly disagree | 14 | 3.60% | | Not Answered | 4 | 1.03% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Lack of prime city centre office / co-working space** | **381/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 36 | 9.25% | | Agree | 73 | 18.77% | | Neither agree or disagree | 161 | 41.39% | | Disagree | 86 | 22.11% | | Strongly disagree | 25 | 6.43% | | Not Answered | 8 | 2.06% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Low quality public realm / pavements** | **383/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 105 | 26.99% | | Agree | 136 | 34.96% | | Neither agree or disagree | 83 | 21.34% | | Disagree | 50 | 12.85% | | Strongly disagree | 9 | 2.31% | | Not Answered | 6 | 1.54% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Rail capacity limited, and congested arrival experience** | **385/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 108 | 27.76% | | Agree | 125 | 32.13% | | Neither agree or disagree | 101 | 25.96% | | Disagree | 46 | 11.83% | | Strongly disagree | 5 | 1.29% | | Not Answered | 4 | 1.03% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Cost challenges in adapting heritage / listed buildings** | **377/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 62 | 15.94% | | Agree | 131 | 33.68% | | Neither agree or disagree | 143 | 36.76% | | Disagree | 30 | 7.71% | | Strongly disagree | 11 | 2.83% | | Not Answered | 12 | 3.08% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - High housing costs and high levels of homelessness** | **384/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 262 | 67.35% | | Agree | 96 | 24.68% | | Neither agree or disagree | 19 | 4.88% | | Disagree | 3 | 0.77% | | Strongly disagree | 4 | 1.03% | | Not Answered | 5 | 1.29% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Barriers to small and start-up businesses getting established** | **379/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 143 | 36.76% | | Agree | 108 | 27.76% | | Neither agree or disagree | 117 | 30.08% | | Disagree | 8 | 2.06% | | Strongly disagree | 3 | 0.77% | | Not Answered | 10 | 2.57% | |
| **7: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Opportunities listed below...?**  **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Rebalance the space within streets from vehicles to pedestrians** | **385/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 181 | 46.53% | | Agree | 87 | 22.37% | | Neither agree or disagree | 52 | 13.37% | | Disagree | 34 | 8.74% | | Strongly disagree | 31 | 7.97% | | Not Answered | 4 | 1.03% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Maximise the development opportunity in the Osney Mead, Oxpens, Rail Station sector (West End)** | **383/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 110 | 28.28% | | Agree | 132 | 33.93% | | Neither agree or disagree | 95 | 24.42% | | Disagree | 34 | 8.74% | | Strongly disagree | 12 | 3.08% | | Not Answered | 6 | 1.54% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Broaden the range of business types in the city centre** | **385/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 150 | 38.56% | | Agree | 161 | 41.39% | | Neither agree or disagree | 57 | 14.65% | | Disagree | 13 | 3.34% | | Strongly disagree | 4 | 1.03% | | Not Answered | 4 | 1.03% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Use events and performance to improve visitor experience** | **383/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 161 | 41.39% | | Agree | 132 | 33.93% | | Neither agree or disagree | 63 | 16.20% | | Disagree | 20 | 5.14% | | Strongly disagree | 7 | 1.80% | | Not Answered | 6 | 1.54% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Encourage more student and residential uses** | **383/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 46 | 11.83% | | Agree | 123 | 31.62% | | Neither agree or disagree | 130 | 33.42% | | Disagree | 62 | 15.94% | | Strongly disagree | 22 | 5.66% | | Not Answered | 6 | 1.54% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Ensure that new development adds to Oxford's reputation for distinct, high quality, built environment** | **384/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 176 | 45.24% | | Agree | 133 | 34.19% | | Neither agree or disagree | 57 | 14.65% | | Disagree | 13 | 3.34% | | Strongly disagree | 5 | 1.29% | | Not Answered | 5 | 1.29% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Build on the carbon emissions pledge** | **384/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 192 | 49.36% | | Agree | 114 | 29.31% | | Neither agree or disagree | 47 | 12.08% | | Disagree | 18 | 4.63% | | Strongly disagree | 13 | 3.34% | | Not Answered | 5 | 1.29% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Increase overnight visitor stays** | **381/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 65 | 16.71% | | Agree | 113 | 29.05% | | Neither agree or disagree | 150 | 38.56% | | Disagree | 42 | 10.80% | | Strongly disagree | 11 | 2.83% | | Not Answered | 8 | 2.06% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Improve safety and ambience** | **382/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 159 | 40.87% | | Agree | 144 | 37.02% | | Neither agree or disagree | 68 | 17.48% | | Disagree | 9 | 2.31% | | Strongly disagree | 2 | 0.51% | | Not Answered | 7 | 1.80% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Enhance accessibility and sustainable travel options** | **386/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 246 | 63.24% | | Agree | 101 | 25.96% | | Neither agree or disagree | 26 | 6.68% | | Disagree | 7 | 1.80% | | Strongly disagree | 6 | 1.54% | | Not Answered | 3 | 0.77% | |
| **Q 8: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Threats listed below...?**  **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Competing pressure for street space** | **384/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 100 | 25.71% | | Agree | 118 | 30.33% | | Neither agree or disagree | 121 | 31.11% | | Disagree | 39 | 10.03% | | Strongly disagree | 6 | 1.54% | | Not Answered | 5 | 1.29% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - An economy reliant on workers and visitors** | **383/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 76 | 19.54% | | Agree | 153 | 39.33% | | Neither agree or disagree | 123 | 31.62% | | Disagree | 23 | 5.91% | | Strongly disagree | 8 | 2.06% | | Not Answered | 6 | 1.54% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Lack of suitable workspace** | **375/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 35 | 9.00% | | Agree | 99 | 25.45% | | Neither agree or disagree | 183 | 47.04% | | Disagree | 48 | 12.34% | | Strongly disagree | 10 | 2.57% | | Not Answered | 14 | 3.60% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Commercial property market doesn't adjust to allow growth of the independent business sector** | **380/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 112 | 28.79% | | Agree | 108 | 27.76% | | Neither agree or disagree | 141 | 36.25% | | Disagree | 14 | 3.60% | | Strongly disagree | 5 | 1.29% | | Not Answered | 9 | 2.31% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - COVID-19 recovery** | **378/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 59 | 15.17% | | Agree | 127 | 32.65% | | Neither agree or disagree | 157 | 40.36% | | Disagree | 29 | 7.46% | | Strongly disagree | 6 | 1.54% | | Not Answered | 11 | 2.83% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - National planning rules (Permitted Development and use classes) limit opportunities for different business types** | **377/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 40 | 10.28% | | Agree | 97 | 24.94% | | Neither agree or disagree | 194 | 49.87% | | Disagree | 30 | 7.71% | | Strongly disagree | 16 | 4.11% | | Not Answered | 12 | 3.08% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Some big retail and major employers moving out** | **381/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 87 | 22.37% | | Agree | 132 | 33.93% | | Neither agree or disagree | 108 | 27.76% | | Disagree | 40 | 10.28% | | Strongly disagree | 14 | 3.60% | | Not Answered | 8 | 2.06% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Increasing vacant units** | **381/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 151 | 38.82% | | Agree | 143 | 36.76% | | Neither agree or disagree | 60 | 15.42% | | Disagree | 20 | 5.14% | | Strongly disagree | 7 | 1.80% | | Not Answered | 8 | 2.06% | |
| **Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats - Ensuring the city centre is a place for all of Oxford's communities and visitors** | **385/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 168 | 43.19% | | Agree | 139 | 35.73% | | Neither agree or disagree | 56 | 14.40% | | Disagree | 12 | 3.08% | | Strongly disagree | 10 | 2.57% | | Not Answered | 4 | 1.03% | |
| **Q9: Are there Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats that you would add or remove…?** | **263/389** | Open text box responses not summarised in the Report |
| **Q10: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Objectives listed above...?**  **Objectives - Connectivity & Access** | **384/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 204 | 52.44% | | Agree | 109 | 28.02% | | Neither agree or disagree | 27 | 6.94% | | Disagree | 19 | 4.88% | | Strongly disagree | 25 | 6.43% | | Not Answered | 5 | 1.29% | |
| **Objectives - Public Realm & Animation** | **376/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 156 | 40.10% | | Agree | 142 | 36.50% | | Neither agree or disagree | 48 | 12.34% | | Disagree | 21 | 5.40% | | Strongly disagree | 9 | 2.31% | | Not Answered | 13 | 3.34% | |
| **Objectives - Getting The Mix Right** | **380/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 118 | 30.33% | | Agree | 183 | 47.04% | | Neither agree or disagree | 48 | 12.34% | | Disagree | 19 | 4.88% | | Strongly disagree | 12 | 3.08% | | Not Answered | 9 | 2.31% | |
| **Objectives - Getting The Basics Right** | **377/389** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Total | Percent | | Strongly agree | 169 | 43.44% | | Agree | 155 | 39.85% | | Neither agree or disagree | 37 | 9.51% | | Disagree | 11 | 2.83% | | Strongly disagree | 5 | 1.29% | | Not Answered | 12 | 3.08% | |
| **Q11: Is anything missing from the Objectives that should be included or that you would like to be removed…?** | **171/389** | Open text box responses  There were a number comments made relating to the objectives presented in the Action Plan, including:   * *A call for clarity on what a world class public transport system looks like;* * *City Centre should appeal to locals, not just visitors;* * *Re-purpose covered market as a food orientated location;* * *Main thing people would like to see is action – love the plan, let’s be bold and really make it happen.*   The objectives will be reviewed, to test whether they should be updated or any objectives removed. |
| **Q12: Would you suggest any additional Projects under any of the Workstreams…?** | **160/389** | Open text box responses  A number of recommendations were put forward, some of which were contradictory, for example: suggestions for free car parking and the development of a large car park to serve the City Centre, versus opinions relating to the full pedestrianisation of the City Centre.  The projects proposed will be reviewed, to evaluate whether additional projects should be included. |
| **Q13: Having read the Projects in the Consultation Draft are there any additional actions you would suggest under any of those in Workstream 1, 2, 3 or 4…? Please say what:** | **85/389** | Open text box responses  In line with the response to Q12 (above), a number of additional actions were proposed. Improving the quality of the built environment was an action that was raised by a number of participants.  The additional actions will be reviewed, to evaluate whether additional projects should be included. |
| **Q14: Are there additional Streets in the city centre you consider should be included…? Additional streets** | **60/389** | Open text box responses  A number of participants commented on the importance of ‘gateways’ to the City Centre, such as the Botley Road and Railway Station area.  However, there seemed to be some confusion in relation to this question as to whether it was about additional streets, or prioritization of identified streets due to the perceived quality of the public realm. |
| **Q15: For those Streets currently included would you identify any additional opportunities or challenges to delivery…? Opportunities or challenges** | **69/389** | Open text box responses  In general the response to this question relate to the quality of the built environment in the street, how they are used and the environment (both green and blue).  The comments will be taken into consideration through a review of the Action plan and used to inform the priority of projects and actions. |
| **Q16: Thinking about Oxford city centre as you use it as a place to live, work, study or visit, are there any other changes you would like to see made...? Changes** | **242/389** | Open text box responses  Many of the responses to this question were a re-iteration of the comments that the participants had made earlier in the survey. Including contrasting opinions on the use of the private car in the City Centre. There were, also, a number of responses relating to the importance of high or higher quality built environment.  The comments will be taken into consideration through a review of the Action plan and used to inform the priority of projects and actions. |
| **Q17: What is your postcode?** | **242/389** | **Data Protected** |
| **Q18: Which of the following best describes how you think of yourself?** | **375/389** | **Collated in section 2 of this report** |
| **Q19: Which age bracket do you fall into?** | **379/389** |
| **Q20: Which of the following best describes your ethnic group?** | **377/389** |
| **Q21: Are your day to day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months?** | **378/389** |

1. **Consultation Response**

This section of the report sets out the analysis from: all of the detailed email/letter responses; all of the one to one meetings; and, **389** free form comments from the portal survey. Through this trawl of the data no calls for ‘*substantial change*’ to the CCAP have been identified and there is nothing to suggest that the Action Plan should not proceed.

**4.1 Response Themes**

The following section sets out some of the patterns and themes that have been identified through the analysis of the data, and suggests a recommendation to address the points raised through the consultation

**Response Theme (RT) 1**

|  |
| --- |
| **Governance** |
| A number of respondents have questioned how the ambition of the CCAP will be delivered. There seems to be two points that need to be addressed through a revision of the document:   1. that the City Council has taken the lead in commissioning the CCAP, but it cannot deliver and implement the actions that are proposed without the involvement and support from stakeholders and the wider community; and, 2. the next stage, alongside the adoption of the CCAP, is to review the delivery mechanisms to establish effective governance structures and partnerships to deliver the actions set out in the Action Plan.   It is **recommended** that it is explicitly set out in the governance section of the CCAP that the City Council will seek to establish a wider stakeholder group to deliver the ambitions proposed in the CCAP.  **RT 2** |
| **The document (CCAP) should be flexible, adaptive and kept under review.** |
| It is the intention of the Council that the CCAP will be a *‘living document’*. The CCAP sets actions which are appropriate and up-to-date when adopted, but has the ability to adapt to changing circumstances. However, it is clear from the consultation response that this point is not well articulated through the document.  It is recommended that the CCAP is amended to reflect that the challenges facing the City Centre, over the life of the Action Plan (2021-2030), are likely to change and an ‘*adaptive resilience’* approach should be adopted.  It is **recommended** that the way in which the CCAP is ‘*kept under review’* should be more clearly set out in the document (this links to RT2 & RT3). |
|  |

**RT 3**

|  |
| --- |
| **Implementation – how can the CCAP be delivered?** |
| The range of views on project priorities from those who responded to the consultation is evident from the data.  Therefore, the CCAP should be more explicit that there may be conflicting agendas and some disagreement over what actions are included, as well as what actions take priority.  It is **recommended** that the CCAP is amended to reflect the need for transparency, accountability and adaptability of the Action Plan as it is implemented (see RT1 & RT2). |

**RT 4**

|  |
| --- |
| **How will you know if it (CCAP) has been successful?** |
|  |

A number of respondents directly and indirectly asked what ‘success’ would look like? As set out on RT 1, the CCAP is a ‘*living document*’, it will evolve and change. However, there does appear to be an opportunity to identify a number of Key Performance Indicators which could be developed to track, monitor and gauge the relative ‘success’ of the CCAP.

It is **recommended**, following the adoption of the CCAP, that a bespoke set of CCAP Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are explored with the City Centre Task Force and others. Furthermore, that the KPIs should reflect the commercial viability, as well as the vitality of the City Centre as relevant social and civic hub available to all of the community.

**RT 5**

|  |
| --- |
| **The quality of the public realm and the built environment are priority issues** |
| A significant number of participants considered that the quality of the public realm and built environment was, in their opinion, poor and did not reflect the ‘*global*’ City identity of Oxford.  It is **recommended** that improving the quality of the public realm and built environment in the City Centre is a high priority project area.  **RT 6**   |  | | --- | | **Changing role of the City Centre** | | The challenges facing the City Centre from the change in the role that it will play in the future, might call for a change in use for some properties. However, as one respondent commented this disruption should not just be seen as a threat, but that: ‘Vacant units should be seen as an opportunity…’; and, another commented that ‘….reducing vacant units….’ should be an additional project.  It is **recommended** that an *adaptive resilient* strategy is developed to support the changing role of the City Centre through a curatorship of assets. | |

**4.2 Wider Themes identified from the Data**

The following section picks out some of wider themes identified through the key comments that are evident through the analysis of the data, which might be addressed through the implementation of the CCAP and inform the prioritisation of projects.

**Inclusivity** (Connectivity and Access, Getting the Mix Right, Getting the Basics Right)– there were a number of comments relating to respondents feeling that the City could be enhanced as a hub, and become more connected and welcoming,. For example:

* there were a number of comments, such as: ‘*More needs to be done to attract local people to Oxford City Centre. At the moment it's just too much effort / expense*’.
* another participant in the consultation said that: ‘*Most locals can't afford to live in the city and most have no reason to visit the city because there's nothing there of interest, most development seems to be for the benefit of tourists, visitors from outside Oxford, businesses, colleges and property developers’.*
* the cost of living and availability of affordable housing was a further area of concern for a number of respondents, who felt that: ‘*We need much more affordable housing*….’, and that there is a ‘*Lack of affordable Housing for normal People*.’
* it was also suggested by a number of participants that there should be ‘….*much more engagement with local residents*….’, and ‘*More face to face meetings with residents….is the only way to come to some consensus*’. However, it is clear that engagement needs to be across communities, so that people feel connected to and have a *right* to the city.

**Movement Hierarchy**, **pedestrians and cyclists as the priority** (Connectivity and Access) – the written responses to the consultation show:

* that there are conflicting views on how the movement hierarchy in the City Centre should be considered. For example: ‘….*the city centre is dominated by cars*….’ and that there should be ‘….*No cars. Of course*….’, to views that ‘*Getting rid of cars is not the answer. Providing the right volume and places to park is key*….’.
* proposals for alternatives to the private car should be bolder, including a number of proposals for trams: ‘*Cheap or free public transport. Trams or trolley buses. That allow families to use them*’; and, ‘*Trams would be electric and have priority over other vehicles, and therefore would be fast. They would also be novel and exciting for visitors and residents to use, and be an added tourist attraction. This has been done in other cities very successfully’.*

**Where is the City Centre?** (The Streets)– what the respondents considered to be the spatial location of the City Centre varied, for example:

* a theme from the survey emerged relating to the spatial context of the town centre. What was of interest from this finding is that some of the comments suggest that there is an opportunity for the City Centre to be a key social, civic and commercial hub (in line with Inclusivity, above). A possible approach might be to look at the 15 minute concept that has been developed, amongst others, by Carlos Moreno in Paris.

**Music, Culture and Events/Free Things to do** (Getting the Mix Right) – a number of participants commented on the evening and night time economy:

* the following comments are typical of the responses relating to a need for music venues – one respondent said that: that ‘*I would like to see more support for live music venues’.* ….’, whilst another considered that ‘*There is an opportunity of nurturing and enabling the Oxford Live Music Scene by providing infrastructure to support it. Most obviously the City Centre needs 1 or more grassroots venue*’; and, ‘*If OCC wants to enact the policies set out in this draft in regarding creative industries and night life it needs to reach out and engage….*’.

**Getting the Mix Right** – the response to the survey suggest that:

* the historic architecture and built environment in the City Centre is considered to be important and add to the character and identity of the city. A number of respondents considered that tit should not be seen as a ‘….*negative*….’ or ‘….*restrictive*….’ element, but as a positive factor.
* the repurposing or adaptation of existing buildings in the centre was considered to be a sustainable approach. There was also support for more homes in the City Centre to support a mix-of-uses to support the resilience of the city.
* a number of respondents warned of the ‘*tourist*’ focus of some businesses ad expressed concern, in particular, about new businesses like the ….three American candy stores, multiple "University" merchandise stores’.

**The Covered Market** – a number of respondents commented that:

* the Covered Market is an important venue and asset for the city, but should be seen in a broader context. A typical response highlighted the setting and management from a wider perspective that that just of the managed asset of the Covered Market. They urged that the surrounding area should be more effectively managed as part of the offer, feeling that: ‘….the Golden Cross and the Covered Market should work together.’
  1. **Conclusions**

The response to the consultation demonstrates that most respondents agreed with the approach of the City Centre Action Plan. Six key Themes have been identified and it is recommended that the Oxford City Centre Action Plan is amended to reflect the findings from the consultation. The first four recommendations relate to the implementation of the plan, that:

* an effective governance structure should be developed, including internal and external partners;
* a process is established to review and adapt the CCAP, as appropriate;
* there is transparency and accountability amongst partners in the delivery of the action plan; and,
* there are agreed key performance indicators which will be used to monitor progress.

The final two recommendations relate to priorities that emerged from the consultation response:

* improving the quality of the built environment and public realm; and,
* focus on the resilience of the City Centre – the ability of the City Centre to adapt to challenge and change.

Finally, the section highlighted some wider themes that do not call for change in the action plan, but are set out here as they might inform projects and actions going forward.

**5. Next steps**

The next steps can summarised as:

* 1. Review the consultation response in detail and update the structure and content of the Action Plan, to ensure that it reflects and addresses the comments made by participants.
  2. Ensure those projects and initiatives deemed as a priority by stakeholder receive early focus in action planning.