Sustainability Appraisal of Selected Policy Options for the Oxford Local Plan 2020 - 2040

Levett-Therivel
28A North Hinksey Lane, Oxford OX2 0LX
riki@levett-therivel.co.uk
07759 135811

September 2022

Contents

Introduction

This report appraises the sustainability of some of the policy options for the Oxford Local Plan 2020 – 2040. It focuses on those options that could have significant sustainability impacts, or are likely to be controversial, or which might benefit from in-depth appraisal in order to fine-tune them.

As a first stage, professional judgement was used to screen out those option where:

Option	there is only one uncontroversial 'option'
Option	the options are similar to each other from a sustainability perspective
Option	the options are similar to each other and are unlikely to have significant sustainability impacts
Option	the option is premature for appraisal (too detailed, uncertain, requires additional information not currently available)

Box 1 shows the results of the screening process. The remaining options, which are appraised in this report, are:

- S2. Approach to greenfield sites
- H1. Housing requirement for the plan period
- H2. Housing need for the plan period
- H5. Employer linked affordable housing
- H8. Houses of Multiple Occupation
- E1. Employment strategy
- E3. Allowing housing on existing employment sites
- E4. Location of new employment uses
- G4. Delivering mandatory net gains in biodiversity in Oxford
- R3. Retrofitting existing buildings including heritage assets
- DH7. Motor vehicle parking design standard
- C1. Focusing town centre uses in our district centres
- Northern edge area of focus
- South area
- East Oxford
- University areas
- West End and Botley Road

To carry out the appraisal, the sustainability appraisal framework was used that was proposed in the SA scoping report of June 2021[1]. It is shown again at Annex A.

[1] https://www.oxford.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/7647/occ_local_plan_2040_-_sustainability_appraisal_scoping_report.pdf

Box 1. Results of the options screening process

1.Vision and Strategy

- S1: Directing new development to the right locations
- S2: Approach to greenfield sites
- S3: Infrastructure considerations in new development
- S4: Viability considerations
- S5: Presumption in favour of sustainable development

2. A healthy, inclusive city to live in

- H1: Housing requirement for the plan period
- H2: Housing need for the plan period
- H3: Affordable housing – Overall requirement
- H4: Affordable housing: financial contributions for new student accommodation…
- H5: Employer-linked affordable housing
- H6: Mix of housing sizes (no. bedrooms)
- H7: Loss of family dwellings options
- H8: House of Multiple Occupation (HMOs)
- H9: Location of new student accommodation
- H10: Ensuring there is enough student accommodation to meet needs…
- H11: Managing new student accommodation
- H12: Gypsy and traveller accommodation
- H13: Residential moorings options
- H14: Elderly persons' accommodation and other specialist housing neeeds
- H15: Self-build and custom house building options
- H16: Community-led housing

3.A prosperous city with a globally important role in learning, knowledge and innovation

- E1: Employment strategy
- E2: Making Best Use of Existing Employment Sites
- E3: Allowing housing on existing employment sites
- E4: Location of new employment uses
- E5: Warehousing and storage uses
- E6: Employment and Skills Plans
- E7: Affordable Workspaces
- E8: Short-stay accommodation (hotels and guest-houses) (New Accommodation)
- E9: Short-stay accommodation (hotels and guest-houses) (Existing Accommodation)

4.A green, biodiverse city that is resilient to climate change

- G1: Protection of GI network and green features
- G2: Provision of new GI features
- G3: Provision of new GI features – Urban Greening Factor
- G4: Delivering mandatory net gains in biodiversity in Oxford
- G5: Protecting and enhancing onsite biodiversity in Oxford
- G6: Protecting Oxford's ecological network
- G7: Flood risk and Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs)
- G8: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)
- G9: Groundwater flows and sensitive sites
- G10: Resilient design and construction

5.A city that utilises its resources with care, protects the air, water and soil, and aims for net zero carbon

- R1: Net zero buildings in operation
- R2: Embodied carbon
- R3: Retrofitting existing buildings including heritage assets

R4: Efficient use of land
R5: Air Quality Assessments and standards
R6: Water Quality
R7: Land Quality
R8: Amenity and environmental health impacts of development options

6.A city of culture that respects its heritage and fosters design of the highest quality

DH1: Principles of high quality design of buildings
DH2: Specific design guidance for areas
DH3: View Cones and High Buildings
DH4: Public Art
DH5: Bin and Bike Stores and external servicing features
DH6: Bicycle parking design standards
DH7: Motor vehicle parking design standard
DH8: Privacy, daylight and sunlight
DH9: Internal space standards for residential developments
DH10: Outdoor amenity space
DH11: Accessible and adaptable homes
DH12: Healthy Design/Health Impact Assessments (HIAs)
DH13: Designated Heritage Assets
DH14: Local Heritage Assets
DH15: Archaeology Options

7.A more equal city with strong communities and opportunities for all

C1: Focusing town centre uses in our district centres
C2: Active frontages
C3: Protection and alteration of existing local community assets
C4: Provision of new local community assets
C5: Protection and alteration of existing learning and non-residential institutions
C6: Provision of new learning and non-residential institutions
C7: Protecting cultural, social and visitor attractions
C8: Provision of new cultural, social and visitor attractions
C9: Pubs
C10: Transport assessments, travel plans and servicing and delivery plans

8.Development Sites, Areas of Focus and Infrastructure

Northern Edge Area of Focus
North Area proposed development sites outside of the Areas of Focus
Cowley Branch Line, Littlemore and the Leys Area of Focus
South Area proposed development sites outside of Area of Focus
Marston Road and Old Road Areas of Focus
East Area proposed development sites outside of Area of Focus
University areas north of the city centre Area of Focus
West End and Botley Road Area of Focus
Central and West Area proposed development sites outside of Area of Focus
DS1: Digital Infrastructure

S2. Approach to greenfield sites

The options considered are:

S2a. Assess all greenfield sites and set out reasons for their protection. Direct development away from protected greenfield sites. However, do not have a blanket protection of all greenfield sites. Do include policies to maximise efficient use of land on brownfield sites. This will include a review of Green Belt to assess whether there are any sites in the Green Belt that could come forward, that are not biodiversity sites or flood storage and would not have an unacceptable impact on the integrity of the remaining Green Belt.

S2b. Allow development on greenfield sites only if no brownfield sites are available and needs are not being met on brownfield sites.

SA Objective	S2a	S2b
1. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	0 The option aims to prevent a worsening of flooding by protecting greenfield sites that act as flood storage. Maximising the efficient use of brownfield sites could mean that some brownfield sites that are prone to flooding remain developed.	-? Prioritising brownfield land and only then allowing development on greenfield land would offer less protection from flooding than Option S2a because some of the greenfield sites may be in the floodplain.
2. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040	0	0
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land	+/- This option could allow some greenfield sites within Oxford to be developed. This would allow more of Oxford's housing need to be provided within Oxford, reducing the need for neighbouring authorities to provide housing land.	+ This option gives a strong incentive to make full use of brownfield sites. It would also allow some greenfield sites within Oxford to be developed, but without the protection of S2a.
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	- The lack of housing land in the city constrains what is possible in terms of meeting local housing need	- The lack of housing land in the city constrains what is possible in terms of meeting local housing need
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**;	0	0
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**	0	0
7. To provide adequate green and blue infrastructure, **leisure and recreation** opportunities and	- This option is more likely to lead to greenfield land being developed. Greenfield sites are more likely to offer leisure and	-? This option is less likely to lead to greenfield land being developed, with fewer associated impacts on leisure and recreation

make these readily accessible for all	recreation opportunities (though this depends on the site), so their loss is more likely to have negative impacts for leisure and recreation.	
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry	? Depends on location	
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources	- Development on greenfield sites is likely to lead to runoff and worse water quality	-? Focusing development first on brownfield land is less likely to lead to increased runoff
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**	- This option would allow development on greenfield sites "that are not biodiversity sites". However even these sites will have some biodiversity interest.	- Many brownfield sites have biodiversity interest. The policy would also permit development on greenfield land if there is no brownfield land available: this would also have negative biodiversity impacts
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	? Depends on location	
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector	+ This option would permit development on greenfield sites that meet various criteria, which would help to support Oxford's economy	? The criterion "if no brownfield sites are available" may be difficult to prove and increases uncertainty for developers. It may make development less likely to take place.

Comments/ mitigation: Option S2b more clearly protects greenfield sites, and so is slightly better in terms of leisure/recreation and water quality. Option S2a could allow greenfield sites to be developed in advance of brownfield sites where they are unlikely to increase flooding, affect biodiversity etc. There is no clear preferred alternative from a sustainability perspective. Another option could be to not have more development on greenfield land beyond that already identified in the current Local Plan, if only to show why one of the other options would be better?

H1. Housing requirement for the plan period / H2. Housing need for the plan period

The options considered are:

H1a. Set a capacity-based / constraint-based housing requirement (c7852 dwellings 2020-2040)

H1b. Set a housing requirement in the Plan based on the identified housing need / H2a. Define housing need based on the Standard Method calculation of need. (approx. 729 dwellings/year, 14,580 dwellings 2020-2040)

H2b. Set a housing requirement based on the need calculated by seeking to achieve and support the economic growth, i.e. plan housing to support the forecast increase in workers. Set affordability-based target i.e., seek to meet full affordable housing need.

(This appraisal assumes that the economic growth led housing requirement is significantly greater than the need based on the Standard Method)

SA Objective	H1a	H1b / H2a	H2b
1. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	0? The constraint-based housing requirement would take into account flooding constraints	- Any homes additional to those required under option H1a would need to be secured through joint working on land outside of Oxford city's administrative boundary. It is likely that the delivery of homes outside the city would be on greenfield land. More urban development also risks exacerbating the heat island effect.	-- As for H1b, but with significantly more homes
2. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040	- Additional homes will contribute to climate change through the embodied energy in the homes, heating requirements, and transport movements of the residents of the new homes	-/-- Additional impact from more homes. The additional homes would need to be provided through joint working outside the city boundary. Future residents would need to travel further to access jobs in Oxford, however there are potential economies of scale that could enable more sustainable modes of travel using existing networks.	-- Still greater impact from more additional homes. The additional homes would need to be provided through joint working outside the city boundary. Future residents would need to travel further to access jobs in Oxford, however there are potential economies of scale that could enable more sustainable modes of travel using existing networks.
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the	? Depends on design		

use of greenfield and Green Belt land			
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	- Does not meet housing need in full	+ The Government's Standard Method identifies housing need in the absence of other factors (e.g. employment ambitions, need to deliver large quantities of affordable housing)	++ An affordability-based target would help to ensure that housing need in Oxford was met in full
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**;	- Shortfall in housing compared to housing need would mean that house prices would further increase, increasing poverty and inequality	- The Standard Method would not deliver the affordable housing needed	+ This option would help to deliver the affordable housing numbers needed in Oxford
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**	0? Unlikely to significantly overstretch existing services on the whole, but also unlikely to significantly add to them	+/- The new households could overstretch some existing services, but new development could also be required to provide new services	+/-- The new households could significantly overstretch some existing services, but new development could also be required to provide new services
7. To provide adequate green and blue infrastructure, **leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all	- New housing would probably not all be accommodated on brownfield land, and some of the greenfield land where it would be located is likely to be currently used for leisure and recreation	- /-- The additional housing is likely to be located on greenfield land (outside the city) which is currently used for leisure and recreation or farmland.	As option H1b/ H2a however additional housing land would be needed which would be likely to have a significant impact existing greenfield land outside the city.
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry	- The residents of the new housing would increase traffic levels	-/-- Some of the new housing would be located outside of Oxford, leading to longer journeys (for instance if the residents work in Oxford) however there are potential economies of scale that could enable more sustainable modes of travel using existing networks.	-- Most of the new housing would be located outside of Oxford, leading to significantly more traffic, including longer journeys (e.g. for work in Oxford) however there are potential economies of scale that could enable more sustainable modes of travel using existing networks.
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources	- Oxford is already in an area of high water stress. Additional houses will exacerbate this.	-/--	-- Oxford is already in an area of high water stress. A significant number of additional houses will make this significantly worse
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**	0? This option would provide new housing in locations within Oxford that do not have significant biodiversity constraints	- This option would result in a need to deliver additional homes outside Oxford (to be negotiated through joint working with neighbouring local authorities).	-- This option would result in a need to deliver additional greenfield housing sites outside Oxford (to be negotiated through joint working with neighbouring local

		There would be likely associated impacts on biodiversity, but fewer than option H2b.	authorities). There would be likely significant associated impacts on biodiversity.
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	? Depends on location		
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector	0 This option would not help to significantly grow the economy	+ This option would help to support Oxfordshire's economic growth ambitions, but less than option H2b	++ Greater housing provision would help to support Oxfordshire's economic growth ambitions

Comments/ mitigation:

Option H1a is least harmful environmentally but also least beneficial socially and economically. Option H2b is the reverse. If options H2a or (particularly) H2b are chosen:

- collaboration with adjacent local authorities will be needed to ensure adequate services, including public transport
- biodiversity net gain and leisure/recreational infrastructure will need to be provided
- provision of renewable energy, for instance, via district heating, should be considered

H5. Employer linked affordable housing

The options considered are:

H5a. On specified sites which would be listed in the Plan allow schemes that are available for employees who work for a specific organisation at a rent level affordable to them (as agreed with the local authority. Partial rent forms such as shared ownership may be possible if part remains in the ownership of the employer. Those on student placements may be considered employees).

H5b. Do not consider an employer linked housing policy.

SA Objective	H5a	H5b
1. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	0	0
2. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040	+? Would allow employees to live near where they work, thus reducing their transport emissions	0
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land	? Depends on location. It may be difficult to get employee housing on sites	0
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	+ Provides another route for housing delivery in a constrained city	0
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**;	? Possible undermining of delivery of social rented housing, which focuses on those in greatest need	0
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**	0	0
7. To provide adequate green and blue infrastructure, **leisure and recreation** opportunities and	0	0

make these readily accessible for all		
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry	+ Would allow employees to live near where they work, thus reducing their need to travel	0
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources	0	0
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**	+? Depends on location, but employment sites are likely to be brownfield, and building homes on them is likely to be better for biodiversity than building elsewhere on greenfield land	0
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	? Depends on location	0
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector	+ This option would allow a limited number of employers to support their employees, helping the economy	0

Comments/ mitigation: Generally option H5a is positive. It could be fine-tuned to require employers to contribute towards providing social rented housing elsewhere in the city if they cannot provide it on site?

H8. House of Multiple Occupation (HMOs)

The options considered are:

H8a. Prevent a concentration of HMOs in any area by only allowing a certain percentage of HMOs within a frontage (currently this is 20%).
H8b. Allow new purpose-built HMOs in appropriate locations.
H8c. Concentrate HMOs in certain areas so there is no restriction in particular areas and a complete or near complete restriction in others.
H8d. Do not have any restriction on HMOs.

SA Objective	H8a	H8b	H8c	H8d
1. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	n/a			
2. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040	n/a	+ Purpose-built HMOs are likely to be more energy efficient than older family buildings that are converted to HMOs	n/a	n/a
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land	+ HMOs are generally a very space-efficient way to house people, although this is often at the cost of residents' quality of life. Most HMOs are conversions of existing homes, and so minimise the use of greenfield land			
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	-/+ Restricting the 'natural' / market growth of HMOs in some areas may mean that there will be a shortage of HMOs, or that HMOs would be provided in other, less affordable, parts of the city. It would help to ensure that other housing needs are met.	+ This would increase the stock of HMOs	- Concentrating HMOs in some areas may mean that the house values in those areas go down, making the HMOs more affordable. However it could also restrict the development of HMOs elsewhere meaning that fewer HMOs would be available.	+/- This would maximise the provision of HMOs but could affect the quality and quantity of other accommodation.

5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**;	+ Spreading HMOs more evenly – preventing a concentration of HMOs – helps to prevent areas from becoming dominated by HMOs.	+ Purpose-built HMOs can provide a better quality of environment for residents and neighbours	- Concentrating HMOs in some areas is likely to change the character of the area, and could cause HMO residents to feel excluded. Arguably areas receiving more HMOs would be those that are already more deprived.	- In practice, this option could end up looking like H8c, with some areas becoming dominated by HMOs
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**	n/a			
7. To provide adequate green and blue infrastructure, **leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all	n/a			
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry	+ HMOs are a high-density form of accommodation, often lived in by people who do not own cars. As such, they help to reduce traffic			
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources	n/a			
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**	0			+ HMOs are a very space-efficient form of accommodation. Maximising the number of HMOs in Oxford would help to reduce the need for more greenfield land, with consequent impacts on biodiversity
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage	0 This option aims to maintain the character of existing neighbourhoods	? This option would provide more HMOs but without some of the negative impacts associated with them	- This option is likely to lead to some neighbourhoods losing some local character whilst others maintain theirs.	- Depends on how much accommodation and where, but could lead to some neighbourhoods becoming

assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.				inappropriately dominated by HMOs and losing their local character
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector	0			+ HMOs are a flexible form of accommodation that can suit short-term, part-time and/or temporary workers, as well as providing temporary accommodation for people relocating to Oxford to work.

Comments/ mitigation:

'Option' H8b is not really an alternative to the others: it could be put forward in addition to any of the other options. It is a very positive option.

Concentration of HMOs is some areas is the least sustainable option. No restriction on HMOs would support this sustainable form of accommodation, but could affect existing neighbourhoods.

E1. Employment strategy / E3. Allowing housing on employment sites

The options considered are:

E1a./E3a. Attempt to meet employment needs, but prioritise other uses, in particular housing, rather than employment, even if employment needs cannot be met in full within the city. This would mean making the best use of the city and district centres and existing prime employment sites, primarily through the delivery of continued employment uses at these locations. It could also mean allowing an element of housing to come forward on employment sites. (See options on "enabling housing on existing employment sites"; "making best use of employment sites"; and "location of new employment uses", below.); Allow an element of housing delivery on existing employment sites (if other policy requirements, for example around flood risk, are met).

E1b./ E3b. Allow growth of employment-generating uses throughout the city, including on sites not already in that use and outside of the city and district centres, to try to meet all forecast need within the city; Maintain employment sites for employment or commercial uses. Do not further diversity uses to include housing as well.

E1c. Focus on Oxford providing a broad employment base, trying to protect a wide range of employment-generating uses including those that don't make efficient use of land. This would include protection of warehouse sites and small light-industrial sites, for example, as well as key sites such as the MINI plant and Science Area.

SA Objective	E1a / E3a	E1b / E3b	E1c
1. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	0 This option would not significantly change the amount of greenfield land available	--? This option would support more employment, which would require more associated housing. This, in turn, could exacerbate flooding; and turning agricultural land into urban land could lead to the heat island effect.	? The impact of this option is unclear but it would not indirectly lead to more housing development in the way that option E1b would.
2. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040	+ Prioritisation of housing would help to balance out the current imbalance in favour of employment in Oxford, which is leading to significant commuting and associated carbon emissions	- This option would lead to significantly more employment, requiring additional housing and leading to more commuting, with associated carbon emissions	?
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land	+ This option would aim to make best use of existing employment sites	0	- This option would protect employment-generating uses that don't make efficient use of land

4.	To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	+ This option would allow some employment sites to be turned into housing, helping to meet the city's housing need	- This option would increase the need for local housing by providing more employment	+/-
5.	To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**;	+/- This option could help to reduce the range of employment available in Oxford, with associated impacts on poverty and inequalities. But it could also provide housing to people who would otherwise struggle to find it.	-? This option would maximise the number of jobs in Oxford, providing employment opportunities to more people. However many of these are likely to commute in from elsewhere.	+ This option would aim to provide a range of types of employment, helping to reduce poverty and social exclusion. Oxford's unemployment rate (April 2021 – March 2022) was 3.9% compared with the Great Britain average of 4.1%; and 74.0% of residents were in employment compared with the Great Britain average of 75.2%. This option is the most likely to reduce the unemployment and boost the employment levels for Oxford residents.
6.	To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**	? More housing is likely to require more services and facilities. This option does not clearly account for this	? More employment is less likely to require more services and facilities	?
7.	To provide adequate green and blue infrastructure, **leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all	n/a		
8.	To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry	++ This option would help to reduce the imbalance between the number of jobs and housing in Oxford, and associated commuting, congestion and air pollution	-- This option would further increase the imbalance between the number of jobs and housing in Oxford, exacerbating existing problems of commuting, congestion and air pollution	? The impact of this option would depend on the type and location of employment, but is likely to fall between E1a andE1b
9.	To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources	0	- See below. This option would indirectly lead to more housing development outside Oxford, with impacts on water use and water quality (runoff)	-? The impact of this option would depend on the type and location of employment, but is likely to fall between E1a andE1b
10.	To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**	0 The option would essentially turn land from one brownfield use (employment) to	-- This option would keep or increase the number of employment sites in Oxford, indirectly requiring more housing outside	-? The impact of this option would depend on the type and location of employment, but is likely to fall between E1a andE1b

	another brownfield use (more intense employment or housing)	Oxford, with indirect negative impacts on biodiversity.	
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	n/a		
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector	- This option would lead to some employment land being used for housing	++/+ This option would provide the greatest number of jobs, although it is unclear whether these would be appropriate for Oxford residents who are unemployed.	+ This option would provide fewer jobs than E1b, but these jobs are more clearly appropriate for less skilled local residents

Comments/ mitigation:
From an environmental and overall sustainability perspective, balancing out housing and employment development (options E1a and E3a) in Oxford is most positive, since it would reduce the need to travel, with associated air quality, climate, biodiversity, water quality etc. impacts. For Oxfordshire's economic ambitions, options E1b and E3b are best since it optimises the number of jobs available. Socially, option E1c is positive since it would provide a better range and balance of jobs in Oxford, including jobs suited to people with lower qualifications.

E4. Location of new employment uses

The options considered are:

E4a. Support new employment uses through intensification and modernisation of existing sites, including hospitals and universities, other Category 1 and 2 employment sites (E.g., supporting office and R&D in Oxford's West End and recognising innovation clusters such as the Business Park, Science Park Oxford North and Old Road Campus), together with the City and District Centres (subject to the role and function of each respective centre).

E4b. Do not allow any new employment-generating uses outside of existing sites (i.e., do not allow loss of existing housing sites outside of city and district centres to employment-generating uses).

E4c. As well as intensification on existing sites and in the city centre and district centres, allow new employment uses in a very few locations specified as suitable, which would be only adjacent to existing sites, potentially requiring this expansion to be part of mixed-use schemes only.

E4d. Rely solely on national policy and other policies within the plan (e.g., hierarchy of centres) to determine proposals for new employment floorspace in the city.

This appraisal assumes that E4b would allow no new employment sites; E4d would allow new uses in district/city centres plus edge of town; E4c would allow some existing employment sites to expand, potentially into housing or greenfield land; E4a would be similar to E4d but with a greater focus on themed employment clusters.

SA Objective	E4a	E4b	E4c	E4d
1. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	No significant difference or impact			
2. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040	+? Several of the large sites listed in the policy have the potential for district heating	0	+? Expansion of existing sites (including those listed in option E4a) could allow for district heating or similar to be installed	? It may be more difficult to integrate district heating or similar with a less focused approach such as E4d
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land	-? Depends on the type and location of employment. Clustering of employment types (e.g. many offices together) could lead to monolithic	0	+? Mixed use schemes can support the efficient use of land, for instance by supporting 15 minute neighbourhoods, walking to work, provision of	? Depends on the type and location of employment.

	development and prevent compatible uses that might make more efficient use of land (e.g. daytime and evening uses that could share parking)		services (e.g. café, creche) near the employment site etc.	
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	- Possible loss of housing uses to employment, particularly in the areas listed in the policy	0 No change of housing use to employment	-? Possible loss of housing adjacent to existing employment sites	-? Possible loss of housing, particularly on main roads in/out of the city
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**;	-? This option seems to promote primarily high tech employment, which is unlikely to provide significant employment for less qualified residents. It could also allow some housing to be converted to employment.	0 No significant change from present	+/- This option would allow existing employment sites to expand, providing more (similar?) jobs to those presently provided. However it could also allow some housing to be converted to employment.	-? Depends on the type and location of employment, but it could allow some housing to be lost.
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**	n/a			
7. To provide adequate green and blue infrastructure, **leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all	0	0	-? Expansion of existing sites could be into greenfield land or other land currently used for leisure and recreation	0
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry	-/-- Several of the large employment sites are on the edge of town and most easily reached by car. Traffic and air pollution are already a significant problem in Oxford, so new/additional employment would contribute to that.	0 No significant change	-/-- as E4a. Larger employment sites would generate more traffic, but mixed use development could help to reduce this by e.g. providing food and child care on site	- The town centre hierarchy promotes development in the centre first, then edge of centre, and only then out of centre. This approach helps to minimise the need to travel to work by unsustainable means.
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources	0 No significant impact			

10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**	- Likely negative impacts to biodiversity from (further) development at the listed sites	0 No significant change from present	-/-- Likely negative impacts to biodiversity from expanding existing employment sites	-? Likely negative impacts to biodiversity from development of employment sites using the hierarchy of centres approach
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	? Depends on location and design			
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector	++ Economic clustering would allow the development of specialist economic 'quarters'	0 This option would keep employment sites at their existing size and location	+ This option would allow the expansion of some existing employment sites	+? This option would allow for more employment sites, but not they could be more physically scattered than option E4a, and the lack of clustering would be a missed opportunity

Comments/ mitigation:
The options are broadly variants on a theme, since the existing employment sites are already clearly defined and have growth potential. No expansion of existing employment sites (E4b) is likely to have the fewest positive and negative impacts. Support for economic clusters (E4a) is likely to have economic benefits, but could lead to monolithic development with high car dependency, and could reduce the amount of employment available for Oxfords less skilled residents. Developing existing employment sites into larger mixed use schemes (E4c) has the potential to support 15 minute neighbourhoods and reduce the need to travel. Following the town centre hierarchy (E4d) would, in practice, look much like E4a but without the economic advantages of clustering businesses.

E4a and E4c are unlikely to be consistent with E1a if that is the overall employment strategy chosen.

For all options, the Local Plan could consider including requirements to:
- provide district heating or other forms of renewable energy at the employment sites
- ensure easy access by walking, cycling and public transport
- restrict parking at the employment site to encourage non-car access by employees and optimise the use of land
- expand to adjacent land only if the land does not provide biodiversity, visual etc. benefits

G4. Delivering mandatory net gains in biodiversity in Oxford

The options considered are:

G4a. Set out a hierarchy for how 10% net gain as required through Environment Act should be delivered, particularly where on-site net gain is not possible. Guidance would seek to secure off-site delivery in the local neighbourhood in first instance, then within city boundary, then county. Off-site delivery within Oxfordshire, if no opportunities are available in the city, would be sought within the opportunity areas of the forthcoming Local Nature Recovery Strategy, and the Oxfordshire Nature Recovery Network. Payment to a body managing schemes would be the final option in the hierarchy

G4b. Require higher than 10% net gain on certain sites, in excess of the minimum requirements of the Environment Act.

G4c. Do not include a policy addressing biodiversity net gain requirements as set out in Environment Act, defer to national guidance/policy.

National policy already recommends a hierarchical approach to delivering biodiversity net gain, with on site being preferable, near the site next best and so on to purchase of national level statutory biodiversity credits from government as a last resort[2]. For this reason, G4a and G4c have been appraised together.

<table>
<tr><th>SA Objective</th><th>G4a/ G4c</th><th>G4b</th></tr>
<tr><td>1. To build resilience to climate change, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.</td><td colspan="2">+? No clear distinction between options: all of them would be broadly neutral or slightly beneficial. Improvements made for biodiversity – e.g. green roofs, new plantings – will help to prevent flooding, heat island effect etc.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero carbon emissions by 2040</td><td colspan="2">n/a</td></tr>
<tr><td>3. To encourage the efficient use of land through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land</td><td>-? Net gain can probably be incorporated into landscaping for the site; however, where it cannot be, then it could reduce the amount of housing that can be provided on a site. The hierarchy proposed in this option could constrain how land is used for non-biodiversity purposes</td><td>-? Requiring more net gain may reduce the amount of development possible on a site. Given the strong constraints to housing in Oxford, this would not be an efficient use of land</td></tr>
<tr><td>4. To meet local housing needs by ensuring that everyone has the</td><td>-? Delivery of 10% biodiversity net gain on site could reduce the number of homes that can be delivered; delivery offsite could reduce the viability of the development</td><td>- Delivery of more than 10% biodiversity net gain will exacerbate the impacts of G4a/G4c</td></tr>
</table>

[2] https://www.local.gov.uk/pas/topics/environment/biodiversity-net-gain-local-authorities/biodiversity-net-gain-faqs

opportunity to live in a decent affordable home		
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**;	n/a	
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**	n/a	
7. To provide adequate green and blue infrastructure, **leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all	0/+ Provision of biodiversity net gain locally will help to provide green and blue infrastructure (though not always accessible to all)	+ Provision of more biodiversity net grain would help to provide more green and blue infrastructure (though not always accessible to all)
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry	n/a	
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources	+? Biodiversity net gain could be in the form of ponds or SuDS which would help to protect water quality	+ More biodiversity net gain could be in the form of ponds or SuDS which would help to protect water quality
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**	0 This option aims to protect biodiversity	+ This option would help to enhance biodiversity
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	n/a	
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector	0 No significant impact	0/-? A requirement for 20% biodiversity net gain may restrict some employment development, either by taking up to much space on site or by making the development unviable.

Comments/ mitigation: Would another option be to require either 10% biodiversity net gain on site or more than 10% gain off site?

R3. Retrofitting existing buildings including heritage assets

The options considered are:

R3a. Include a presumption in favour of retrofit measures for all existing buildings that are not heritage assets or in the setting of, subject to certain conditions, where these measures secure demonstrable carbon reduction/energy efficiency/climate adaptation.

R3b. In relation to designated heritage assets and historic buildings, or proposals within conservation areas, set out that carbon reduction/energy efficiency/climate adaptation measures will be considered as benefits that may outweigh harm. Be explicit in setting out a set of key principles to follow, potentially flagging which measures would be more or less likely to cause harm (e.g., permanent versus temporary), and how levels of harm would be assessed against public benefit.

R3c. Do not include policy addressing retrofitting of existing buildings and/or heritage assets.

SA Objective	R3a	R3b	R3c
1. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	+ Would support climate resilience measures in existing non-heritage buildings	+ Would support (with constraints) climate resilience measures in heritage assets, historic buildings etc.	0 No explicit support
2. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040	+ Would support carbon reduction / energy efficiency retrofit measures in existing non-heritage buildings	+ Would support (with constraints) carbon reduction / energy efficiency retrofit measures in heritage assets, historic buildings etc.	0 No explicit support
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land	n/a		
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	+ Helps to make existing homes more liveable and (over time) more affordable	+ Helps to make existing heritage assets etc. more liveable and (over time) more affordable	0
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**;	n/a		

6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**	n/a		
7. To provide adequate green and blue infrastructure, **leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all	n/a		
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry	n/a		
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources	n/a		
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**	n/a		
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	0 Some retrofit measures (e.g. solar panels, small wind turbines) have the potential to change the character of a neighbourhood, although this impact is likely to be insignificant outside conservation areas etc.	-? Some retrofit measures are incompatible with heritage assets, listed buildings etc. The impact would depend on the conditions put on the retrofit measures.	0
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector	n/a		

Comments/ mitigation:
R3a and R3b are not alternatives: they can both be applied (R3b to heritage assets, R3a to other buildings).
R3a is clearly good from a sustainability perspective. R3b is positive where the retrofit measure would not impinge on the character of the heritage asset.

DH7. Motor vehicle parking design standard

The options considered are:

DH7a. Seek car free residential development across the city, subject to criteria to ensure accessibility to public transport and local shops, and low car in locations not suitable for car free. Car free would mean no spaces allocated to a house, but parking would be available to meet disabled and operational needs, for car clubs and potentially for those who can demonstrate a need for a personal vehicle for work that needs to be parked near home (potentially in a designated area within the site) (work vans, health visitors for example). Consideration will be given in the policy to setting a threshold for different levels of car free, because the larger strategic sites (over 50 units) have more scope for successful carpooling and more space for essential vehicles. The policy will set design guidance to ensure the parking provision makes the most efficient use of land, is landscaped, and allows for car free street design. The approach to car free development would be assessed against whole plan viability as set out in Strategic Policy Option S4.

DH7b. Do not allow any additional parking on non-residential sites which are proposed for redevelopment. Seek a significant reduction where there is good accessibility to a range of facilities.

DH7c. Require all new development to be car free across the city.

DH7d. Adopt low car but not car free parking standards. These could still vary by accessibility of the area of the city. These could be the same level of parking standards as for the rest of Oxfordshire, or potentially reduced from this but not car free, for example 1 car per 2 homes and additional parking for new non-residential developments.

This appraisal assumes that DH7c is the most restrictive as it applies to employment as well as residential parking; DH7a is next most restrictive; DH7b would be closest to the current situation; and DH7d would be less restrictive than the current situation.

SA Objective	DH7a	DH7b	DH7c	DH7d
1. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	0 This appraisal assumes that any space freed up by not having car parking would be used for housing or employment purposes			
2. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040	+ This option would significantly restrict car parking at new housing developments, giving a	0 This option would broadly maintain the current level of parking in Oxford	++ This option would significantly restrict car parking at employment sites as well as	- This option would continue to provide parking, supporting the

	strong impetus to walking, cycling and public transport, with reduced greenhouse gas emissions		housing sites, giving a strong impetus to walking, cycling and public transport.	use of the car and associated greenhouse gas emissions
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land	+ Providing less car parking space allows for more housing or landscaping / green infrastructure	0 This option would broadly maintain the status quo in terms of land use	++ Providing less car parking space allows for more housing, employment or landscaping / green infrastructure	- Car parking is an inefficient use of land
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	+/- Less car parking would allow more homes to be built. However car free homes may not be an option for everyone, e.g. carers	0 This option would broadly maintain housing numbers and types in Oxford	++/-- Less car parking would allow more homes and employment area to be built. However car free development may not be possible for many businesses, e.g. warehousing	0 This option would continue to provide homes for people who need cars, but would not have the benefits of increased space for non-parking uses
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**;	+/- This option would provide for more, cheaper homes because car parking would not need to be provided: this could help to reduce poverty and social exclusion. However it would not cater for e.g. shift workers, carers etc who are on low income but require a vehicle	0 This option would broadly maintain the status quo	++/-- As for DH7a, but would also restrict businesses that rely on vehicular access/parking, and which may provide jobs for unskilled people, e.g. warehousing	+/- This option maintains flexibility for people who need cars for work, but increases the average cost of housing and means that fewer homes can be built (or less green space provided) for an equivalent unit of land
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**	n/a			
7. To provide adequate green and blue infrastructure, **leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all	n/a			
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice,	+ Car free housing would significantly help to reduce	0 This option would broadly maintain current levels of traffic. Air quality is likely to	++ Car free housing and employment development would significantly help to	0 This option would broadly maintain current levels of traffic. Air quality is likely to

	shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry	traffic and associated air pollution	improve anyway with the greater incidence of electric vehicles.	reduce traffic and associated air pollution	improve anyway with the greater incidence of electric vehicles.
9.	To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources	? Depends on what the alternative to the parking provision would be. If more housing/development, then water resources could be negatively affected. If more green infrastructure, then water resources/quality could be positively affected			
10.	To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**	? Depends on what the alternative to the parking provision would be. If more housing/development, then there would be no significant impact on biodiversity. If more green infrastructure, then there would be an improvement in biodiversity.			
11.	To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	n/a			
12.	To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector	-? Car-free housing may not be attractive for many people, and could limit who moves to Oxford, with associated economic impacts	0 This option would broadly maintain the status quo	-- Making all new employment sites car-free could significantly limit the type of development that comes forward, and constrain Oxford's economic growth	0 This option would broadly maintain the status quo

Comments/ mitigation:
Any policy requiring development to be car free will need to be supported by a range of other measures, notably controlled parking zones
Making all development, including employment, car-free would have significant negative impacts, limiting the type of development that can come forward and possibly constraining Oxford's economic growth. Reducing car parking at new housing would have many environmental benefits, but would limit the attractiveness of the housing for many people. However Oxford lends itself well to car-free development, as a compact city with good quality public transportation.

C1. Focusing town centre uses in our district centres

C1a. Define the district centres as on the map above as areas that are highly accessible and include a broad range of facilities including shops, hospitality, community and leisure facilities. These include: City centre, Blackbird Leys, Cowley Centre, Cowley Road, Summertown, Headington. Identify the character of each area, strengths and weaknesses, and provide design guidance to ensure new developments enhance the character and attractiveness of these areas to encourage people to visit and linger and a sense of belonging. Allow new Use Class E uses in the district centres, including: Retail, cafes and restaurants; Leisure and entertainment and indoor sports uses (e.g. gyms, leisure centres); Health centres, GPs and clinics; Offices. Also allow: Community facilities (see options below), residential including student accommodation (where compliant with any policy on active frontages); Visitor attractions, Hotels, Flexible work-spaces, co-working spaces and live-work units.

C1b. Define local centres to include those on the map above, to ensure protection of facilities within 15 minutes' walk, which are: St Clement's, Walton Street and Little Clarendon Street, High Street east, Rose Hill, and Underhill Circus (not previously designated as a local centre). Allow new Use Class E uses in local centres, including: shops, cafes and restaurants; Leisure and entertainment and indoor sports uses (e.g. gyms, leisure centres); Health centres, GPs and clinics; Offices; Encourage flexible work-spaces, co-working spaces and live-work units. Do not allow student accommodation, hotels or visitor attractions (Sui Generis uses including cinemas, concert halls, dance halls).

C1c. Include a policy that sets out a sequential approach for locating new town centre uses based on: centres (city, district and local) first, then edge of centres and only out-of-centre locations where no alternative sites are available. Applicants would be required to demonstrate how they have applied the sequential approach if they are proposing town centre uses outside the centres, looking at edge of centre first. Include criteria that will be used to assess applications for town centre uses outside of the existing centres, including accessibility by public transport, that negative impacts on the road network can be mitigated, that there is no harm to adjoining land uses. Require an impact assessment for retail and leisure proposals outside of centres (currently required for those of 350m2 or more) demonstrating that there will be no adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the existing centres, and that there is good accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport.

C1d. Do not include a policy that sets a sequential approach requirement or criteria for town centre use proposals outside of centres.

SA Objective	C1a	C1b	C1c	C1d
1. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	n/a			

2. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040	+ Providing a wide range of facilities in district centres reduces the need for people to travel to multiple places, helping to reduce greenhouse gas emissions	+ Providing a good range of facilities in local centres reduces the need for people to travel to multiple places, helping to reduce greenhouse gas emissions	+ This option supports options C1a and C1b, using criteria related to accessibility.	0 No significant impact
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land	+ Providing a wide range of facilities in one area allows parking to be shared; and multiple occupiers to be co-located in one building.	+ Providing a good range of facilities in one area allows parking to be shared; and multiple occupiers to be co-located in one building.	+ This option supports options C1a and C1b by channelling new development towards district and local centres	0 No significant impacts – a missed opportunity
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	n/a			
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**;	0 Focusing town centre uses on district and local centres, and away from outside of centres, supports walking, cycling and public transport, which in turn can help to improve health and reduce social exclusion. The district and local centres include those in Oxford's more deprived communities. However this impact is likely to be limited.			
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**	++ This is the main purpose of this option. Supports the concept of 15 minute neighbourhoods.	++ This is the main purpose of this option. Supports the concept of 15 minute neighbourhoods.	+ This option indirectly supports the provision of accessible essential services and facilities	0 No significant impacts – a missed opportunity
7. To provide adequate green and blue infrastructure, **leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all	n/a			
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry	++ Providing a wide range of facilities in one area means that multiple journeys are not needed to access multiple facilities/services; and supports the provision of public transport	++ Providing a good range of facilities in areas that are easily accessible by walking and cycling helps to reduce the need to travel by car; and supports the provision of public transport	+ This option indirectly helps to reduce traffic and associated air pollution by steering town centre development towards locations that are easily accessible by walking, cycling and public transport	0 No significant impacts- a missed opportunity

9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources	n/a			
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**	n/a			
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	n/a			
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector	+ District centres provide focuses of business and economic growth	+? Local centres provide, in a more limited manner, focuses of business	+ The hierarchy of centres supports the vitality and viability of Oxford city centre and various district/local centres, indirectly supporting the economic growth of the city	0 No significant impact

Comments/ mitigation:

- Of the above options, only C1c and C1d are 'alternatives': there are no alternatives (e.g. other combinations of uses) for C1a and C1b.
- Options C1a, C1b and C1c are all positive from a sustainability perspective, and mutually complementary.
- Is another local centre needed in, or north of, Cutteslowe? The nearest district/local centre is Summertown, which is more than a mile away and involves crossing the A40
- Generally the options say little about 15 minute neighbourhoods, even though option S1 ('Directing new development to the right locations') refers to this as a key principle.

Northern edge area of focus

Area of focus and specific development sites (with HELAA number)	Contextual analysis	Key principles for all sites across the area	Sites within the area of focus for minimum housing numbers, key principles
Northern Edge of Oxford including: • OUP Sports Ground. HELAA #49 • Jordan Hill Business Park. HELAA #512 • Frideswide Farm. HELAA #107 • Oxford North (formerly Northern Gateway). HELAA #1 • Pear Tree Farm. HELAA #590	• Generally low-density suburban development and includes former independent rural settlements such as Wolvercote and Godstow • Some parts of the area are in the least deprived parts of the city, as such, housing affordability is a significant challenge. • Severance by some key routes and junctions • Poor air quality • Lack of connections with adjoining area outside city (in Cherwell District) • Cutteslowe park is an excellent community facility and open space • Five Mile Drive Sports Ground • Limited open space in west of the area- OUP private sports grounds • Jordan Hill Business Park is low density • Poor connectivity across ring road for cycling and walking	• Ensure connectivity by foot and cycle to sites adjoining the city • Connectivity of local facilities and services (that may be in Cherwell) and communities • Key characteristics to enhance, based on contextual analysis • Increase public access to green spaces • Potential to intensify Jordan Hill Business Park, with any expansion to be limited and part of a mixed-use scheme • Improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes, including safe crossing at desire lines across the major roads in the area • Protect the SSSI at Port Meadow • Green Belt edges • Wolvercote Neighbourhood Plan	• OUP Sports Ground (to have minimum number of housing units and significant amount of public open space and reprovision of sports pitch capacity) • Frideswide Farm (likely to have commenced, resolution to grant planning permission subject to S106.) • Oxford North • Pear Tree Park and Ride area • Pear Tree Farm to have a minimum number of housing units, public open space and compensatory improvements should be made to the surrounding areas of Green Belt in accordance with the *Identification of Opportunities to Enhance the Beneficial Use of Green Belt Land Report*.

SA Objective	The cumulative impact of developing the area as proposed
1. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	- Significant development is expected to take place on greenfield land in the area, increasing the risk of flooding and the possibility of a heat island effect
2. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040	-- The Northern Edge developments would be surrounded by roads and probably most easily accessible by car. New housing and employment development will require energy to construct and heat. Overall a significant negative impact.

3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land	- Depends to an extent on design and layout, but much of the development would be on greenfield land
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	+/- The area would provide significant quantities of new housing, but also employment land which would attract more employees to the city
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**;	0 North Oxford is the least deprived area of Oxford, although parts of Cutteslowe are in the upper half of the Index of Multiple Deprivation. Unless significant efforts were made to secure truly affordable housing in the new developments, development is unlikely to significantly reduce poverty or social exclusion.
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**	-- The nearest local/district centres are Summertown and Kidlington. Both are More than 1km from the proposed developments and involve crossing busy A roads.
7. To provide adequate green and blue infrastructure, **leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all	+ Much of the green space in the area is currently in private ownership. (Re-)development of the area provides an opportunity to increase public access to green spaces.
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry	-- The Northern Edge developments would be surrounded by roads and probably most easily accessible by car. Access by walking and cycling is hindered by the road/ car domination of the area. The impact of air pollution on the Oxford Meadow SAC is already significant.
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources	- Concerns about the local water regime, which affects Oxford Meadow SAC, being affected by new development
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**	-/-- Possible cumulative impacts (air quality, recreational pressure, water levels) on the Oxford Meadow SAC, also significant development on greenfield land in the area.
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	0 The area has limited 'local character', being dominated by roads and the railway line. Wolvercote is a conservation area.
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector	+ The proposed development includes significant employment.

Comments/mitigation:

- Concern re. water flow to Oxford Meadow SAC
- Significant concern re. air quality impacts of traffic on A34 and A40 re. Oxford Meadow SAC
- Is there scope to provide local services in the area, rather than just improving connectivity to existing services?

South area

Area of focus and specific development sites (with HELAA number)	Contextual analysis	Key principles across the area	Sites within the area of focus for minimum housing numbers, key principles
Cowley Branch Line, Littlemore and the Leys Area of Focus including: • Kassam Stadium and Ozone. HELAA #28a • Stadium overflow carpark #28b • Oxford Science Park. HELAA #588 • Oxford Business Park. HELAA #587 • Mini Plant Oxford. HELAA #497 • Sandy Lane Recreation Ground. HELAA #289 • Oxford Stadium. HELAA #111	• Major employment hubs • Area of high deprivation • Severance by some key routes and junctions • Poor air quality • Poor connectivity of this area to the rest of the city by public transport • Residential development is generally lower-density suburban typology • Poor cycling connectivity between Littlemore and Blackbird Leys • Very poor connectivity for cycling along Barns Road to Templar shopping centre • Poor connectivity across ring road for cycling and walking • Opportunities from community facilities like the Leys Pools, Kassam Stadium • Regeneration opportunities	• Ensure good connectivity by foot and cycle and public transport across the area • Consider the connectivity of the urban extension area to the rest of the city and some sites in the city to the rest of the city. • Seek a reduction in car parking across the area. • Ensure land is safeguarded for stations and access for the proposed CBL. • Key characteristics to enhance the existing built environment, based on contextual analysis • Increase public access to green spaces • Ensure good urban design and place making opportunities are taken for the new residential areas to be brought forward. • Improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes, including safe crossing at desire lines across the major roads in the area linking housing and employment areas • Increase opportunities to enhance existing tree cover which is the lowest canopy cover across the city. • Improve walking and cycling connectivity to proposed Cowley Branch Line stations	• Kassam Stadium and surrounding area including Knight's Road. This existing allocation to be split into two sites, to cover the stadium site and the overflow car park site. The minimum number of housing units will vary depending on whether the Kassam Stadium remains as a stadium. • Kassam surface level parking area residential allocation with minimum number of houses • Oxford Science Park has scope for intensification • Oxford Business Park protection of this key employment site • Sandy Lane Recreation Ground – residential scheme, minimum number of houses, reprovision of loss of sports facilities. • Mini plant/BMW protection of key employment site • Oxford Stadium – mixed use development leisure and recreation and residential enabling development.

SA Objective	The cumulative impact of developing the area as proposed
1. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	- Most of the development proposed would be on brownfield land, so would have limited additional impact on flooding, heat island effect etc. However the Kassam Stadium and part of the Oxford Science Park are prone to flooding.

2. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040	- Additional development in the area would generate greenhouse gases during construction and operation (including transport). The Cowley Branch Line will provide an attractive alternative to many of the transport movements, but overall the impact is still likely to be negative.
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land	++ The area is currently under-used, with large unused parking at Kassam Stadium; sporadic uses (Ozone, stadia); and the Oxford Science Park and Oxford Business Park not at capacity. The proposed development would provide more intensive and efficient use of this area.
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	+ Housing proposed for the stadia and Sandy Lane
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**;	++ This is Oxford's most deprived area, and development will help to provide employment, housing and facilities there.
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**	? The nearest district centres are Blackbird Leys (which is being redeveloped) and Cowley Centre. There is the potential to improve the services and facilities in the area.
7. To provide adequate green and blue infrastructure, **leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all	? There is a dearth of green space in the area, although more formal sports facilities are generally good. More publicly accessible green space could be provided as part of the development of the area.
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry	- The area is not particularly accessible by car, public transport or walking/cycling. Plans for the Cowley Branch Line and improved pedestrian/cycle routes would help to minimise vehicle movements per person. However given the projected increase in population, traffic in the area is still likely to increase.
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources	-? Littlemore Brook in particular could be affected cumulatively by development at Kassam Stadium, the Science Park and elsewhere in Littlemore. A greater population will require more water resources
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**	0 Most of the area is underused brownfield land with some biodiversity value. Redevelopment is unlikely to significantly affect this
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	0 Oxford Stadium is a conservation area. There are no other significant heritage constraints in the area. Redevelopment is unlikely to have a significant impact on design or the historic environment.
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector	++ The Oxford Science Park and the Oxford Business Park provide knowledge-based employment opportunities, and the Mini factor is a major employer in Oxford. Protecting and intensifying development on these sites will help to achieve economic growth.

Comments/mitigation:

- Will the redevelopment of the Blackbird Leys centre provide adequate services/facilities for the area, or are more required (and should they be clearly identified here)?
- Can more publicly accessible green space be provided as part of the redevelopment of the area: for instance could a walking/cycling route between Blackbird Leys and Littlemore be provided via the Oxford Science Park? Or alongside the future Cowley Branch Line?
- Flood-resistant development would be needed at Kassam and possible Oxford Science Park

East Oxford

Area of focus and specific development sites (with HELAA number)	Contextual analysis	Key principles across the area	Sites within the area of focus for minimum housing numbers, key principles
Marston Road, and Old Road Area of Focus including: • Government Buildings and Harcourt House. HELAA #24 • Land surrounding St Clement's Church. HELAA #117 • Headington Hill Hall and Clive Booth Student Village. HELAA #560 • Oxford Brookes University Marston Road Campus. HELAA #439 • Old Road Campus. HELAA #43 • Warneford Hospital. HELAA #63 • Churchill Hospital. HELAA #12 • Nuffield Orthopaedic Centre. HELAA #42 • Pullens Lane Residential. HELAA #440	• More open area with several parks and areas of public open space inc. some key views, particularly towards the historic core and across the Cherwell Meadow. • Range of uses inc. educational, residential, research and hospital. • Poor air quality as a result of traffic congestion. • Proximity to sensitive areas: River Cherwell, Marston SSSI, Lye Valley SSSI, heritage assets including Headington Hill Hall and St Clement's Church. • Poor cycling connectivity from Headington area.	• Ensure good connectivity by foot and cycle and public transport across the area and between hospital sites to provide/support a network of realistic alternatives for people other than using private car. • Seek to manage/reduce the levels of car parking on the hospital sites. • Maintain the frontage of St Clements Church and ensure setting is not compromised. • Ensure protection of New Marston SSSI and Lye Valley SSSI. • Seek opportunities to increase active frontages along the southern end of the Marston Road. • Maintain the rural character of Cuckoo Lane whilst taking opportunities to enhance its function as a walking and cycling route. • Ensure good urban design and place making. opportunities are taken for the redevelopment of Clive Booth Hall and Headington Hill Hall. • Ensure heights of new development do not impact on views into the city's historic core or on amenity of residents. • Ensure impacts upon the Conservation Areas are fully considered.	• Government Buildings and Harcourt House residential development with a minimum number of units, student accommodation and academic uses. • Land surrounding St Clement's Church – residential or student accommodation a minimum number required. • Headington Hill Hall and Clive Booth Student Village residential and student accommodation, academic and leisure uses – minimum housing numbers required. • Oxford Brookes University Marston Road Campus, minimum housing numbers required. • Old Road Campus – medical teaching and research facilities which maybe academic research and/or commercial research. • Warneford and Churchill and Nuffield Orthopaedic Centre medical and healthcare facilities with some residential development such as employer linked housing or extra care accommodation. • Pullens Lane residential development – minimum number.

SA Objective	The cumulative impact of developing the area as proposed
1. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	0 Most of the development proposed would be on brownfield land, so would have limited impact on flooding, heat island effect etc.

2. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040	- Much of the area is difficult to reach by car, and public transport in the area is good. Providing employer-linked housing to some of the sites could help to reduce the need to travel. However, the amount of development envisaged is likely to generate greenhouse gases both during construction and operation (including travel).
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land	+ Intensifying development on the sites would help to make efficient use of land.
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	+ The proposals are primarily for student accommodation. Although this does not 'ensure that everyone has the opportunity…', it would free up housing elsewhere in the city for non-student use; and some of the new housing would be non-student housing.
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**;	+? This is not an area of deprivation. The proposals seem to be particularly for students and hospital employees. The latter would help to support health in the city and more widely.
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**	+ The proposals would be for student accommodation and health care facilities, both of which are key to life in Oxford. The area lies near the district centres of Headington and Cowley Road, and the local centre of St. Clements
7. To provide adequate green and blue infrastructure, **leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all	0 Significant green and blue infrastructure is already available in the area: South Park, Headington Hill Park, sports grounds adjacent to the River Thames etc. New development should not cut off access to these.
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry	+ Much of the area is difficult to reach by car, and public transport in the area is good, although it is arguably impossible to make many trips to the hospitals by walking, cycling or public transport. Providing employer-linked housing to some of the sites could help to reduce the need to travel.
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources	-? The Lye Valley is very sensitive to changes in water quality / levels, which are possible with the proposed development
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**	- The proposals would encroach on land at St. Clements Church, and would intensify uses on brownfield land elsewhere, some of which will be biodiverse
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	- This area has many heritage assets, and Old Headington, Headington Hill and Headington Quarry are conservation areas. Unless done sensitively, development could negatively affect these assets.
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector	+ The proposals would support Oxford's education and health sectors, both major knowledge-based sectors of the economy.

Comments/mitigation:

- This area may be prone to HMOs, and especially to HMOs that might be turned into student accommodation in the future. This may require specific standards to be put in place to help maintain the character of the area.
- New development should not reduce access to green infrastructure in the area

- New development needs to reflect the character of the area, including its heritage assets, conservation areas etc.
- Much of the accommodation in the area could be car-free (student accommodation, employer-linked housing)

University areas

Area of focus and specific development sites (with HELAA number)	Contextual analysis	Key principles across the area	Sites within the area of focus for minimum housing numbers, key principles
University areas north of the city centre including: • Science Area and Keble Road Triangle. HELAA #62 • ROQ. HELAA #579 • Banbury Road University Sites. HELAA #6 • West Wellington Square. HELAA #65 • Oxford University Press – Cat 1 Employment sites. HELAA #523	• Dominated by institutional buildings of a wide range of styles, and ages including some RIBA award winning designs. • Many buildings with a large floorplate. • Some substantial Victorian dwellings mainly converted to academic use. • Interface with University Parks. • Lack of definition between public and private space. • Some routes are public but not obviously so, exacerbated by servicing features of the science buildings such as delivery areas, chemical storage tanks, vents and extractors. • There is little public use of the institutional buildings. • Small pockets of parking that affect the public realm. • Mature trees line key streets. • Includes and is in the setting of significant heritage assets (e.g. Central Conservation Area, Radcliffe Observatory, North Oxford Victorian Suburbs, Jericho and Walton Manor Conservation Areas and University Parks). • Many buildings individually of very high quality, although they don't always relate well to each other or their surroundings. • Jericho local centre on the edge of the area which provides a range of facilities retail, leisure and health facility (Jericho health centre).	• Public uses of some institutional uses, especially at ground floor would be beneficial, for example cafes, exhibition spaces. • Better integrating servicing needs into the built form or enhanced landscaping of them is important. • Impacts of heights on views, including from University Parks an important consideration- and roofscape, including the impacts of plant. • Improved demarcation of public routes through these areas, through design and wayfinding. • Tree planting and wayfinding away from the few key routes. • Creating a stronger building line along the streets.	• Science Area and Keble Road Triangle – residential development and academic institutional area and associated research with minimum number of homes to be delivered. No adverse impacts upon the Marston SSSI. • Radcliffe Observatory Quarter – academic institutional uses, student accommodation and residential development. Development should not result in adverse impacts on the Oxford Meadows SAC. • Banbury Road University Sites – academic institutional uses, student accommodation and/or residential development, enhance pedestrian and cycle links across the sites. • West Wellington Square – academic institutional uses, student accommodation, seek opportunities to deliver more residential units, a minimum number of homes to be delivered. • Oxford University Press – Cat 1 Employment site.

SA Objective	The cumulative impact of developing the area as proposed
1. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	0 No significant impact. River Cherwell is prone to flooding, but development would be on brownfield sites so limited concern.
2. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040	0 The area is already dominated by university-related activities with comparatively few car journeys generated. New buildings could be more energy-efficient.
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land	+ Would encourage public use of ground floor of some university buildings, and intensify use of the buildings
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	+? Development would provide some additional housing, mostly student housing. This would free up other housing elsewhere in the city.
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**;	0 This area is not deprived, and the type of development proposed would not change this, or reduce deprivation elsewhere
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**	0 The area is close to the city centre, and already well served by services and facilities.
7. To provide adequate green and blue infrastructure, **leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all	0 The proposals would not increase green or blue infrastructure, or leisure/recreational opportunities, but would also not decrease them. They would somewhat increase the pressure on existing infrastructure.
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry	0 The area is close to the city centre, has limited parking, and journeys are already typically by walking, cycling and public transport. This will be strengthened with the roll-out of bus gates, expansion of the zero emission zone etc. The proposals are for improved legibility for walkers and cyclists but this is likely to have limited impact.
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources	0 The area is bounded to the west by the Oxford Canal, and to the east by the River Cherwell. Proposed development is unlikely to significantly affect water quality. Additional people and employment will use more water, affecting water resources, but the impact is likely to be limited.
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**	-? The area is bounded to the west by Port Meadow (Oxford Meadow SAC, mostly favourable condition) and to the east by the New Marston Meadows SSSI (favourable condition). The development would involve an intensification of the area, with more recreational impact. However this is likely to be limited.
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	+ There are many heritage and architectural assets in the area. The proposals are for a more cohesive and intelligible area, with limited heights, better concealment/ integration of servicing, some additional trees, and a stronger building line.
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector	++ The proposals would support the growth of the University of Oxford and the knowledge economy

Comments/mitigation:

- Overall the proposals are very much for a continuation and slight intensification of existing uses, but bringing them better together visually
- Given how accessible the area is by walking, cycling and public transport, all new development could be car free

West End and Botley Road

Area of focus and specific development sites (with HELAA number)	Contextual analysis	Key principles across the area	Sites within the area of focus for minimum housing numbers, key principles
West End and Botley Road. • Oxpens. HELAA #76. • Osney Mead. HELAA #586 • Oxford Railway Station. HELAA #75 • Island Site. HELAA #70 • Worcester Street Car Park. HELAA #81 • Oxford Centre for Innovation. HELAA #448 • Botley Road Retail Park. HELAA #607 • Units 1 and 2, 135-137 Botley Road. HELAA #607	• Area contains a wide variety of buildings and uses including brownfield land, commercial premises. • Key area of public transport provision, both rail and bus and Seacourt Park & Ride along the Botley Road. • Some parts fall into areas of high flood risk and so unsuitable for residential development. • Poor air quality. • Traffic congestion. • Poor and congested access for cycling to the city centre and train station particularly between Osney Island and to the east of the train station. The retail park benefits from the cycle infrastructure on Botley Road and access to paths to the rear/landscaped connecting to Hinksey and Osney Mead. Once inside the retail park, it is a car dominated area and a difficult environment to navigate on both foot or bicycle.	• Create high-density urban living with good provision and access to public open space. • Maintain a vibrant mix of uses. • Refers to the West End SPD. • Contribute to the knowledge economy. • Enhance public realm opportunities particularly around the waterways. • Enhance accessibility and permeability of the area through good pedestrian and cycle links. • Support the redevelopment of Oxford railway station to create an easy and attractive transport interchange between rail, bus and active travel. • Reduce car parking to make more efficient use of land. • Careful consideration of heights of buildings, being mindful of views into and out of the historic core. • Careful consideration of the landscape setting of Oxford.	• Oxpens – minimum no of units for residential development plus employment land to be delivered on the site. • Osney Mead - employment led plus some residential. • Oxford Railway Station and Becket Street Car Park – mixed use scheme alongside transport hub. • Island Site, the land between Park End and Hythe Bridge Street mixed use scheme. • Worcester Street Carpark mixed use scheme. • Oxford Centre for Innovation – economic uses. • Botley Road Retail Park - economic uses.

SA Objective	The cumulative impact of developing the area as proposed
1. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	-- Much of the area is in flood zone 3. Future development is likely to be on brownfield sites, so is unlikely to exacerbate the flooding problem, but future development should be flood resilient.
2. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040	- The kind of development envisaged for the area would require more energy, making it more difficult to achieve the city's ambitions.

3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land	++ Much of the area could be used more efficiently, e.g. less parking, slightly taller buildings
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	+ Some additional housing planned for, but much of the proposed development is employment
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**;	n/a Not a particularly deprived area. Affordable housing should be provided in line with city-wide levels
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**	0 The area already has a good range of services and facilities
7. To provide adequate green and blue infrastructure, **leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all	0 The area has significant quantities of green and blue infrastructure, which has been protected from development by being in the floodplain. Future planned development would be on brownfield sites, so keeping the existing green and blue infrastructure.
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry	-- More development in the area would exacerbate the already-bad congestion and air pollution. The good public transport in the area means that future development could be car-free or low-car.
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources	0
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**	-? The area already has significant biodiversity, e.g. River Thames corridor, field system to South Hinksey. The Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme could negatively affect this, particularly near Botley Road. New development should be restricted to brownfield land.
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	0/+ The area has comparatively few heritage assets (though Osney Town/Island is a conservation area). Sensitive/cohesive redevelopment of the area could improve the local character
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector	++/- The proposed development would include a range of economic (R&D, high tech, knowledge economy) developments which would support the city's economic growth. Osney Mead is currently an industrial estate, and some of the existing businesses are likely to find it difficult to relocate in Oxford unless provision is made for them elsewhere.

Comments/ mitigation:

- Employment development should be required to be flood-resilient (e.g. with parking on the ground floor) should be required
- Given the good public transport in the area, should most or all new housing by car free?
- New development should only go on brownfield sites, not expand into the Green Belt / floodplain
- It could be possible to develop some of the parking areas along the Botley Road as employment or housing
- There may be scope for renewable energy installations (e.g. rooftop solar) and/or district heating for the area
- Consider options for relocating existing (non high tech) businesses which would need to leave the area under redevelopment plans

Annex A. SA framework used for options appraisal

SA Objective	Issues covered	SEA Themes
1. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	• Flooding • Building design and layout	Water, Climatic Factors
2. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040	• Building standards • Renewable energy • Active travel, public transport	Material assets, Climatic Factors, Soil, Air, Population
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land	• Building densities and layout • Greenfield land • Green Belt	Population, Material Assets
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	• Housing numbers • Housing size • Affordable housing • Energy efficiency • Minimum size requirements • Specialist accommodation, e.g. care homes, gypsies/travellers, homeless shelters • Student accommodation	Material Assets, Population
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**;	• Regeneration • Geographical spread of new development • Accessibility of areas of deprivation • Availability of green space in areas of deprivation • Availability of essential services/facilities in areas of deprivation	Population, Material Assets,
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**	• Thriving city/local centres (esp post Covid) • Community facilities • Health care / GP • Schools • Facilities for young people • Children's play areas • Shops etc.	Material Assets, Health
7. To provide adequate green and blue infrastructure, **leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all	• Green infrastructure (availability and location) • Blue infrastructure • Leisure facilities (availability and location)	Landscape, Human health

	• Playing fields and public open space (availability and location)	
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry	• Walking, cycling • Public transport, incl. train station and branch line • Commuting and housing/ jobs balance • Tourist buses • Electric vehicle charging points	Air, Climatic Factors,
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources	• Water use • Water quality • SuDS, buffers on streams etc.	Water
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**	• Habitat Regs Assessment, esp. air quality • SSSIs, Local Nature Reserves etc. • Biodiversity more generally (e.g. hedges, un-built up areas) • Biodiversity net gain	Biodiversity, Flora, Fauna
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	• Listed buildings • Archaeology • Setting/curtilage • Conservation areas • Good design, beauty • View cones • High buildings	Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Archaeology
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector	• Jobs • Knowledge-based jobs • Visitor economy • Locations for start-up ventures • Jobs for local unskilled residents, apprenticeships • Cultural provision	Population, Material Assets