1. This Statement is submitted on behalf of Milton Property Investments Ltd in response to the consultation of the draft Master Plan for the Oxpens, Oxford West End area.

2. My client, Milton Property Investments Ltd, is the majority landowner of the Oxford Business Centre, and is an important stakeholder in the delivery of the objectives and vision behind this Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

**Background**

3. The draft Master Plan has been prepared in compliance with the policies and objectives of the Oxford Core Strategy and the West End Area Action Plan.

4. Milton Property Investments Ltd has been involved in meetings, discussions and correspondence with lead Officers of the Council and has provided feedback on an informal basis to a number of the objectives set out in this Master Plan.

5. As such, Milton Property Investments Ltd is in a position as a landowner of most of the Oxford Business Centre to help the delivery of the relevant parts of the vision behind the Master Plan SPD.

**Response**

6. There are references in this consultation draft that should be clarified or changed, but most of our response relates to the Phasing and Delivery of the Master Plan vision, and confirming the viability of the proposed use for student accommodation at the Oxford Business Centre.

**Site Context – Chapter 3**

7. Reference is made to the forthcoming Oxford Station Master Plan SPD, where its area of influence is shown on the accompanying diagram (Figure 3.1) as crossing into the Oxford Business Centre and therefore also crossing into the Oxpens Master Plan SPD area. The reference to the Oxford Station SPD should not include reference to a line on Figure 3.1 as this could be confusing and raise concern over conflict between the vision behind two Master Plan documents seeking to fulfil different objectives.

8. If the Oxford Station SPD were to include my client’s land to meet a different objective this will not meet my client’s own objectives and would therefore not be deliverable.

9. It is suggested that the green line on Figure 3.1 is removed and the Council should ensure that there would be no conflict between the master planning exercises for both SPDs involving my client’s land.

**Site Features – Figure 3.7**

10. With reference to my client’s land the diagram is annotated for the site to come forward in the “later stages of development”. This reference conflicts with comments made further in the document under the Phasing and Delivery chapter.

11. It is suggested that the reference to the Oxford Business Centre coming forward at later stages of development should be removed. Or, it is made clear that the land within the control of
my client could come forward sooner, whereas the remainder of the site with a mix of landowners could come forward “at later stages of development”.

**Policy DP12 – Phasing**

12. Paragraph 5.57 describes how my client’s land could be developed in separate phases to, or alongside, the main development of the wider site. We agree with this. If the design of the buildings and their layout are set by the Master Plan document there is no need for its development to be held back to wait for the core or central area of the site (the BR Land) to be developed first. The front elevations of the buildings on my client’s site would be designed to have regard to the implementation of the wider vision, and how these buildings would relate to the wider area and have future access to it. The rear elevations of these blocks would be designed to have regard to the need to provide acoustic and visual barrier as well as provide a well designed facade.

**Possible Land Uses – Figure 6.2**

13. The document should delete references to office and research & development on the Oxford Business Centre site as these would not be viable. These uses would not be brought forward for development.

**Illustrative Master Plan – Figure 6.3**

14. It is suggested that the illustrative Master Plan diagram should show access and delivery areas to the rear of the blocks.

**Phasing and Delivery – Chapter 7**

15. In consideration of phasing the development of the Oxpens area, my client’s site could be phased to come forward independently of or alongside the development of the Osney Lane frontage/part of the wider site.

**Developer Contributions – Chapter 7**

16. The Draft Charging Schedule (for CIL) as set out in the Master Plan document proposes to charge £100 per sq m of student accommodation floor space. Based upon the floor space guide as set out in the Master Plan of 10,600 sq m for student accommodation, the developer contributions would be £1,060,000. This amount added to construction costs, fees and any other S106 contributions would be excessive, and would contest the viability of developing the site and could limit the implementation of the vision.

17. It is suggested that it should be made clear in the Master Plan document or any future Development Brief for parts of the wider site within the Master Plan area what will be the Council's charging schedule for a site coming forward. This figure should be fixed as a ceiling figure for a period to enable developers to assess the costs and risks against building out their schemes.

18. Alongside the reference to Grant Funding it is suggested that the Master Plan document should provide details of the infrastructure costs involved and how and when the infrastructure is to be provided.

**Conclusion**

19. Milton Property Investments Ltd is supportive of the Council's objectives and vision for the Oxpens area and is impressed with the quality of the Master Plan, subject to clarification and changes to some of the detail behind the Master Plan vision.
20. The proposed use of the Oxford Business Centre for 5 storey blocks of student accommodation (and other residential accommodation), is the only viable land use for the site. This development would be welcomed and supported by Milton Property Investments Ltd.
COMMENTS ON THE OXPENS MASTERPLAN CONSULTATION DRAFT (JULY 2013) ON BEHALF OF BRITISH RAIL BODY (RESIDUARY)

BRBR is pleased to see that the Masterplan sets out to achieve a high quality mixed use development but is not overly prescriptive. It is helpful to have indications and guidance on the features expected to deliver a successful development but also to find the opportunity for design flair and innovation via the application process.

The main concern of BRBR arises from the expectation of considerable and costly infrastructure and mitigation works and the lack of explanation in the Masterplan as to how these will be delivered, funded and the costs shared across the site-wide beneficiaries.

Section 7 make reference to CIL but there is no clear indication that the infrastructure will be incorporated into the CIL Schedule of Works and the document would benefit from greater clarity and certainty on this. There are a considerable amount of costly flood mitigation and landscaping works expected to take place before any development is occupied which raises a key question of how this is to be funded and by whom given the need for major expenditure in advance of any income from development.

Oxpens is expected to provide significant public benefit in the form of new and improved highways, pedestrian and cycle routes, public parks as well as acting as the catalyst for high quality development in the rest of the West End. It is reasonable to expect, therefore, that the infrastructure works will form part of the CIL Schedule of Works and be funded in whole or part by that route. It is highly unlikely that development of the site will be able to fund the comprehensive set of infrastructure set out in the Masterplan, to fund this in advance of occupied development and also to pay CIL contributions from which the site will not benefit.

Delivery is a key aspiration of the Masterplan and the Council – to achieve a comprehensive and integrated development, albeit implemented in phases. The financial side of delivery, therefore, justifies some further consideration in the document. We understand that viability advice was taken during the production of the Masterplan and believe that this should be on greater display in supporting the phasing and infrastructure expectations.

In more detail;

Flood Mitigation - At 3.45/3.47 it appears to be the case that the extent of flooding and any need for mitigation is currently uncertain. However, the Masterplan makes quite definitive assumptions about the need for mitigation and these have a particular and widespread effect on the Development Framework Plan and the Illustrative Masterplan. There are also serious consequential impacts on the need for costly infrastructure and phasing of the overall development.

If uncertainty exists and further studies are needed to establish the extent of flooding, it would be helpful to make clear in the Masterplan that the ultimate Framework may evolve differently if mitigation measures are not needed or required in a different form.
BRBR would also like to see the Masterplan consider alternative ways of maximising the site’s development potential whilst also managing any flooding risk. For example, the introduction of useable water bodies such as a marina which could add value to the site in terms of developable area whilst also providing an attractive focal point for the City Centre and delivering the public space and benefits expected of the Masterplan.

We understand that the Masterplan process did not consider the option of a marina. However, it has been suggested as a viable and productive approach by some of the developers interested in the acquisition and development of the BRBR land and, thus, must be considered a realistic option. Whilst the Masterplan cannot consider all options for the site, the evolution of ways in which flooding can be creatively managed whilst also maximising site value and public benefits should be borne in mind. It would be positive and aid aspirational thinking if the Masterplan could make clear that flooding need not be a constraint and that the City Council is open to solutions to the site’s development which consider creative options which might be outside the strict assumptions in the Framework Plan.

At para 5.44 in DP8 it is stated that the flood mitigation scheme needs to be delivered prior to the development of built form in order to ensure protection is in place. This seems, however, an unnecessarily restrictive approach given that only parts of the site are at risk of flooding, that many of the uses are not considered “vulnerable” by the Environment Agency and there is no risk from simply building as opposed to occupation. It is important that the Masterplan recognises that development will be needed to fund the flood mitigation works and that the role of the document should be to facilitate a phasing and form of development which generates enough value in the early stages to fund the flood mitigation works for the following phases.

It is possible that development and mitigation works can proceed in parallel but it is most unlikely that funding for the mitigation will be found before any commitment to value generation from the release of built and occupiable development.

Throughout the document it should be stated that development of vulnerable uses in the areas liable to flooding may first need the mitigation works in place before occupation but, on all other parts of the site, development can proceed. Without this, important routes through to open up the site in the north will be unnecessarily held back.

This will also require amendments to paras 7.11, 7.17 and the Phasing column at 7.47.

Possible Land Uses - Para 6.12 suggests that Fig 6.2 sets the location of land uses; ie where they “should” be sited. This is not one of the key diagrams in the Masterplan (para 6.2) and should not be used in this inflexible way. It would be preferable to use the word “could.”

There is conflict between paras 6.18 and 6.19 with reference to the status or priority of R&D. There is also no reference to R&D on the site in the WEAAP so it would be inappropriate to apply any status.

At para 6.128 there is the statement that the Oxpens site “must” provide accommodation for specific new business opportunities and this has no backing in other higher tier policy. It would be preferable to indicate that such uses may be encouraged but the Masterplan cannot reasonably insist that they all be provided.
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Planning Policy
Oxford City Council
St Aldate’s Chambers
109 St Aldate’s
Oxford
OX1 1DS

Dear Sir/Madam

Oxpens Master Plan Supplementary Planning Document – Consultation Draft (May 2013)
Submission of representations on behalf of Westgate Oxford Alliance

Westgate Oxford Alliance (WOA) is progressing pre-application discussions with officers at Oxford City Council (OCC) and Oxfordshire County Council for the refurbishment and part redevelopment of the Westgate Centre and redevelopment of adjacent land within Oxford City Centre. The representations to the draft SPD are provided within this context.

The representation relate to four areas: connection between the city centre and public realm, proposed retail offer, public square, temporary car parking and miscellaneous comments regarding drafting.

Connectivity and public realm

WOA fully supports the Master Plan’s vision regarding integration:

The Oxpens site should be developed in a comprehensive manner to deliver maximum benefit and a fully integrated scheme that properly responds to its surroundings, enhancing connections to the wider Oxford West End.

The comprehensive masterplanning of Oxpens seeks to improve connections through the whole site, enabling better public access. This is welcomed by WOA.

As acknowledged in the draft Master Plan (paragraph 3.6) the proposed Westgate development will extend the city centre towards Oxpens and the existing pedestrian connections are not as strong as they could be. WOA is keen to ensure that there are strong connections with the wider West End and city centre (and the rail station) and seeks to work together with OCC and the County Council to ensure that this is delivered in a comprehensive manner.

WOA concurs with the Master plan that the public realm at Oxpens Road needs to be improved, however any landscape/public realm strategy, such as introduction of a tree boulevard, needs to take account of the vehicular and operational requirements on this main arterial route described as “a major city thoroughfare” at paragraph 6.85.

Similarly although there is a need to improve pedestrian crossing points at Oxpens Road these need to provide safe crossing points that do not adversely compromise traffic movements. We understand that the number and location of crossing points will be further reviewed with both the City Council and County
Council at the detailed design stage and will inevitably continue to be discussed as part of WOA’s pre and post-application discussions.

Paragraph 6.93 refers to a common palette of streetscape materials, street furniture and lighting that should be used for development schemes in the West End. The principle of this general approach is supported by WOA however there does need to be sufficient flexibility within the palette to ensure that different character areas and unique designs can be progressed throughout the major development areas identified in the West End.

**Proposed retail offer**

Paragraph 6.29 supports “a mixture of A1-A5 land uses …. in the ground floor of the mixed use buildings that front Oxpens Road and Oxpens Public Square.” Given the projected growth of Oxpens to accommodate 300 new households plus student accommodation, WOA supports the need for complementary retail uses that will serve local needs.

Paragraph 6.30 acknowledges that the site is outside of the retail core and that retail floorspace needs to be restricted to smaller units. In order to protect the existing retail core we consider that this statement should be qualified further by clarifying that no retail unit should be above a certain size and that units cannot be amalgamated to create larger units.

**Public square**

Although the current location of the public square directly faces the College WOA does not consider that it maximises potential linkages and opportunities with the city centre. We understand that the retention of the existing ice rink is the main reason for this location.

Due to land ownership constraints the Master Plan will be delivered in phases WOA therefore supports sufficient flexibility being provided in the Master Plan so that the square’s location can be reviewed and potentially located further eastwards should the ice rink move in the medium-long term.

**Temporary car parking**

Paragraphs 6.51, 7.4 and 7.29 and Appendix C refer to the potential to accommodate a temporary car park on the Oxpens site. WOA fully supports the opportunity to accommodate temporary car parking spaces on this site during the construction phase of the Westgate development only. Such a use would not comprise the proposed phasing of the Master Plan development and would provide a temporary facility for shoppers and visitors in a location that remains close to the city centre.

**Miscellaneous comments**

1. The overall SPD is a Master Plan for Oxpens and Chapter 6 is entitled ‘Oxpens Master Plan’ to reduce confusion consideration should be given to retitling Chapter 6.
2. Figure 3.1 – the boundary for the Westgate site should either reflect the AAP’s boundaries or WOA’s red line boundary which can be provided upon request.
3. Figure 6.8 needs to also ensure that there will be sufficient allowance for buses and coaches.
4. Appendix A, including the Planning Policy Diagram, needs to refer to saved policies of the adopted Local Plan and the Sites and Housing Development Plan Document.
5. Appendix D, paragraph 1.5 – the landowner of the Westgate Centre and adjacent land is ‘Westgate Oxford Alliance’.

We look forward to confirmation that these representations have been received and would welcome the opportunity to discuss our comments with you further.

Yours faithfully
26th July 2013

Dear Sir / Madam

ROYAL MAIL GROUP REPRESENTATIONS:
OXPENS MASTERPLAN SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) CONSULTATION DRAFT (MAY 2013)

We are instructed by Royal Mail Group Ltd (Royal Mail) to submit representations to the Oxpens Masterplan, Supplementary Planning Document (May 2013).

Background

Royal Mail, formerly Consignia plc, is the successor to the former statutory corporation, The Post Office. Although its management operates independently, Royal Mail is wholly owned by the Government through the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills. Its services are regulated by Ofcom. Its letters business, Royal Mail, is the operator of universal postal functions through the Royal Mail letterpost delivery and collections services, handling letters, postal packets and high value (registered) packets. Royal Mail Group also operates Parcelforce Worldwide, which is a parcels carrier. Post Office Limited (a “sister” company to Royal Mail) operates the national network of post offices and sub post offices.

The United Kingdom letter post business has been fully liberalised since the Postal Services Act 2000 and Royal Mail now operates in a highly competitive market place. As such, it effectively operates like any other business and is continually seeking to find ways to improve the efficiency of its business (e.g. increased automation) and respond to the changes in communications technology (e.g. email and internet). Put simply, the nature of the mail industry has, and continues to change and Royal Mail’s real estate needs to respond accordingly.

Royal Mail Properties

Royal Mail has a statutory duty to provide an efficient mail sorting and delivery service for Oxford Council’s administrative area. Royal Mail’s collection and delivery service for the Borough is provided from the following properties:

- Oxford Delivery Office and King’s Mead House, Oxford, OX1 1XX (894);
- Oxford East Delivery Office, Units 14-18 Oxford, OX4 6HA (925); and
- Oxford South Yard PAR, Becket Street, Oxford, OX1 1PP (3158).
The Oxpens Road site comprises the Oxford Delivery Office and King’s Mead House which is owned on a freehold basis. King’s Mead House contains some of Royal Mail’s administrative functions including Royal Mail’s Commercial MarketReach Door-to-Door (D2D) business unit centre and other space let to external tenants. Royal Mail also lease an additional area of surface car parking. Both of these areas lie within the Oxpens Masterplan area and therefore the Council’s masterplan proposals for the area are of particular interest to Royal Mail.

The two other properties are in leasehold ownership and outside the Oxpens Masterplan area. These representations therefore only relate to the Oxford Delivery Office (894).

Policy Considerations

Our representations set out in this letter accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) which “provides a presumption in favour of sustainable development” from which we consider the following to be of particular relevance:

- That plan-making should “positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area...with sufficient flexibility to adapt [to] rapid change, unless:
  - Any adverse impact of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits” (paragraph 14);
- That planning should “encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system. To help achieve economic growth, local planning authorities should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century” (paragraphs 19-20);
- That planning policy should “support existing business sectors, taking account of whether they are expanding or contracting...policies should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances” (paragraph 21); and
- “Plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of goods or people. Therefore, developments should be located and designed where practical to accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and supplies” (paragraph 35).

Representations

The draft Oxpens Masterplan proposes that the Royal Mail site is redeveloped as part of a comprehensive mixed use development. The Masterplan recognises the potential of the site to make an important contribution to the redevelopment of the area, having a frontage to both Oxpens Road and Osney Lane. As such, the Masterplan identifies the potential for this site to be a ‘key corner and gateway requiring built form emphasis’ (Figure 6.1).

In terms of possible land uses, the draft Masterplan (Figure 6.2) identifies that the Royal Mail site could include a mix of uses including retail (A1-A5) on the frontage, with the majority of the site developed for education (D1), hotel (C1), and business (B1) uses.

Whilst Royal Mail have no objection to the inclusion of their freehold site within the Masterplan area, it should be noted that redevelopment can only come forward once the existing Royal Mail operations have been relocated / re-provided. It is essential that this relocation / reprovision takes place prior to the site’s redevelopment to ensure that Royal Mail can continue to comply with its statutory duty to maintain a ‘universal service’ for the UK pursuant to the Postal Services Act 2000.

As such, Royal Mail wishes to make the following comments in relation to the draft Masterplan.
Draft Paragraph 1.4

Draft Paragraph 1.4 correctly states that the site is in multiple ownerships and that ongoing uses include the Royal Mail Delivery Office. However, for accuracy, it is suggested that the wording of Paragraph 1.4 is amended as follows:

“The site is currently in multiple-ownership: Oxford City Council, British Rail Board (Residuary) (BRBR), and the Milton Property Investments Ltd (the key landowner at the Oxford Business Centre), and Royal Mail each own part of the site, and there are ongoing uses including the Royal Mail Delivery Office and administrative functions, sorting office, Oxford Ice Rink, a coach park, a petrol filing station, sheltered housing and a range of local businesses. The masterplanning work contained within this SPD has taken account of these factors”

This would be in line with Paragraph 3.14 and Figure 3.2 of the draft Masterplan.

Draft Paragraph 3.26

Paragraphs 3.26 and 3.27 refer specifically to the Royal Mail site. Royal Mail have no objection to the description of the Royal Mail site although suggest that for accuracy, the operation is referred to as a ‘delivery office and administrative offices’, rather than a ‘sorting office’.

DP12 and Draft Paragraphs 5.56 – 5.58

This section refers to the phasing of the masterplan. Royal Mail support the recognition that the site should be redeveloped in phases, although suggest that the need to relocate / re-provide the Delivery Office and administrative functions to another suitable site(s) in Oxford is explicitly stated in this section of the Masterplan. Failure to satisfactorily relocate / re-provide the Delivery Office and administrative functions could result in a delay in the delivery of the masterplan. As such, it is suggested that the following amendment is made to Paragraph 5.57:

“The SPD Master Plan as presented in Chapter 6 presents a comprehensive development proposal for the site. The Master Plan illustrations show the site in fully developed form, but the arrangement of blocks, streets and spaces has been carefully considered to ensure that the Ice Rink, and Oxford Business Centre and Royal Mail sites could be delivered as separate phases, with current uses retained in the interim. The Oxford Business Centre site could be delivered alongside the core development area, but the master plan retains flexibility”.

Draft Paragraph 6.14

Whilst it is not in Royal Mail’s interest to question policies relating to residential uses, it is noted that draft Paragraph 6.14 states that any residential development should provide 50% affordable housing in line with the Oxford West End AAP Affordable Housing policy (WE16). The Oxford West End AAP was adopted in 2008 and it is important for the future viability of the Oxpens Masterplan that the level of affordable housing can be tested based on an up-to-date viability appraisal. As such, it is suggested that draft Paragraph 6.14 is amended as follows:

“In line with the Oxford West End AAP Affordable Housing policy (WE16) the Council will seek 50% of the residential development as should be affordable housing (comprising 80% social rented and 20% shared ownership). Any planning application that is unable to provide this level of affordable housing will need to justify a lower affordable housing contribution through a viability appraisal”.
Draft Paragraph 6.21

Draft Paragraph 6.21 suggests that the Council will seek to protect employment sites and what it notes that the land within the Oxpens Masterplan area are not ‘key protected employment sites’, the Council will seek to ensure that there is no net loss of employment space at Oxpens. Royal Mail have no objection to this in principle, although it is important for the Masterplan to be viable and as such, the Council may need to accept a degree of flexibility in the application of this policy. Many uses, including education, retail, and hotel introduce employment to an area and therefore it is important that the policy does not seek to constrain the redevelopment of the site by the need to re-provide the same level of employment floorspace.

As such, it is suggested that the following amendment is made to Paragraph 6.21:

“...The Master Plan proposes redevelopment of these existing plots. Proposed new uses include new employment floorspace, retail, hotel and education uses, ensuring continued presence of employment activity. Although the existing employment space may be replaced in a different location, the objective is to have no net loss of employment space at Oxpens, some of which could be provided by non-B uses....”

Section 7: Phasing & Delivery

Royal Mail supports the phased approach to delivery of the Masterplan. This will be crucial to ensure that some existing operations (such as the Royal Mail Delivery Office and administrative offices) can continue during the early stages of delivery.

However, Royal Mail object to the wording of this Section as it fails to fully recognise the essential need to relocate/ re-provide Royal Mail’s Delivery Office and administrative functions prior to the development of that phase. Royal Mail have a statutory duty to maintain a universal postal service across the UK and cannot allow a Delivery Office to be demolished until a new facility has been delivered to replace it.

The Masterplan envisages the redevelopment of the Royal Mail site in Phase 2a (i.e. from 2016 onwards). Whilst it may be possible to relocate / re-provide the Delivery Office and administrative offices within this timescale, it is important to recognise the specialist nature of the infrastructure and importance of finding a site (or sites) that meets Royal Mail’s current and future operational needs in the postcode catchment.

The cost associated with the relocation / reprovision of a Delivery Office is significant due to the machinery within it. Any redevelopment of the site will need to fully fund the relocation / reprovision of the Delivery Office and administrative offices and Royal Mail would be keen to work with the Council to ensure the relocation is undertaken efficiently and fully covers the cost of the relocation.

As such, it is suggested that the following change is made to Paragraph 7.24:

“Phase 2a comprises the development of plots in the north east corner of the Oxpens site, adjacent to Oxpens Road and Oxney Lane. Plots fronting the street and at the corner of Oxpens Road / Oxney Lane are key development opportunities with high visibility and high standard of design is required to provide high quality architectural frontage to the public realm.

*Redevelopment of the Royal Mail site will be wholly dependent on the relocation / reprovision of the Delivery Office and administrative offices which will need to be fully funded by the Masterplan development. Royal Mail and the Council will need to work together to ensure the early relocation / reprovision of these facilities*. 
Royal Mail will continue to closely monitor plans for the masterplan redevelopment of the Oxpens area and look forward to working closely with the Council to discuss potential alternative sites for the relocation / reprovision of the Delivery Office and administrative offices.

Royal Mail reserves the right to amend or supplement these representations at a later date if necessary.

I trust that these representations are acceptable and would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt and keep me informed of future stages of the Masterplan preparation. In the meantime, we will be in touch with the Council to discuss the need to identify a suitable alternative location for the Delivery Office and administrative offices to ensure that the delivery programme is not affected by the need for Royal Mail’s facilities to remain in place until a new facility is operational.

Yours faithfully,
Planning Policy
City Development
Oxford City Council
109-113 St. Aldate's Chambers
Oxford
OX1 1DS
29 July 2013  BY EMAIL & POST

Dear Sirs

Oxpens Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

We are writing on the behalf of Christ Church to respond to the City Council's consultation on the draft Oxpens Masterplan SPD.

As you know Christ Church has a number of strategic freehold interests in properties identified as development opportunities in the West End area, and further to the west of the City Centre.

We have reviewed the Oxpens Masterplan SPD on Christ Church's behalf. We note that the widening of the existing Becket Street and its extension into the masterplan site (with the relocation of on-street car parking) is proposed as part of the masterplan. This would provide an additional entrance to the Oxpens site.

Christ Church would support proposals for widening and extending Becket Street that are properly integrated into the emerging designs for Frideswide Square and the station area. This would be potentially beneficial to both the Oxpens and Station/Frideswide Square areas.

We have no further comments to make on the Oxpens Masterplan SPD at this stage, but would ask that you keep us informed of the progress of the document.

Please contact James Wickham or Alex Gillington if you have any queries regarding the content of this letter.

Yours faithfully