

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Council

22 July 2019

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title
4.	Pages 1 – 2	Petitions and Requests to Address the Meeting List of requests to address the meeting
8.	Pages 3 - 6	Questions Written questions with responses
9.	Pages 7 - 10	Motions Proposed amendments to motions

If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Natasha Clark, Democratic and Elections natasha.clark@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk, 01295 221589

This page is intentionally left blank

Council

Monday 22 July 2019

Agenda Item 4, Petitions and Requests to Address the Meeting

There have been 4 requests to address Council as set out below.

Agenda Item 9: Motion on Climate Change

- Robert Nixon, Bicester Town Council

Agenda Item 9: Agenda on Local Plan

- Graham Thompson, Chairman of Yarnton Parish Council
- Pam Roberts, representing CPRE Oxfordshire
- Giles Lewis, Chair of Cherwell Development Watch and Chair of Begbroke & Yarnton Green Belt Campaign

The Chairman will call the speakers to the front of the Chamber to address Council in the order they registered to speak prior to the motions being presented to Council by the proposers.

The speakers will each be able to speak for a maximum of 5 minutes and will return to the public gallery after their address. There is no question and answer of speakers.

This page is intentionally left blank

Council

Monday 22 July 2019

Agenda Item 8 (a), Written Questions

Question From: Councillor Mark Cherry

Question To: Leader of the Council, Councillor Barry Wood

Topic: Parking Enforcement

Question

Currently, our district's parking enforcements are carried out by Thames Valley Police at some expense to the council. Using our newly created partnership with Oxfordshire County Council, is the leader going to push for decriminalisation of parking across the district and the county as advised by the former Thames Valley Chief Constable?

Response

Currently this Council, in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council, South Oxfordshire District Council and Vale of White Horse, is exploring the possibility of introducing Civil Parking Enforcement.

The partnership is commissioning a feasibility study to fully explore all the implications and costs associated with introducing and operating Civil Parking Enforcement. The study will also outline the likely timelines for implementation, should the Council decide to proceed. A partnership meeting is happening tomorrow to commence the feasibility study and agree timescales for the study to be completed.

Once the study is completed, Members will receive a report with recommendations on whether to proceed with Civil Parking Enforcement.

In the meantime, this Council has agreed with Thames Valley Police to continue funding parking enforcement activities while Civil Parking Enforcement is explored.

Question From: Councillor Hugo Brown

Question To: Leader of the Council, Councillor Barry Wood

Topic: Local Plan

Question

On 29th May, the Joint Planning Inspectors examining the Oxford Local Plan 2036 published their "Initial Questions and Comments". These suggest that Oxford is over-stating its need for houses (1,400 dpa vs 1,004 dpa as found by the Inspectors citing GL Hearn, 2018) and simultaneously under-stating its own capacity to accommodate them (8,620 to 2036 vs 10,000 to 2031 as found by the Oxon Housing and Growth Deal). The Joint Inspectors clearly have significant concerns about the "soundness" of Oxford's Local Plan especially as it is based on the 2014 SHMA figures which they themselves state "are now quite a few years old". They further make the point that the over-statement of housing need and the under-statement of the City's own ability to accommodate it "could have a bearing on the level of unmet need which would have to be accommodated by neighbouring local authorities". In light of these observations, should CDC not, at the very least, halt the Partial Review process until Oxford City's Local Plan has been adopted and in addition revisit the housing numbers for CDC as contained in Local Plan Part 1?

Response

Officers have seen the questions put to the City Council and the Local Plan Inspector is aware of them. The Oxford Local Plan is at a relatively early stage in its Examination. The City Council has recently submitted its response further explaining its position

(https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20286/local_plan_examination/1312/oxford_local_plan_2016-2036_examination). Public hearings need to be held and it is likely to be some significant time before the outcome is known.

It will not be until Cherwell District Council Members have considered the Partial Review's Examination Report that the Plan's formal adoption would be considered. Nonetheless, it would not be helpful if the Partial Review process was delayed further while Oxford Local Plan is completed. This could lead to significant uncertainty and unplanned, speculative development proposals.

Furthermore, the implications of the completed Oxford Local Plan would subsequently need to be considered cooperatively by all the Oxfordshire Councils. This could occur through the on-going preparation of the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 but will take time.

The Council continues to rely on its submitted evidence demonstrating the robustness of the Growth Board work, the agreed housing need assessment and how it was produced cooperatively by the Oxfordshire Councils. That work has been tested at local plan examinations and is considered to be compelling. The Examination Report for the Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part 2 which was published on 26 June supports this view. The Vale Inspector's observations include:

"...The examination of the Oxford City Local Plan has only recently commenced, but the OGB has overseen an objective, robust work programme to determine

both the quantum of this unmet need and its apportionment between the relevant districts...” (para. 25);

“The starting point for this work was the Oxfordshire SHMA and the Cundall report, a critical review of the housing potential of Oxford City. Together these enabled the OGB to agree a ‘working assumption’ that the housing needs of Oxford City which needed to be met in adjacent districts was 15,000 over the plan period. The Oxford Spatial Options Assessment, supported by a range of other evidence including a Green Belt study, was then undertaken to inform the apportionment of this figure between the districts. This work was necessarily high level and strategic in nature, only looking at large site options, but was only intended to provide district figures for subsequent local plans to take forward. The culmination of this work programme was agreement by the OGB in September 2016 as to how the 15,000 figure was to be apportioned...” (para. 26);

“Whilst criticised in representations, there is no relevant guidance in place and the process was both logical and comprehensive, considering an appropriate range of assessment criteria. The exercise was carried out jointly with full agreement between the Councils concerned and overseen by the OGB. There is no reason to depart from the conclusions of the OGB which provide a robust basis to prepare and adopt the LPP2 to provide additional housing land to meet the needs of Oxford as soon as possible as required by LPP1...” (para. 27);

“The figure of 2,200 dwellings [Vale’s apportionment] is therefore justified as the basis for meeting the housing needs of Oxford City in the LPP2. However, this figure has the status of a working assumption at this stage to be confirmed or adjusted through examination of the Oxford City Local Plan and then the preparation of the Oxfordshire Joint Spatial Strategy....” (para. 28);

These conclusions of the Vale Inspector were reached notwithstanding the fact that the Oxford City Local Plan had been submitted and is being examined. The Cherwell Inspector’s Post-Hearing Advice Note was received on 13 July 2019. It is appended to the tabled information note and published on-line at <https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/info/83/local-plans/515/local-plan-part-1-partial-review---examination/11>.

The Inspector observes, “...there can be no reasonable justification for suspending the examination to allow the Oxford examination to be advanced to its final stages.”

The Inspector also observes, “All in all, like my colleagues who examined Local Plans in West Oxfordshire, and the Vale of White Horse, I find nothing problematic in the Plan’s reliance on the figures produced and agreed through the OGB [Oxfordshire Growth Board]. I consider that the 4,400 figure provides a sound basis for the Plan.”

The Inspector expresses concerns about one of the proposed allocations in the Partial Review (site PR10 – land south east of Woodstock) and has invited the Council to propose Main Modifications to address this. These modifications will be presented to the Council for consideration and approval before they are submitted to the Inspector.

It is considered that there is no justification for delaying the Partial Review pending the outcome of the Oxford City Local Plan examination.

This page is intentionally left blank



Council

Monday 22 July 2019

Agenda Item 9, Motions

Motion Proposer: Councillor Mark Cherry

Motion Seconder: Councillor Surinder Dhese

Topic: Climate Change

Motion

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in their October report stated that if the planet wants to avert dangerous climate breakdown, we need to cut emissions in half by 2030, and hit zero by the middle of the century.

Oxfordshire is already doing its bit: we are committed to reducing emissions from our own estate and activities by 3% a year. Unfortunately, our current plans are not enough. The IPCC's report suggests that the world has just a dozen years left to restrict global warming to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels. Should they increase by 2°C, humanity's capacity to prevent catastrophic food shortages, floods, droughts, extreme heat and poverty will be severely impaired. Limiting Global Warming to 1.5°C may still be possible, but only with ambitious action from national and sub-national authorities, civil society, the private sector, indigenous peoples and local communities. Furthermore, bold climate action can deliver economic benefits in terms of new jobs, economic savings and market opportunities.

Cherwell District Council calls on the Leader to:

1. Declare a 'Climate Emergency';
2. Pledge to make Cherwell District Council carbon neutral by 2030, taking into account both production and consumption emissions;
3. Call on Westminster to provide the powers and resources to make the 2030 target possible;
4. Continue to work with partners across the Cherwell and region to deliver this new goal through all relevant strategies;
5. Report to Council within six months with the actions the Council will take to address this emergency.

Proposed Amendment

Amendment Proposer: Councillor Andrew McHugh

Amendment Seconder: Councillor Dan Sames

Add the following after point “4” as “5” and the current “5” will become “6”,

“endorse the cross party position taken by the LGA, in particular to call on HMG to explore supporting domestic implementation of Sustainable Development Goals through funded partnership roles within each local authority area.”

Motion Proposer: Councillor Ian Middleton

Motion Seconder: Councillor Conrad Copeland

Topic: Local Plan

Motion

This council notes:

1. That when he approved the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031, the planning inspector stated that a review of the plan should be carried out ***“once the specific level of help required by the city of Oxford to meet its needs that cannot reasonably be met within its present confines, is fully and accurately defined”***
2. That questions and comments raised recently by Jonathan Bore and Nick Fagan, the inspectors reviewing the Oxford Local Plan 2036, along with other recent studies, have cast doubt on the assumptions underlying Oxford’s housing need, suggesting that it has not been ***“fully and accurately defined”*** and may have been over-estimated and based on outdated data.
3. That recent announcements from the University of Oxford as to their plans for development as part of the partial review raises concerns that removal of substantial amounts of the green belt will not in fact deal with unmet housing need in Oxford.
4. That as a result of the above, the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (Part1) Partial Review – Oxford’s Unmet Housing Need could be premature, based on potentially inaccurate information, and could lead to outcomes which differ significantly from expectations.

This council therefore agrees:

1. The ‘working assumption’ of Oxford’s housing need can no longer be relied on as an accurate figure and should be urgently reviewed.
2. That the planning inspector’s report into the Cherwell partial review should only be considered alongside the Oxford City local plan once it has been examined and published, and Oxford’s need is “fully and accurately defined”.
3. That in the meantime, the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (Part1) Partial Review should be suspended, and no land under consideration as part of the review should be removed from green belt protection.

4. That expansion of the Begbroke Science Park and the building of reserved housing for the university on green belt land has no bearing on Oxford's unmet housing need and should be subject to a separate and specific planning policy review and inquiry.

Proposed Amendment (set out as track changes to the submitted motion)

Amendment Proposer: Councillor Sean Woodcock

Amendment Seconder: Councillor Barry Richards

This council notes:

1. That when he approved the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031, the planning inspector stated that a review of the plan should be carried out ***“once the specific level of help required by the city of Oxford to meet its needs that cannot reasonably be met within its present confines, is fully and accurately defined”***
- ~~2. That questions and comments raised recently by Jonathan Bore and Nick Fagan, the inspectors reviewing the Oxford Local Plan 2036, along with other recent studies, have cast doubt on the assumptions underlying Oxford's housing need, suggesting that it has not been “fully and accurately defined” and may have been over-estimated and based on outdated data.~~
- ~~3.2.~~ That recent announcements from the University of Oxford as to their plans for development as part of the partial review raises concerns that removal of substantial amounts of the green belt will not in fact deal with unmet housing need in Oxford.
- ~~4.3.~~ That as a result of the above, the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (Part1) Partial Review – Oxford's Unmet Housing Need ~~could be premature, based on potentially inaccurate information, and~~ could lead to outcomes which differ significantly from expectations.

This council therefore agrees:

- ~~1. The ‘working assumption’ of Oxford's housing need can no longer be relied on as an accurate figure and should be urgently reviewed.~~
- ~~2. That the planning inspector's report into the Cherwell partial review should only be considered alongside the Oxford City local plan once it has been examined and published, and Oxford's need is “fully and accurately defined”.~~
- ~~3.1.~~ That in line with the Inspector's most recent letter, the meantime, the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (Part1) Partial Review should be subject to an urgent review so that ~~suspended, and~~ no land under consideration as part of the review should be removed from green belt protection without consideration of all potential sites.
- ~~4.2.~~ That expansion of the Begbroke Science Park and the building of reserved housing for the university on green belt land has no bearing on Oxford's unmet housing need and should be subject to a separate and specific planning policy review and inquiry.

Councillor Woodcock's Proposed Amendment (track changes removed)

This council notes:

1. That when he approved the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031, the planning inspector stated that a review of the plan should be carried out ***“once the specific level of help required by the city of Oxford to meet its needs that cannot reasonably be met within its present confines, is fully and accurately defined”***
2. That recent announcements from the University of Oxford as to their plans for development as part of the partial review raises concerns that removal of substantial amounts of the green belt will not in fact deal with unmet housing need in Oxford.
3. That as a result of the above, the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (Part1) Partial Review – Oxford's Unmet Housing Need could lead to outcomes which differ significantly from expectations.

This council therefore agrees:

1. That in line with the Inspector's most recent letter, the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (Part1) Partial Review should be subject to an urgent review so that no land under consideration as part of the review should be removed from green belt protection without consideration of all potential sites.
2. That expansion of the Begbroke Science Park and the building of reserved housing for the university on green belt land has no bearing on Oxford's unmet housing need and should be subject to a separate and specific planning policy review and inquiry.