



## Council

**Monday 22 July 2019**

### **Agenda Item 9, Motions**

**Motion Proposer: Councillor Mark Cherry**

**Motion Seconder: Councillor Surinder Dhesi**

**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° above pre-industrial levels. Should they increase by 2°, humanity's capacity to prevent catastrophic food shortages, floods, droughts, extreme heat and poverty will be severely impaired. Limiting Global Warming to 1.5° 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.