

# Council Agenda



Contact: Steven Corrigan, Democratic Services Manager

Telephone number 01235 422526

Email: [steven.corrigan@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:steven.corrigan@southandvale.gov.uk)

Date: 9 July 2019

Website: [www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk](http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk)

## Summons to attend a meeting of Council

to be held on Wednesday 17 July 2019 at 7.00 pm  
The Ridgeway, The Beacon, Portway, Wantage, OX12 9BY

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M Reed".

Margaret Reed  
Head of Legal and Democratic

**Alternative formats of this publication are available on request. These include large print, Braille, audio, email and easy read. For this or any other special requirements (such as access facilities) please contact the officer named on this agenda. Please give as much notice as possible before the meeting.**

# Agenda

## Open to the public including the press

### Council's vision

The council's vision is to take care of your interests across the Vale with enterprise, energy and efficiency.

### 1. Apologies for absence

To record apologies for absence.

### 2. Minutes

(Pages 9 - 19)

To adopt and sign as a correct record the Council minutes of the annual meeting held on 15 May 2019 - attached.

### 3. Declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests in respect of items on the agenda for this meeting.

### 4. Urgent business and chair's announcements

To receive notification of any matters which the chair determines should be considered as urgent business and the special circumstances which have made the matters urgent, and to receive any announcements from the chair.

### 5. Public participation

To receive any questions or statements from members of the public that have registered to speak.

### 6. Petitions

To receive any petitions from the public.

### 7. Ashbury Neighbourhood Plan

(Pages 20 - 24)

At its meeting on 12 July 2019, Cabinet will consider the head of planning's report on the Ashbury Neighbourhood Development Plan.

A copy of the report is attached. Cabinet's recommendations will be circulated to all councillors on Friday 12 July 2019.

## **8. Uffington and Baulking Neighbourhood Plan**

(Pages 25 - 29)

At its meeting on Friday 12 July 2019, Cabinet will consider the head of planning's report on the Uffington and Baulking Neighbourhood Development Plan.

A copy of the report is attached. Cabinet's recommendations will be circulated to all councillors on Friday 12 July 2019.

## **9. Establishment of a Climate Emergency Advisory Committee**

(Pages 30 - 39)

To consider the report of the head of legal and democratic on the establishment of a Climate Emergency Advisory Committee – **report attached**.

## **10. Appointment of substitute members to the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel**

At its annual meeting Council appointed Councillor Neil Fawcett as the council's representative and Councillor Ruth Molyneaux as the observer substitute on the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel. At its annual meeting the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel agreed to change the membership rules of the panel to enable all 18 Thames Valley local authorities to appoint a named substitute member to the panel.

The appointed substitute will receive notification of meetings and agenda, and could attend meetings of the Panel, in the absence of the appointed member.

**RECOMMENDATION:** to appoint Councillor Ruth Molyneaux as the substitute member on the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel.

## **11. Report of the leader of the council**

To receive any updates from the leader of the council.

## **12. Questions on notice**

To receive questions from councillors in accordance with Council procedure rule 33.

### **Question 1: Councillor Simon Howell to Councillor Emily Smith, Leader of the council**

Officers put in place an excellent and detailed induction programme for new and returning councillors. Could the leader of the council summarise the level of attendance?

**Question 2: Councillor Eric Batts to Councillor Catherine Webber, Cabinet member for planning**

What is the new administration's approach to the Local Plan Part 2 now that the inspector has found the plan to be sound?

**Question 3: Councillor Elaine Ware to Councillor Emily Smith, Leader of the council**

Following the appointment of Cabinet members at the annual meeting of Council, could the leader of the council share the rationale for an expanded Cabinet arrangement to the maximum size allowed by the constitution?

**13. Motions on notice**

To consider motions from councillors in accordance with Council procedure rule 38.

**(1) Motion to be proposed by Councillor Nathan Boyd, seconded by Councillor Simon Howell:**

Council notes that other neighbouring councils are dealing with their own local plans that are at various stages of development, discussion and inspection. Of particular note to residents in the Didcot area is the debate and discussion surrounding the South Oxfordshire District Council Local Plan.

This council is very concerned about the impact of decisions taken by South Oxfordshire District Council on residents in the Vale of White Horse.

Council requests that the leader of the council urgently writes to the leader of South Oxfordshire District Council and all South Oxfordshire councillors before any vote is taken on their Local Plan proposals to state the views of this council and the impact on residents in the area, specifically:

- This council opposes any withdrawal or major amendments to the South Oxfordshire District Council Local Plan that has the consequences of putting at risk the Vale of White Horse District Council delivery of the five year land supply, the loss of Housing Infrastructure funding for the area, and the loss of Growth Deal funding for the area.
- This council urges South Oxfordshire District Council to work collaboratively with Vale of White Horse District Council and other stakeholders to ensure the infrastructure funding is not delayed. Residents and visitors to the area desperately need this investment in infrastructure to be delivered.

**(2) Motion to be proposed by Councillor Alison Jenner, seconded by Councillor Andy Foulsham:**

Council notes that, given all possible routes through the government's chosen corridor, the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway will have a direct impact on communities, businesses, and the environment across the Vale of White Horse District. This council should therefore agree a position on this matter.

Council notes with concern the lack of public consultation and lack of clarity from

Government on proposals about whether an Expressway is the most effective way to enhance connectivity within the Oxford to Cambridge Arc and before Corridor B was chosen.

Council notes that published evidence on similar road building schemes, such as widening the M25, led to increased car use without any benefit in terms of congestion or journey time after a few years.

Council notes that the increased carbon emissions, damage to our countryside and biodiversity associated with road building would be significant.

Council notes our recent declaration of a Climate Emergency and our commitment to reducing our carbon footprint through our policies, decisions and actions. The Expressway will have a serious negative impact on the achievement of climate change targets at a time when all public bodies are being actively encouraged to improve air quality and contribute to significant carbon reductions.

Therefore, Council resolves to oppose the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway as proposed.

Council requests that the leader of the council, and members of the Cabinet, make our opposition to the road building scheme clear at relevant partnership meetings.

Council requests that the leader of the council write to the district's two Members of Parliament and to the Minister for Transport to make clear this council's position, as set out above, and to request that the following actions be taken:

- That the Expressway proposal be abandoned;
- That the estimated £3-7billion cost of the scheme to be invested instead into completing and enhancing phase three of the East-West Rail link and to local government to enhance cycle infrastructure and public transport;
- That all new transport schemes proposed by Department for Transport be subject to full public consultation and environmental assessments be published from the beginning;
- That the government prioritise rail and sustainable active travel when developing policy and awarding grant funding for infrastructure.

**(3) Motion to be proposed by Councillor Debby Hallett, seconded by Councillor Catherine Webber:**

1. Council notes the inspector's Report of the Examination of Vale's Local Plan Part 2, dated 25 June 2019. In his report, the inspector lists the four objectives of LPP2, one of which is to set out policies and locations for new housing to meet the unmet need of Oxford City.
2. Council notes that the inspector (in paragraph 26) reminds us that the Oxfordshire Growth Board agreed a 'working assumption' that Oxford City's unmet need was 15,000 homes, of which Vale should supply 2200 homes over the plan period. He says (in paragraph 28) that this 'working assumption' is to be 'confirmed or adjusted' through the examination of Oxford's Local Plan and the preparation of Oxfordshire's Joint Statutory Spatial Plan, which is currently in its early stages. He reminds us again (in paragraph 92) that the additional housing requirement is a 'working assumption' rather than definitive and warrants some caution in allocating sites in the LPP2'. There

is no guidance or explanation of what this would mean in practice.

3. Council notes that Oxford City has submitted its Local Plan for examination, but the inspector has found some issues that require more work before it is ready to be examined in public hearings; he discusses the issues in his letter to that council (undated, but to be found on Oxford City's Local Plan examination website page). Inspector is concerned that the housing figures are based on figures in the 2014 SHMA, which are based on 2011 ONS population and household projections that 'are now a few years old' (page 2). He also points out there may have been double counting. Therefore, the housing need figure is questionable. This housing need figure 'could have a bearing on the level of unmet need which would have to be accommodated by neighbouring local authorities'.
4. Council notes that LPP2 allocates 1200 homes at Dalton Barracks, for Oxford's unmet need. Dalton Barracks and the neighbouring village of Shippon are to be removed from the Green Belt for future housing development.
5. Council notes that paragraph 137 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires Green Belt boundaries to only be modified under exceptional circumstances. The inspector for Vale LPP2 says (in paragraph 29) that the housing required for Oxford's unmet need must be close to Oxford, and much of it is to be social rented housing. The inspector says (in paragraph 55) that the number of houses to meet Oxford's unmet need, and the fact that they must be near Oxford, demonstrates there are exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of Dalton Barracks and Shippon from the Green Belt.
6. Council notes that the Campaign to Protect Rural England wrote to the planning Inspectorate in May 2019 to object to the order in which Oxfordshire's Local Plans are being examined, citing rules in NPPF:

9 May 2019

Sarah Richards  
Chief Executive  
Planning Inspectorate

cc Mr Jonathan Bore, Mr Nick Fagan, Mr Paul Griffiths, Mr. Malcolm Rivett, Mr. David Reed.

By email:  
[enquiries@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

[www.cpreoxon.org.uk](http://www.cpreoxon.org.uk)

working locally and nationally to  
protect and enhance a beautiful,  
thriving countryside for everyone to  
value and enjoy

...

It is made explicitly clear in para 137 of the NPPF that there must be a sequential process of determination of Oxford's need and exhaustive assessment of the City's internal capacity to accommodate it - including brownfield sites, higher densities and availability of non Green Belt land in neighbouring authorities - before consideration can be given to possible exceptional circumstances for release of Green Belt land. This has not been done.

The present sequencing of the examinations of Oxfordshire Local Plans turns para 137 on its head. The Local Plans of neighbouring authorities to release Green Belt land for Oxford's (notional) unmet need are being examined with exceptional circumstances taken as read before that of Oxford itself has been *assessed through the examination of its strategic policies*, as para 137 of the NPPF requires, or any independent and robust assessment of Oxford's level of need (as defined by the NPPF) and the City's capacity to meet it.

It is therefore unsound and unlawful for the Inspectorate to proceed with the examination of Local Plans to accommodate Oxford's unmet need on Green Belt sites in neighbouring authorities until both Oxford's level of need (as defined by the NPPF) and the City's capacity to meet it (as required by para 137) have been tested through the examination of Oxford's own plan rather than, as at present, that being the last Plan to be examined.

The reply from PINS failed to answer the question:



The Planning Inspectorate

3J Kite Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 0303 444 5326  
Customer Services: 0303 444 5000

e-mail: [Andy.Gadsby@Planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:Andy.Gadsby@Planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

---

Helen Marshall  
Director  
CPRE Oxfordshire

Your Ref:

Our Ref:

Date: 13 May 2019

Inspectors are charged with assessing whether the local plan they are examining is sound and this includes assessing whether the plan is consistent with national policy and whether it is based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters. This is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework<sup>1</sup>. This also includes national policy on providing for housing needs.

In procedural terms it is for the individual Inspectors to determine how they should run their examinations within the framework set by the *Procedural Practice in the Examination of Local Plans*.

I hope this helps explain the position.

7. It is this council's opinion that in order for Vale's Local Plan to be sound, the exact, evidenced number of houses that Oxford requires in order to meet its real need should be determined before Vale includes them in Vale's Local Plan Part 2. Oxford's assessment of its housing need must include evidence that Oxford City has done all it can to accommodate its own need, including evidence that the use of land for employment sites over housing sites is justified and lawful. There must be a public examination of the Oxford City Local Plan to definitely identify the unmet need (if any) to precede any adoption of neighbouring authorities' Local Plans to accommodate it. Until this is done, there are no exceptional circumstances to allow removal of Dalton Barracks and Shippon from the Green Belt.
8. Council therefore requests the Leader of the council to write to the Minister for Housing, Communities and Local Government to:

- a. Let the Minister know that Vale is assessing its options with regard to the Local Plan Part 2 and of council's opinion as stated.
- b. Point out that in Oxfordshire the various Local Plans are *not* independent of each other. That fact should have been considered in the examination process by ensuring Local Plans that are part of another authority's evidence, as is Oxford City's Local Plan, are examined first. Current examination procedures are deficient.
- c. Point out that the Duty to Cooperate should include Oxford City's duty to have a clear evidenced housing target before asking its neighbours to help meet its need. This Duty to Cooperate should run both ways.
- d. Ask for the Minister's advice about how we should 'confirm or adjust' our Local Plan Part 2 once Oxford's unmet need is established, if our local plan is already adopted.
- e. Ask the Minister to explain to us how this Local Plan Part 2 can be considered sound and legal when the housing figures used are based solely on a 'working assumption' of Oxford's unmet need, the Plan allocates housing development in the Green Belt in clear contravention of paragraph 137 of the NPPF, and the Plan removes Dalton Barracks and Shippon from the Green Belt without the exceptional circumstances that the regulations require.

And to write to our two local Members of Parliament, explaining the situation and asking them for their support.

**(4) Motion to be proposed by Councillor Emily Smith, seconded by Councillor Debby Hallett:**

Council resolves to remove the current 'vision' of the council "taking care of your interests throughout the Vale with Enterprise, Energy and Efficiency" with immediate effect, and then develop a new vision statement that better reflects this council's priorities as part of the work on our new corporate plan.