

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Council



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

Open to the public, including the press

Present:

Members: Councillors Margaret Crick (Chair), Jerry Avery, Paul Barrow, Ron Batstone, Eric Batts, Samantha Bowring, Nathan Boyd, Andy Cooke, Andrew Crawford, Amos Duveen, Neil Fawcett, Andy Foulsham, Hayleigh Gascoigne, David Grant, Debby Hallett, Jenny Hannaby, Simon Howell, Alison Jenner, Bob Johnston, Diana Lugova, Robert Maddison, Sarah Medley, Ruth Molyneaux, Patrick O'Leary, Helen Pighills, Mike Pighills, Judy Roberts, Emily Smith, Bethia Thomas, Max Thompson, Elaine Ware, Catherine Webber and Richard Webber

Officers: Steven Corrigan, Andrew Down and Margaret Reed

Number of members of the public: 15

Co.12 Apologies for absence

Apologies were submitted on behalf of councillors Barber, Briggs, de la Harpe, Shaw and Shelley.

Co.13 Minutes

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the annual meeting of Council held on 15 May 2019 as a correct record and agree that the chair sign them as such.

Co.14 Declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest

None.

Co.15 Urgent business and chair's announcements

The chair advised that her chosen charities for her year in office will be Practical Action, a charity that works to alleviate poverty in some of the poorest parts of the world and the Earth Trust at Little Wittenham.

She advised that Councillor Emily Smith, Leader of the council, and Councillor Simon Howell, Leader of the Conservative Group, had agreed to trial a process for councillor questions whereby written responses are circulated to all councillors in advance of the

Council meeting. These were circulated to all councillors on Tuesday 16 July with copies made available for members of the public. In light of this she sought, and received, Council's agreement to suspend Council Procedure Rule 36, which specifies how questions may be answered.

Co.16 Public participation

1. Mr Pete Underwood, representing Abingdon Extinction Rebellion, made the following statement

"Good evening. I'm Pete Underwood, one of the coordinators of Abingdon's Extinction Rebellion group and we're keen to establish links with local councils to see how we can help collectively address the climate and ecological crises that we're all facing.

Our presence at this meeting represents the first step at engaging with the Vale of White Horse council and we would welcome the opportunity for more detailed conversations about how we can assist you. Please feel free to speak with me at the end of the meeting if this is something of interest.

With regards to this meeting's agenda we welcome the proposed opposition to the Oxford Cambridge Expressway. We urge the council to oppose this project in the strongest possible terms.

The Expressway is a fundamentally flawed concept on many levels, as detailed in the agenda and by campaign groups such as the No Expressway Alliance. The Expressway completely contradicts the direction we should be taking to mitigate climate and ecological disaster and should be stopped.

We also welcome the proposal of a Climate Emergency Advisory Committee and urge the council to establish the committee as soon as possible.

Actions must be taken to address the climate and ecological crises and therefore talking about carbon neutrality and environmental protection will not be enough. We need action.

Therefore, it's critical that the committee is suitably resourced so that it can be effective, and its advice should be taken seriously by the council. Please do not use the 'advisory' role of the committee as a reason for inaction.

To help the committee with generating advice, we feel that a creating a citizens assembly that represents the vale is important and necessary as it will help create solutions that work for all of us, not just those with power and a vested interest in maintaining the status quo".

2. Mr Pete Underwood asked the following question:

"Will the council be willing to create a citizens assembly as part of its stakeholder engagement in order to help address the climate and ecological crises, whether or not the Climate Emergency Advisory Committee is established"?

Councillor Emily Smith responded as follows:

"Thank you for your question. I agree that it is really important that this council's response to the Climate Emergency includes drawing on ideas from local groups and individuals from our communities.

If the Climate Emergency Advisory Committee gets approved tonight, this will create an obvious point of contact between the council and members of the community keen to work with us on this agenda. The exact format will need to be agreed by the Chair of the new committee, but we have built into the procedure rules the opportunity for

Vale of White Horse District Council – Council minutes

anyone to come and address the committee with ideas. I would hope that the committee will consider how best to engage with the community.

As you know, Oxford City have started work on their Citizens Assembly about the Climate Emergency. I spoke to the leader of Oxford City a few weeks ago about it. It is expensive, the City have budgeted £200,000 to cover the costs – and the Vale would not be able to afford that in this financial year. But I am watching with interest how the City one works out and I suggest that this is something our new Climate Committee liaise with City colleagues about and could consider whether this approach could work in the Vale.

So, I am not in a position to say yes, Vale should have citizens assembly, but I think it is an idea worth considering for the future”.

3. Ms Sally Mears asked the following question of Councillor Emily Smith, Leader of the council:

"Can you guarantee that areas of important conservation and biodiversity along the A34 too will have a Strategic Environmental Assessment and will not be harmed (eg by housing developments)?"

Councillor Emily Smith responded as follows:

“Thank you Sally for your question.

Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs), under European Directive, must be undertaken on any policy documents that propose development – including any along the A34 - to determine the likely environmental impacts. And an assessment of appropriate mitigation must be undertaken to address likely environmental impacts.

So, SEAs are undertaken on all of our Local Plan policies and Environmental Impact Assessments done for all planning applications for sites above a certain size. But this does not include smaller developments.

National planning regulations determine which developments are subject to these assessments and the Council has to work within this legislation. So, in short, I am not able to guarantee that SEAs will be carried out on all development sites that may come forward along the A34.

What the council can do, and will be doing, is reviewing our planning policies, and introducing new policies to try and strengthen environmental protection. We have asked officers to begin work on our next local plan with improving environmental sustainability. We are also looking at whether supplementary planning documents can be used to ‘hang off’ our existing local plan to increase the council ability to insist on more sustainable build standards and increased mitigation of environmental damage.

Again, new supplementary planning documents are something that a Climate Committee would be able to help research and help Councillor Catherine Webber to put into place. And I hope that if you, and anyone else, have specific ideas we would love to hear about them so that we can see what we might be able to take forward”.

Co.17 Petitions

None.

Co.18 Ashbury Neighbourhood Plan

Council considered the recommendations of Cabinet, made at its meeting on 12 July 2019, on making the Ashbury Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the development plan for Vale.

RESOLVED to:

1. make the Ashbury Neighbourhood Development Plan so that it continues to be part of the council's development plan; and
2. authorise the head of planning, in agreement with the Qualifying Body, to correct any spelling, grammatical, typographical or factual errors in the Ashbury Neighbourhood Development Plan, together with any improvements from a presentational perspective.

Co.19 Uffington and Baulking Neighbourhood Plan

Council considered the recommendations of Cabinet, made at its meeting on 12 July 2019, on making the Uffington and Baulking Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the development plan for Vale.

RESOLVED to:

1. make the Uffington and Baulking Neighbourhood Development Plan so that it continues to be part of the council's development plan; and
2. authorise the head of planning, in agreement with the Qualifying Body, to correct any spelling, grammatical, typographical or factual errors in the Uffington and Baulking Neighbourhood Development Plan, together with any improvements from a presentational perspective.

Co.20 Establishment of a Climate Emergency Advisory Committee

Council considered the report of the head of legal and democratic on the establishment of a Climate Emergency Advisory Committee.

Councillors welcomed the establishment of the committee to advise on how the council can contribute to carbon reduction targets and minimise the damage to the environment and reduce damage to the global and local environment through its policies and practices.

RESOLVED: to

1. establish a Climate Emergency Advisory Committee with the terms of reference and procedure rules set out in Appendix A to the report of the head of legal and democratic to Council on 17 July 2019;
2. appoint the membership, substitutes, chair and vice-chair as set out in the table below;

| Climate Emergency Advisory Committee, 7 Members | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Liberal Democrat (6) | Conservative (1) |
| Amos Duveen (Vice Chair) | Eric Batts |
| David Grant (Chair) | |
| Hayleigh Gascoigne | |
| Eric de la Harpe | |
| Alison Jenner | |
| Max Thompson | |
| Preferred substitutes | |
| Liberal Democrat (6) | Conservative (3) |
| Ron Batstone | Nathan Boyd |
| Andy Foulsham | Simon Howell |
| Bob Johnston | Elaine Ware |
| Rob Maddison | |
| Sarah Medley | |
| Mike Pighills | |

- authorises the head of legal and democratic to incorporate the terms of reference and procedure rules set out in Appendix A to the report of the head of legal and democratic to Council on 17 July 2019 into the council's constitution and to make any consequential changes to the constitution to reflect the decision of Council.

Co.21 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. Since that meeting the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel had 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 who would receive notification of meetings and agenda, and could attend meetings of the panel, in the absence of the appointed member.

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

Co.22 Report of the leader of the council

Councillor Emily Smith, Leader of the council, addressed Council. The text of her report is available on the council's [website](#).

Co.23 Questions on notice

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?

Written answer

There has indeed been a very good programme of training available to members. This started on 8 May with two sessions for all our councillors to meet with the Chief Executive and Senior Management Team, and other key members of staff, and all were allocated a 1:1 'Officer Buddy' as a point of contact. 37 of the 38 councillors attended. The one member who missed this slot due to a pre-booked holiday, has had a 1:1 catch up session and has the useful induction booklet provided.

Planning training sessions have been attended by 13 councillors – planning committee members and some others.

26 councillors attended the Good Governance training held in June. Members who did not attend have been provided with the slides from that session and a date for a mop-up briefing for those who could not attend is being finalised.

Supplementary question and answer

In response to a supplementary question Councillor Smith confirmed that she will provide updates on the progress on the training programme and details of any refresher training.

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?

Written answer

The Liberal Democrats were voted into office on May 2 2019 by Vale residents because they strongly opposed the proposed Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) and the previously adopted Local Plan Part 1.

In particular, they opposed the excessively high housing targets, the lack of adequate infrastructure, the lack of genuinely affordable homes and the further erosion of the Green Belt.

As we have inherited this Local Plan at a stage when it is nearly complete and ready to be adopted our options are very limited.

However, the Inspector's initial letter in response to Oxford City's housing figures in their proposed Local Plan has cast doubt on the level of Oxford's unmet need and in turn the housing targets on which our own LPP2 is based.

We are exploring the implications of this and all other legal, social and economic ramifications.

Our intention is to deliver what residents voted for, within the constraints of previous decisions and the law. Once we have fully examined the facts and are able to make sound decisions, we will notify Council on how we intend to proceed.

Supplementary question and answer

In response to a supplementary question seeking confirmation that councillors will have the opportunity to endorse LLP2 in the autumn as notified in a press release, Councillor Webber responded that the council would explore the issues, referred to in her written response, before Council is invited to make a decision on LLP2.

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 share the rationale for an expanded Cabinet arrangement to the maximum size allowed by the constitution?

Written answer

As the question states, the number of Cabinet posts are in line with the constitution and national guidelines. But we decided to use all posts allowed in year one because:

1. The problems we have been left by the previous administration are significant. We have inherited a desperate lack of truly affordable homes and a lack of infrastructure to meet existing need (let alone the levels of housing growth committed to the Housing and Growth Deal), and most importantly we need to find ways to make savings and generate enough income to make sure the council doesn't run out of money in four years time. If we are to meet these huge challenges, as well as develop innovative new policies in line with our priorities across the council's services areas, we need to make sure we have the leadership capacity to do that work – particularly in this first year.
2. The previous leader held two portfolios, but officer and Local Government Association mentors have advised me that the leader should not also take on a portfolio to ensure cover and good governance.
3. We are a large group in what we intend to be a member-led administration. It's important to me that as many members of our administration as possible are involved as much as possible in policy development. The Cabinet system is far from ideal and we are looking to review the constitution, including the role and structure of cabinet and other positions.

Supplementary question and answer

In response to a supplementary question, Councillor Smith stated that any overspend in the councillor allowances budget would be met from reserves.

Co.24 Motions on notice

1. **Motion proposed by Councillor Nathan Boyd and 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”.

Whilst a number of councillors supported the motion, the majority of councillors, whilst understanding the sentiment of the motion in respect of the potential loss of infrastructure funding, supported the views expressed that South Oxfordshire District Council had every right to review its Local Plan in light of the manifesto commitments made at the elections in May and the need to revisit the Oxford City unmet housing needs figures. Cabinet members would continue to work with their counterparts at South Oxfordshire District Council regarding this issue.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 67, which provides for a recorded vote if three members request one, the Chairman called for a recorded vote on the motion which was declared lost with the voting as follows:

| For | Against | Abstentions |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Councillors | Councillors | Councillors |
| Eric Batts | Jerry Avery | Margaret Crick |
| Nathan Boyd | Paul Barrow | |
| Simon Howell | Ron Batstone | |
| Elaine Ware | Samantha Bowring | |
| | Andy Cooke | |
| | Andrew Crawford | |
| | Amos Duveen | |
| | Neil Fawcett | |
| | Andy Foulsham | |
| | Hayleigh Gascoigne | |
| | David Grant | |
| | Debby Hallett | |
| | Jenny Hannaby | |
| | Bob Johnston | |
| | Alison Jenner | |
| | Diana Lugova | |
| | Robert Maddison | |
| | Sarah Medley | |
| | Ruth Molyneaux | |
| | Patrick O’Leary | |
| | Helen Pighils | |
| | Mike Pighills | |

Vale of White Horse District Council – Council minutes

| For | Against | Abstentions |
|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|
| | Judy Roberts | |
| | Emily Smith | |
| | Bethia Thomas | |
| | Max Thompson | |
| | Catherine Webber | |
| | Richard Webber | |
| Total: 4 | Total: 28 | Total: 1 |

2. Motion 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”.

A number of councillors supported the view that the project should be abandoned in favour of more sustainable transport projects including the East-West rail link and local infrastructure projects to enhance cycling infrastructure and public transport. The proposed Expressway offered poor value for money, would have a detrimental impact on the environment, increase carbon emissions, worsen air quality, increase congestion on the roads in the district and encourage further speculative building.

An alternative view was expressed that the council should await the details of the proposal and options before expressing a view. The proposed road could offer some environmental benefits, improve traffic flow and connectivity and improve air quality.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 67, which provides for a recorded vote if three members request one, the Chairman called for a recorded vote on the motion which was declared carried with the voting as follows:

| For | Against | Abstentions |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Councillors | Councillors | Councillors |
| Jerry Avery | Eric Batts | Margaret Crick |
| Paul Barrow | Nathan Boyd | |
| Ron Batstone | Simon Howell | |
| Samantha Bowring | Elaine Ware | |
| Andy Cooke | | |
| Andrew Crawford | | |
| Amos Duveen | | |
| Neil Fawcett | | |
| Andy Foulsham | | |
| Hayleigh Gascoigne | | |
| David Grant | | |
| Debby Hallett | | |
| Jenny Hannaby | | |
| Bob Johnston | | |
| Alison Jenner | | |
| Diana Lugova | | |
| Robert Maddison | | |
| Sarah Medley | | |
| Ruth Molyneaux | | |
| Patrick O’Leary | | |
| Helen Pighils | | |
| Mike Pighills | | |
| Judy Roberts | | |
| Emily Smith | | |
| Bethia Thomas | | |
| Max Thompson | | |
| Catherine Webber | | |
| Richard Webber | | |
| Total: 28 | Total: 4 | Total: 1 |

RESOLVED: to

1. note 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.
2. note 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.
3. note that the increased carbon emissions, damage to our countryside and biodiversity associated with road building would be significant.
4. note 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.
5. therefore, oppose the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway as proposed and request the leader of the council, and members of the Cabinet, to make our opposition to the road building scheme clear at relevant partnership meetings.
6. request 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 proposed by Councillor Debby Hallett and 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

Vale of White Horse District Council – Council minutes

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.

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".

The majority of councillors supported the view that the council should consider the implications of adopting the plan before any final vote. Further information was required on Oxford City's unmet housing need before a final decision is made. Making a decision in advance of clarification on this issue could lead to allocated sites coming forward. Currently the unmet housing figure assumption has been used to justify building in the Green Belt and justify a higher housing figure for the Vale.

The view was expressed that the council had, via a press release, stated that a vote on LLP2 would be taken in the autumn. Support for the motion could jeopardise this commitment.

RESOLVED:

1. To note 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. To note 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. To note 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. To note 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. To note 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. To note 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.
7. That 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. To, therefore, request 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' this council's 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 the council's two local Members of Parliament, explaining the situation and asking them for their support.

4. Motion proposed by Councillor Emily Smith and 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.

The view was expressed that the council should not remove the existing vision without a replacement. However, the majority of councillors supported the motion and welcomed the development of a new vision to reflect the new administration and its priorities.

RESOLVED: 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.

The meeting closed at 8.40pm