

# Supplement for

# Cabinet

On **Wednesday 18 October 2023** At **6.00 pm**

## Agenda Item 7 - Scrutiny Reports

### Contents

#### 7. **Scrutiny reports**

3 - 24

The Climate and Environment Panel met on 12 September 2023, the Housing and Homelessness Panel met on 5 October 2023, and the Scrutiny Committee will meet on 10 and 16 October 2023. The following reports are expected and will be published as a supplement, together with any other recommendations from those meetings:

- Air Pollution
- ~~Local Government Association Corporate Peer Challenge – no recommendations~~
- Delivery of Electric Vehicle Infrastructure for Oxford
- ~~Utilities Procurement 2024-2028 – no recommendations~~
- Oxford Local Plan 2040 Regulation 19 Consultation Document
- ~~Partial GIL Charging Schedule Review – no recommendations~~

The agenda, reports and any additional supplements can be found together with this supplement on the committee meeting webpage.

This page is intentionally left blank

**To:** Cabinet  
**Date:** 18 October 2023  
**Report of:** Climate and Environment Panel  
**Title of Report:** Air Pollution

<b>Summary and recommendations</b>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To present Panel of the Scrutiny Committee recommendations for Cabinet consideration and decision
<b>Key decision:</b>	No
<b>Scrutiny Lead Member:</b>	Councillor Alex Hollingsworth, Panel Chair
<b>Cabinet Member:</b>	Cllr Anna Railton, Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice
<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Pursue a Zero Carbon Oxford
<b>Policy Framework:</b>	Council Strategy 2020-24
<b>Recommendation: That the Cabinet states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in the body of this report.</b>	

<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>Appendix A</b>	Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

## Introduction and overview

1. The Climate and Environment Panel met on 12 September 2023 to consider a Scrutiny-commissioned item on Air Pollution. The item included consideration of the Council's Annual Air Quality Status Report and Action Plan; the OxAir Air Quality Sensor recommendations and progress since the report was published; and indoor air pollution. It was recommended that the Panel note and comment on the Annual Air Quality Status Report; receive a presentation followed by an opportunity for discussion; and agree any recommendations.
2. The Panel would like to thank Councillor Anna Railton (Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice) and Pedro Abreu (Principal Air Quality Officer) for attending the meeting to present and answer questions.

## Summary and recommendations

3. Pedro Abreu, Principal Air Quality Officer delivered a presentation and highlighted that Oxford City Council had statutory duties in relation to air quality and had published its Annual Air Quality Status Report in June 2023. There was a Council commitment to improve air quality through the Air Quality Action Plan. The presentation spanned a number of areas, including key achievements from July 2022 to June 2023; historic air pollution data; levels of Nitrogen Dioxide, the Zero Emission Zone; Low Traffic Neighbourhoods; particulate pollution; indoor air pollution; and the OxAir recommendations.
4. The Panel asked a range of questions, including questions relating to air quality monitoring stations and data, monitoring of indoor air pollution in commercial kitchens, use of diesel generators by street traders, communications and messaging, the impact of air quality on people and the use of data as a decision-making tool.
5. During discussion, the Panel noted that the Annual Air Quality Status Report was produced on a template supplied by the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and there was not much flexibility for the Council in terms of structure and content. However, the Panel suggested that it would be helpful if the Council produced an accessible and easily digestible executive summary to sit alongside the larger report which set out what the Council had done, next steps and outlining any issues with particular actions which meant those actions may take longer to progress. The Panel agreed that this would assist decision-makers and encourage public engagement by navigating away from the technical detail which was not always compelling to read.

***Recommendation 1: That the Council produces an accessible and easily digestible executive summary to sit alongside the Annual Air Quality Status Report in future years; to include what the Council has done, next steps and any issues which are likely to delay progress on particular actions.***

6. The Panel also discussed the need for specific communications and messaging for the public around air quality; including what the Council was doing and why it was important. In particular, the Panel felt it would be useful if information was provided around the wider benefits of action to improve air quality (e.g. to health, the economy etc.). It was suggested the materials could include infographics and other short, easy to digest formats for public consumption which told compelling stories around the importance, and real impact of, improving air quality.

***Recommendation 2: That the Council considers how to identify and promote the broader benefits of action to improve air quality.***

<b>Report author</b>	Alice Courtney
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 529834
e-mail	<a href="mailto:acourtney@oxford.gov.uk">acourtney@oxford.gov.uk</a>

This page is intentionally left blank

**Appendix A**  
**Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of**  
**the Climate and Environment Panel of the Scrutiny Committee**

The document sets out the draft response of the Cabinet Member to recommendations made by the Climate and Environment Panel on 12 September 2023 concerning the Air Pollution item presented at the meeting. The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agree?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1) That the Council produces an accessible and easily digestible executive summary to sit alongside the Annual Air Quality Status Report in future years; to include what the Council has done, next steps and any issues which are likely to delay progress on particular actions.	Yes	A simplified one pager capturing actions and progress on tackling air quality will be produced alongside the existing Annual Air Quality Status Report and press release materials. At the point the Council's existing Air Quality Action Plan needs to be updated in 2025, officers will review the format of the report to consider further design changes to improve accessibility.
2) That the Council considers how to identify and promote the broader benefits of action to improve air quality.	Yes	There is an extensive ongoing programme of communications around actions to improve air quality, and why this is important. Videos were created and posted featuring a consultant at the John Radcliffe Hospital specifically highlighting the health benefits of cleaner air. Last winter's <i>Do You Fuel Good</i> campaign targeting the use of wood burning stoves will be reprised this heating season.  A full public consultation and engagement programme is also planned in support of the Council's proposal to create a citywide smokeless controlled area (SCA), as approved by September Cabinet. While boaters will be exempt under

		the proposed new SCA, further communications are planned to support the Council's introduction of eco-moorings along the Oxford Canal, which will also highlight the broader benefits of action to improve air quality.
--	--	---



**To:** Cabinet  
**Date:** 18 October 2023  
**Report of:** Scrutiny Committee  
**Title of Report:** Delivery of Electric Vehicle Infrastructure for Oxford

<b>Summary and recommendations</b>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To present Scrutiny Committee recommendations for Cabinet consideration and decision
<b>Key decision:</b>	No
<b>Scrutiny Lead Member:</b>	Councillor Lucy Pegg, Scrutiny Committee Chair
<b>Cabinet Member:</b>	Councillor Louise Upton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities; and Councillor Anna Railton, Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice
<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Pursue a Zero Carbon Oxford; Enable an Inclusive Economy; Support Thriving Communities
<b>Policy Framework:</b>	Council Strategy 2020-24; Local Plan 2036
<b>Recommendation: That the Cabinet states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in the body of this report.</b>	

<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>Appendix A</b>	Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

### **Introduction and overview**

1. The Scrutiny Committee met on 10 October 2023 to consider a report concerning the Delivery of Electric Vehicle Infrastructure for Oxford. The report, which is due for Cabinet consideration on 18 October 2023, recommends that Cabinet approves the draft Implementation Plan for the Council's Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy (OxEVIS) delivery alongside various related delegations of authority; and agrees transition of the on-street elements of Go Ultra Low Oxford (GULO) from Oxford City Council delivery to Oxfordshire County Council delivery, subject to a number of conditions.

2. The Committee would like to thank Councillor Upton (Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities), Mish Tullar (Head of Corporate Strategy), Tina Mould (Sustainable Innovation Project Team Manager) and Sarah Hassenpflug (Project Manager – Innovation Team) for attending the meeting to answer questions.

### **Summary and recommendations**

3. Councillor Louise Upton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities introduced the report. Oxford City Council had been very successful at attracting Government funding in the past for Go Ultra Low Oxford (GULO) and had been a pioneer in this space compared to other surrounding districts. The Council had a dedicated, prize-winning team for the delivery of Electric Vehicle (EV) Infrastructure, which had been in place for a number of years. Ensuring fair and equitable rollout of EV Infrastructure was a priority for the Council, which included a focus on supporting car clubs, electrifying blue badge parking bays and enabling Council tenants to access EV charging.
4. National changes set out in the Government's 'Taking Charge' document shifted responsibility for EV Infrastructure to Tier 1 local authorities (i.e. Oxfordshire County Council). This was a move that the Council regretted, however the City Council would continue to work closely with the County Council.
5. The Committee asked a range of questions, including questions relating to appropriate priority for EV Infrastructure rollout being afforded to deprived urban areas; how affordability and speed of EV charging could be balanced to encourage EV uptake; potential for Oxford Direct Services (ODS) to commercialise pavement cable gulleys; opportunities for the Council to implement dedicated car club charging spaces within Council-owned car parks; how to overcome barriers to installing EV Infrastructure in conservation areas; the impact of parking constraints on onstreet EV charging; and the possibility of the Council introducing a Local Development Order regarding household planning applications to install onstreet EV Infrastructure.
6. In particular, the Committee discussed issues around parking in certain areas of the city and how this was likely to lead to situations where residents were unable to park in front of their own home; therefore they would be unable to charge their vehicle via a pavement cable gully. The Committee felt that this should be taken into serious consideration and the possibility of reserved parking spaces for the purposes of onstreet EV charging at home be explored. Linked to this, the Committee agreed that consideration should be given to how onstreet EV charging was facilitated and managed in conservation areas.

***Recommendation 1: That the Council works closely with Oxfordshire County Council to consider options for reserved parking spaces outside homes specifically for at-home onstreet EV charging in areas of Oxford where a need for this provision is identified (e.g. because of parking constraints in those areas).***

***Recommendation 2: That the Council works closely with Oxfordshire County Council to consider options for at-home EV charging in conservation areas to ensure that residents living in these areas do not experience disproportionate access to onstreet EV charging opportunities.***

7. The Committee also queried the possibility of incentives to help ensure that suppliers (“concessionaires”) repair EV chargers promptly when they are broken or faulty, as the Committee was aware of a number of instances where EV chargers had been left in a state of disrepair for prolonged periods of time, which negatively impacted communities.

***Recommendation 3: That the Council works closely with Oxfordshire County Council to explore options to incentivise concessionaires to promptly repair EV Infrastructure when a unit is out of service.***

8. In addition, the Committee explored the topic of co-charging and commented that co-charging on employment sites outside of working hours, whereby the public could access EV charging, could help improve residents’ access to EV charging and make best use of EV Infrastructure across the city.

***Recommendation 4: That the Council works closely with Oxfordshire County Council to investigate the viability of EV co-charging between employment and the public on employment sites.***

<b>Report author</b>	Alice Courtney
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 529834
e-mail	<a href="mailto:acourtney@oxford.gov.uk">acourtney@oxford.gov.uk</a>

This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix A

### Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

The document sets out the draft response of the Cabinet Member to recommendations made by the Scrutiny Committee on 10 October 2023 concerning the Delivery of Electric Vehicle Infrastructure for Oxford. The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agree?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1) That the Council works closely with Oxfordshire County Council to consider options for reserved parking spaces outside homes specifically for at-home onstreet EV charging in areas of Oxford where a need for this provision is identified (e.g. because of parking constraints in those areas).	Yes	Officers will recommend to Oxfordshire County Council EV Team that they explore these options (allocated EV gulley bays, shared community gulley bays) with County Highways as part of the GUL-e project.
2) That the Council works closely with Oxfordshire County Council to consider options for at-home EV charging in conservation areas to ensure that residents living in these areas do not experience disproportionate access to onstreet EV charging opportunities.	Yes	The LEVI grant fund includes GUL-e channels which could be used in conservation areas. Oxford City Council EV Team will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council to develop guidance for home charger applications in all localities, including conservation/heritage areas (guidance for applications is an output of the GUL-e LEVI grant). We will also continue to lobby central government to equalise Planning Policy for all homeowners, whether they have access to off-street parking or not.
3) That the Council works closely with Oxfordshire County Council to explore options to incentivise concessionaires to promptly repair EV Infrastructure when a unit is out of service.	Yes	This is already in scope for both the planned LEVI contracting and the existing DPS Concession Contract. The draft (documentation is not yet finalised by Oxfordshire County Council officers) LEVI tender specifications for both off-street and onstreet sites contain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Performance Indicators setting minimum targets for when the charger must be operational.</li> <li>• Financial compensation penalties to be paid to the</li> </ul>

		<p>Council – for uptime targets not met. Based on averaged revenue share payments for chargers that are not working (down-time penalty).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthened and clearly quantified escalation up to contract termination for continued SLA breaches and material defaults.</li> </ul>
4) That the Council works closely with Oxfordshire County Council to investigate the viability of EV co-charging between employment and the public on employment sites.	Yes	<p>Support for co-charging is already in scope for Oxford's proposed EV Infrastructure Implementation Plan. This work will be undertaken as part of a work package, which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop relationships with all local stakeholders and partners to deliver a citywide approach.</li> <li>• Create a city EV working group to identify shared assets and opportunities and utilise ZCOP and other private landowners to maximise EV infrastructure opportunities across the city.</li> </ul> <p>The draft LEVI contracts contain the option of inclusion of third party owned land, which could include employment sites, simplifying the delivery of the above work packages.</p> <p>Public EV charging solution impacts and opportunities have been raised with the County Council as a consideration under the workplace parking LEVI work strand.</p>

**To:** Cabinet  
**Date:** 18 October 2023  
**Report of:** Scrutiny Committee  
**Title of Report:** Oxford Local Plan 2040 Regulation 19 Consultation Document

<b>Summary and recommendations</b>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To present Scrutiny Committee recommendations for Cabinet consideration and decision
<b>Key decision:</b>	No
<b>Scrutiny Lead Member:</b>	Councillor Lucy Pegg, Scrutiny Committee Chair
<b>Cabinet Member:</b>	Councillor Louise Upton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities
<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	All
<b>Policy Framework:</b>	Council Strategy 2020-24; Development Plan Document
<b>Recommendation: That the Cabinet states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in the body of this report.</b>	

<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>Appendix A</b>	Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

### **Introduction and overview**

1. The members of the Scrutiny Committee held an extraordinary informal remote meeting on 16 October 2023 to consider the Local Plan 2040 Regulation 19 Consultation Document. The report, which is due for Cabinet consideration on 18 October 2023, recommends that Cabinet approves the Oxford Local Plan 2040 Proposed Submission Document for consultation; approves the statutory supporting information (Sustainability Appraisal, Habitats Regulation Assessment, Infrastructure Development Plan, Equalities Impact Assessment); and authorises the Head of Planning Services to make minor changes as detailed in the Cabinet report, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities.
2. The Committee would like to thank Councillor Upton (Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities), David Butler (Head of Planning and Regulatory

Services), Rachel Williams (Planning Policy and Place Manager) and Sarah Harrison (Team Leader (Planning Policy)) for attending the meeting to answer questions.

3. The Committee also had two external contributions at the meeting and would like to thank Kaddy Beck for attending to address the Committee and the Oxfordshire branch of the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) for submitting a representation.

### **Summary and recommendations**

4. Councillor Louise Upton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities introduced the report. The Local Plan was an important document which set the context within which Oxford was going to develop over the next 15 years. It would be the document used by the Council when determining planning applications, including consideration of where homes would be built; where jobs would be located; the protection of blue and green spaces; and the protection of district centres to ensure they remained vibrant and thriving. The Local Plan was a lengthy and complex document which had been in development for a very long period of time; and sought to balance factors such as the delivery of affordable housing, net zero, employment and protecting heritage and conservation areas – while still ensuring that buildings were viable.
5. The Committee asked a range of questions, including questions relating to site allocation; local and district centres; provision of healthcare infrastructure; pressures on services from other developments outside of the City boundary; collaboration and partnership working during the Plan making process (both in Oxford and neighbouring Districts); viability policies; affordable workspace; First Homes; parking standards; development density; and information contained in the Sustainability Appraisal (Appendix 2 to the report).
6. In particular, the Committee discussed the need for the provision of adequate healthcare infrastructure within the City, both to address new demand as a result of new development within *and* outside the City boundary and existing unmet need. Officers advised that the Council did engage with the Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West Integrated Care Board (BOB ICB) as part of the Plan making process, as was also the requirement for the surrounding Districts, wherein the Council informed the ICB of the Council's plans, including planned growth, and the ICB then considered what plans it needed to put in place to address need. The Committee was of the view that engagement with healthcare partners could be improved to ensure a mutual understanding of development plans, planned growth and what healthcare infrastructure provision was required as a result, to include wider cross-boundary collaboration between the ICB and all neighbouring Districts so that healthcare demand could be considered in the round.

***Recommendation 1: That the Council seeks to facilitate increased engagement with the Integrated Care Board in relation to the provision of healthcare infrastructure to meet both new and existing unmet demand as a result of development within and outside the City boundary, to ensure that adequate plans are drawn up to meet existing and future demand, in collaboration with the neighbouring Districts to encourage good joined-up, cross-boundary working.***



7. The Committee noted the inclusion of a policy within the draft Local Plan relating to affordable workspace (Policy E3) and queried why a lower target requirement for the provision of affordable workspace by developers was not included. The Committee was advised that this particular policy was ground-breaking and no other local authority was doing it; the policy had been tested in the preferred options consultation and viability work had shown that it was viable for developers to contribute towards affordable workspace, but because this was a new policy there was a limited evidence base at present. Eight sites had been identified within the draft Local Plan which would be expected to deliver affordable workspace as part of their masterplans and it was anticipated that the Council would work collaboratively with those sites to deliver on the policy and then build upon the policy in future Local Plans by hopefully being able to include concrete proposals and numerical targets once the evidence base had grown. Cllr Upton and officers were of the view that the Council had gone as far as it possibly could with this policy in the current context but were hopeful that the policy could be strengthened in future iterations of the Local Plan.
8. While the Committee broadly accepted the rationale provided for not including specific targets within Policy E3 at the current time, it agreed that the policy could be strengthened by requiring developers to justify why they could not provide affordable workspace, in the event that their affordable workspace strategy did not propose the provision of any affordable workspace.

***Recommendation 2: That the Council adds a requirement into Policy E3: Affordable Workspace Strategy and Affordable Workspace Provision on Commercial Sites that, in the event that a developer of any of the 8 sites listed does not propose the provision of affordable workspace within their affordable workspace strategy, that developer must include a justification within their strategy as to why not.***

9. The Committee discussed the definitions of District Centres and Local Centres within the draft Local Plan, with a particular focus on what constituted a Local Centre. Members made reference to a number of locations across the City which were not currently defined as Local Centres and how, when cross-referenced with other locations which were included on the list of Local Centres within the document, it was not clear why those areas had not been included in the list of Local Centres in addition. The Committee queried how the list of Local Centres was determined relative to the definition and was informed that it was a difficult judgement call and there was often a very fine line between whether a location was defined as a Local Centre or not; many Local Centres had been defined as such for a very long time and carried forward from one Local Plan to the next, though the list of Local Centres was reviewed during the development of the draft Local Plan and consideration given to defining areas as Local Centres which were not already served by other District or Local Centres.
10. The Committee noted that a new Local Centre had been defined in Marston, however believed that there would be value in reassessing the list of Local Centres and locations not included in the list against the definition to see whether more locations could be included. In the event that this recommendation was not accepted for the current draft Local Plan, the Committee recommended that the definition of a Local Centre within the document be made clearer to aid understanding as to why some areas were not defined as such.

***Recommendation 3: That the Council reassesses the list of Local Centres and locations not included in the list against the definition to see whether more locations can be included in this and future Local Plans.***

***Recommendation 4: That the Council clarifies the definition of a Local Centre within the draft Local Plan to aid understanding as to why some areas are not defined as such, in the event that recommendation 3 is not accepted for the current draft Local Plan.***

11. During discussion relating to site allocation and density of developments, the Committee queried policies SPS16 (Crescent Hall) and SPS11 (Cowley Marsh Depot). In relation to Policy SPS16, the Committee noted that the draft Local Plan stated the site was currently described as having capacity of approximately 300 bedspaces, but the policy stated the minimum number of dwellings to be delivered on the site was 29, which was a significant reduction on the current capacity. In relation to Policy SPS11, the Committee noted that the draft Local Plan stated the site was suitable for residential development of similar density to the surrounding residential area, however further highlighted that the area was quite low density and queried the appropriateness of opting for more dwellings at that low density. Officers advised that the minimum number of dwellings stated was a minimum *in addition* to any dwellings already on the site and that the density around the Cowley Marsh Depot site was reasonably high for a suburban area.
12. The Committee was informed that the Council had to make very cautious assumptions in terms of number of dwellings as the Local Plan had to be fully deliverable. Developers were encouraged to come forward with appropriate plans to deliver more dwellings than stated in the policy, but there was a requirement for the minimum number of new homes stated in the document to be delivered, therefore there was a need for the Council to be comfortable that it had not been too ambitious with the minimum numbers. The Committee agreed that it was not clear in the draft Local Plan that minimum numbers of dwellings to be delivered were in addition to any dwellings currently on sites and that this would benefit from clarification.

***Recommendation 5: That the Council clarifies the way in which housing numbers on sites are presented within the draft Local Plan, to make clear that the minimum number of dwellings to be delivered which are stated within policies are in addition to the number of existing dwellings on those sites.***

13. In further discussion on development sites, the Committee considered Policy SPS12 (Templars Square) and the level of importance of this site in terms of a regeneration project which would benefit the whole southeast of the City. The Committee noted the cautious wording within the document, including relating to the impact of any development at the site on views from the historic and central cores of the City, and was concerned about how this caution might be balanced with achieving the full potential of the Templars Square site. The Committee agreed that the Council had an important role to play in ensuring the site was reinvigorated and it would therefore be beneficial for the narrative and Policy SPS12 around Templars Square

to be amended so that it highlighted the importance of its redevelopment to a wide area of the City.

***Recommendation 6: That the Council amends the narrative around Templars Square and related Policy SPS12 to highlight the current significance and significant future potential of the site, more broadly than just the provision of housing, to a large number of people and communities across a large area of the City beyond Cowley alone – stressing the importance of redevelopment and reinvigoration of the site.***

14. The Committee held a brief discussion around the ward names used in the draft Local Plan and noted that there were some instances where ward names had changed since the previous iteration of the Local Plan, but had not been updated in the current draft (e.g. references to Iffley Fields, which was now Rose Hill & Iffley). The Committee agreed that references to wards should be reviewed to ensure the ward names within the document correctly reflected the current wards.

***Recommendation 7: That the Council reviews the ward names used within the draft Local Plan to ensure that they correctly reflect the current wards of the City.***

15. The Committee touched on accessibility and agreed that, owing to the document's length and density, it was difficult to easily identify what had changed compared to the Local Plan 2036. The Committee agreed that, at the point at which the Local Plan 2040 was published, it would be helpful to include a list of changes between the Local Plan 2036 and Local Plan 2040 for public consumption to aid accessibility, understanding and general interaction with the document.

***Recommendation 8: That the Council produces a list of changes between the Local Plan 2036 and Local Plan 2040 to publish alongside the Local Plan 2040 for public consumption.***

<b>Report author</b>	Alice Courtney
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 529834
e-mail	<a href="mailto:acourtney@oxford.gov.uk">acourtney@oxford.gov.uk</a>

This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix A

### Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

The document sets out the draft response of the Cabinet Member to recommendations made by the members of the Scrutiny Committee at its extraordinary informal remote meeting on 16 October 2023 concerning the Oxford Local Plan 2040 Regulation 19 Consultation Document. The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agree?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1) That the Council seeks to facilitate increased engagement with the Integrated Care Board in relation to the provision of healthcare infrastructure to meet both new and existing unmet demand as a result of development within and outside the City boundary, to ensure that adequate plans are drawn up to meet existing and future demand, in collaboration with the neighbouring Districts to encourage good joined-up, cross-boundary working.	Yes	We will continue to encourage BOB ICB to engage in the process. We will also seek to use the Future Oxfordshire Partnership's Planning Advisory Sub-Group as an additional means to co-ordinate this engagement across Oxfordshire as a Senior Manager of the ICB has recently been co-opted as a non-voting member of that group.
2) That the Council adds a requirement into Policy E3: Affordable Workspace Strategy and Affordable Workspace Provision on Commercial Sites that, in the event that a developer of any of the 8 sites listed does not propose the provision of affordable workspace within their affordable workspace strategy, that developer must include a justification within their strategy as to why not.	Yes	<p>We propose a change to Policy E3 to emphasise this point as follows:</p> <p><b>“Development proposals delivering commercial development<sup>4</sup> on the following sites are expected to <u>deliver affordable workspace</u> <del>produce an affordable workspace strategy which will set out the details of the affordable workspace to be delivered as part of their masterplans which should include details of the size, marketing, servicing and the management of the spaces on the following sites:</del></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ARC Oxford</b></li> <li>• <b>Oxford Science Park</b></li> <li>• <b>Oxpens</b></li> <li>• <b>Osney Mead</b></li> <li>• <b>Nuffield Sites</b></li> <li>• <b>Kassam Stadium and Ozone Leisure complex</b></li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unipart</li> <li>• Northern Gateway</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Details of the size, marketing, servicing and the management of the spaces should be set out in an affordable workspace strategy.</u></b></p> <p><b>The City Council will work proactively and collaboratively with any developers on any sites where they would like to promote the delivery of affordable workspace in their development.</b></p> <p><b>The details of the affordable workspace strategy including the size, management and servicing of the space will be secured through a Section 106 agreement to the satisfaction of the local planning authority.”</b></p>
3) That the Council reassesses the list of Local Centres and locations not included in the list against the definition to see whether more locations can be included in this and future Local Plans.	No	<p>Local Centres have been identified in several previous Local Plans. In drafting the Local Plan 2040, we considered whether any additional ones should be added. We were alert to the NPPF definition of a local centre being clear that it can't just include a parade of shops that serve only the immediate area.</p> <p>Also important to this consideration was the policy approach that applies to local centres (and district centres and the city centre), which is that there should be an area of active frontage notable in the street and that should be protected as an area of activity.</p> <p>We also looked at maps of access to facilities and services and considered where this was lacking. These considerations led us to add Underhill Circus to the list of local centres, as this is a clear focal point with an active frontage which serves a fairly wide area. Other areas of shops were considered, including for example around Hollow Way and Magdalen Road. However, these were</p>

		considered to be stretching the definition quite far, because they have small collections of units which are spread out and which do not create a focal point, which do not obviously serve a wider area and which do not create a strong active frontage.
4) That the Council clarifies the definition of a Local Centre within the draft Local Plan to aid understanding as to why some areas are not defined as such, in the event that recommendation 3 is not accepted for the current draft Local Plan.	No	<p>The glossary of the Local Plan currently includes this definition:</p> <p><b>“Local centres</b> - Local centres include a range of small shops of a local nature, serving a small catchment. Typically, local centres might include, amongst other shops, a small supermarket, a newsagent, a sub-post office and a pharmacy. Other facilities could include a hot-food takeaway and launderette. Small parades of shops of purely neighbourhood significance are not classified as local centres.”</p> <p>It is considered that this is a full definition as requested.</p>
5) That the Council clarifies the way in which housing numbers on sites are presented within the draft Local Plan, to make clear that the minimum number of dwellings to be delivered which are stated within policies are in addition to the number of existing dwellings on those sites.	Yes	<p>We have tried to make this clear on applicable sites, however we will check and ensure that this is clear on every site with existing housing.</p> <p>We also propose an additional sentence for clarity to the third paragraph in the introduction of the chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>“Housing numbers are expressed as a minimum net-gain. This means that sites with existing housing will be expected to re-provide the equivalent numbers and also the minimum stated in the policy as a net-gain.</u> The minimum number shall be exceeded where it is possible to do so consistent with the other policies in the Plan. The homes should be delivered as general market and affordable housing in accordance with Policy H2 unless it is expressly stated in the site allocation policy that student accommodation or employer-linked affordable</p>

		housing are suitable on the site. Other specialist forms of housing will be considered on their merits.”
6) That the Council amends the narrative around Templars Square and related Policy SPS12 to highlight the current significance and significant future potential of the site, more broadly than just the provision of housing, to a large number of people and communities across a large area of the City beyond Cowley alone – stressing the importance of redevelopment and reinvigoration of the site.	Yes	We propose adding to the opening paragraph of the supporting text of Policy SPS12 to read:  “Templars Square is within the Cowley Centre district centre and provides a varied retail and commercial offer which serves a local and wider catchment area. Residential apartments are also provided across the site, including at Hockmore Tower. Templars Square plays an important role in serving the local and wider community. <u>Redevelopment provides a significant opportunity for this part of the city</u> ”.
7) That the Council reviews the ward names used within the draft Local Plan to ensure that they correctly reflect the current wards of the City.	Yes	We’ll make sure they are all up to date before the document is published.
8) That the Council produces a list of changes between the Local Plan 2036 and Local Plan 2040 to publish alongside the Local Plan 2040 for public consumption.	Yes	We have updated the Local Plan <a href="#">website</a> to make it easy to work through the main sections of the document (e.g. housing) and read what the Local Plan 2036 did, and where the Local Plan 2040 intends to build on this. We hope this will provide the function and readability intended.