

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.

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Agree?</i>	<i>Comment</i>
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>“Development proposals delivering commercial development⁴ on the following sites are expected to <u>deliver affordable workspace</u> 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARC Oxford • Oxford Science Park • Oxpens • Osney Mead • Nuffield Sites • Kassam Stadium and Ozone Leisure complex

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unipart • Northern Gateway <p><u>Details of the size, marketing, servicing and the management of the spaces should be set out in an affordable workspace strategy.</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.”</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>“Local centres - 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 website 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.