

Council

Local Plan Debate – Process for submitting amendments

Opposition Group Amendments

Deadline: These must be received by Committee and Members Services before 1.00pm on two working days before the meeting (Wednesday, 21st January 2026), and preferably earlier than that.

These are considered as substantive amendments to the submitted Local Plan and must be available in advance. These are published in the briefing note.

These must be discussed with the Director of Planning and Regulatory Services and include his commentary before Committee and Members Services will accept these for publication.

Minor amendments, or individual amendments, arising as a result of the debate on opposition group proposals

Deadline: These must be set out clearly and legibly **on the form** (below) and emailed to Committee and Member Services in advance and by no later than **15 minutes before the start of this section of the debate**.

These must be discussed with the Director of Planning and Regulatory Services before acceptance for debate. The Director of Planning and Regulatory Services will review these and decide if an amendment is minor and can be taken; or substantive and cannot be taken at this late stage. His decision is final.

Council needs to be clear what is being suggested along with the implications for the budget so the form should set out

- What is proposed and why;
- Impact on the Local Plan;
- Commencement and duration of the proposal.

Amendments will be taken in the order given to Committee and Member Services.

Debating minor/ individual amendments

These are taken separately or in groups as appropriate

1. Lord Mayor calls the amendment number
2. the amendment is taken as read – so the proposer and seconder should only speak briefly
3. the Lord Mayor will take one speaker from each Group.
4. If the seconder has not already spoken, they can do so.
5. Cabinet Member responds.
6. Proposer sums up.
7. Vote.

Proposer _____

Seconded _____

What is proposed

Amendment 1

In Policy C7,

Replace each usage of "Oxfordshire County Council's Parking Standards for New Developments (as shown in Appendix 7.4)" with "Appendix 7.4".

At end of paragraph beginning "Cycle parking should be well designed..." add sentence "Cycle parking design should comply with LTN 1/20 "Cycle Infrastructure Design" section 11.4, "Cycle parking types and dimensions".

In Appendix 7.4,

Delete "Hotel/Guest Houses" from the "Residential" section (duplicate of the C1 Hotels row below)

In table row "C1 Hotels", after "1 cycle space per 5 car-parking spaces provided", add ", or 1 space per 5 non-resident staff plus 1 space per resident staff, whichever is greater".

After "F.1 Non-residential institutions (education, art gallery, museum, public library, public exhibition hall, place of worship, law courts)" add ", other than primary/junior schools, senior/secondary schools and non-residential higher/further education "

Add table row "F.1 Primary/junior schools: 1 space per 5 pupils, plus 1 space per 3 staff"

Add table row "F.1 Senior/secondary schools: 1 space per 2 pupils, plus 1 space per 3 staff"

Add table row "F.1 Non-residential higher/further education: 1 space per 2 students (based on anticipated peak number of students on-site at any one time) Plus 1 space per 5 staff"

Replace each instance of "1 space 50sqm" with "1 space per 50sqm" and "1 space 4 staff" with "1 space per 4 staff" (typos)

Officer response: The approach currently taken in the Local Plan is to use the County Council's cycle parking standards. This was considered to be a good approach, working with a partner and being able to rely on the County's background work which supports those standards. This should mean that the examination of the currently drafted standards goes smoothly. It should be noted that the standards as drafted are already framed as minimum standards. Officers are grateful for the spotting of typographical errors and will correct those prior to publication.

Should Council be minded to support this amendment, officers will need to prepare additional evidence and justification to support those changes in advance of the examination.

Amendment 2

In policy H6, add "d) The merger or combination of two or more dwellings that have previously been used as a single dwelling"

And re-letter subsequent list items accordingly.

Officer response: officers consider that this proposed amendment would weaken the policy by allowing the loss of dwellings currently protected. It would likely lead to the creation of some very large and very expensive homes in parts of the city where former villas have been converted into flats over time. Every year the City Council monitors and reports on loss of dwellings in the Authority Monitoring Report, losses which would be permissible under the amendment would have a clear impact in our monitoring of homes within the city. The policy as drafted is tightly worded to ensure that only a minimal level of loss of homes is permitted and only in specific circumstances where that loss would secure a community benefit. It is not considered that the creation of a single larger home (even if this is a reversion) is a community benefit like the others identified in the policy. Further to this, such a weakening of the policy would be harmful to the work to demonstrate that the City Council is doing everything possible to maximise housing capacity within the city. We are actively trying to find capacity for as many new homes as possible within the city and yet still are reliant on our neighbours to provide for a large number of homes towards our unmet need. In this context we do need to demonstrate that we are actively seeking to prevent loss of existing homes. Preventing loss of existing dwellings helps demonstrate that we are serious about attempting to maximise housing capacity within the city.

However, should Council be minded to support this amendment officers would need to assemble evidence and justification for this change in order to support it at examination.

Reason

Amendment 1: Cycle Parking Standards

Reasoning: to ensure that no categories of development have lower cycle parking requirements than under the existing Local Plan 2036.

Amendment 2: Merger of previously-divided dwellings

Reasoning: in certain circumstances, a person who has divided a dwelling, for example to separately accommodate a carer as an alternative to an annex or lodging within the main dwelling, can be left unable to restore it to its original state by policy H6, which prohibits most loss of dwellings. By permitting re-merging of previously split dwellings we hope to prevent people from becoming trapped by this corner case, while keeping such dwelling merges rare because relatively few dwellings have ever been split, and merging is a relatively expensive way to gain living space compared to relocating.

We also note that "loss" of dwellings via merger is much less significant than actual loss of living space to a different use or demolition, similar to how actual gain of new dwellings is more socially valuable than subdividing existing stock to cause technical gain of dwellings. The constraint that "The scale and nature of the proposed use is compatible with neighbouring uses and with the surrounding area" remains in operation.

