

## **Addendum for Planning & Regulation Committee 17<sup>th</sup> July 2023**

### **Report by the Director of Planning, Environment and Climate Change (Agenda Item 5 (Didcot Garden Town HIF 1 Scheme))**

#### **Further Representations Received**

Since the committee report was published, ten further representations in objection have been received. The issues raised in these objections were:

- The proposal would adversely affect the village of Appleford;
- The information submitted does not materially address the very serious negative impacts on the residents of Appleford in respect of noise, vibration, pollution, air pollution and traffic danger;
- The proposal would have a significant adverse effect on residents along Main Road and Chambrai Close in Appleford;
- The development would create permanent noise damage in Appleford at the price of providing a new trunk road from the A34 at Didcot;
- The elevated road over the Appleford Sidings will present particular noise risks. Have these been investigated ?
- There is an increase in air pollution in Appleford due to the elevated road and significant visual intrusion
- Appleford Parish Council has shown that there are alternative routes for the road and the applicant has declined to consider this alternative
- The development would have a devastating effect on the environment
- The development would take place at a prohibitive cost to the taxpayer
- The development would undermine the County Council's net-zero commitments
- Concern over the rationale for the project being to deliver thousands of homes in the local area
- The application undermines the County Council's transport commitments and will result in more traffic
- The development will cause unacceptable damage to the natural environment
- The application is a risky financial gamble with public funds
- The development will not solve rush-hour traffic congestion
- The development will have a detrimental impact on residents in terms of noise and pollution
- The LTCP finds that road schemes generate new demand and are not a sustainable long-term solution for Oxfordshire's transport network. It states that new roads should only be considered in exceptional circumstances
- The road scheme would generate at least 500,000 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>. The County Council's own operations cause about 13,000 tonnes per year. This will completely undermine the County Council's commitment to reaching net zero.
- The extra traffic generated will add to congestion and pollution
- HIF1 would also lead inevitably to major traffic congestion and disruption for neighbouring villages and towns. OCC's traffic modelling has always been seriously flawed since it was first presented to us by an OCC Planner, as being a road to support local housing rather than a major arterial road

between the A34 and the M40 with hundreds of Heavy Goods Vehicles passing every day. HIF1 conflicts with OCC's own Local Transport and Connectivity Plan, which states "it is NOT a sustainable solution for Oxfordshire's transport network". It also conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework and the DoT's Transport Analysis Guidance.

- Infrastructure funding should be spent on bus and train services or supporting safer cycling and walking
- There has been no consideration of alternatives including those presented by affected Parish Councils
- The scheme will impact hundreds of Oxfordshire residents at a time when OCC pushes LTNs in Oxford to reduce noise and improve air quality for its residents
- The applicant has not accurately quantified the carbon emissions linked to the development
- There has been no proper consideration of the environmental consequences of the development, the impact on residents from noise and pollution, and the costs of the scheme.
- The application should be refused and alternatives should be looked at which are better for the environment and residents.

#### Officer Response:

These points are noted although are considered to repeat concerns raised and addressed in the assessments provide in the Officer's report to the Planning & Regulatory Committee.

#### **Further representations from The Neighbouring Parish Councils Joint Committee**

The Neighbouring Parish Councils Joint Committee (NPCJC) wrote to your officers on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2023, stating its view that there is considerable outstanding information required to satisfy the requirements of the EIA Regulations 2017. It stated that some examples of the missing information are as follows:

- Alternatives Options Appraisal as required by the DfT webTAG 2014 and later guidance
- Revised traffic modelling incorporating induced traffic, and management options; and re-scoped to include missing communities e.g. Abingdon and Nuneham Courtenay
- Routing option appraisals assessing environmental, noise, health and air quality impacts on adjacent communities
- Corrected Landscape and Visual Appraisal to meet webTAG 2014 definitions
- Failure to demonstrate bridge design to meet NPPF paragraph 16 and 157
- Corrected noise analyses based on local noise monitoring to meet the requirements of the Noise Policy Statement for England 2010, PPG 2019, and BS 8233:2014; and recognising DEFRA's Noise Action Plan Important Areas along the scheme's proposed route
- Reconciliation of the scheme with OCC's LTCP 2022

- Required full Health Impact Assessment as guidance from Public Health England and guided by the NPPF and PPGs and required by the LTCP 2022
- Full Climate Change Position Statement to meet Policy 27 of the LTCP and the requirements of the EIA Regulations

The NPCJC stated that notwithstanding the exchanges under Regulation 25 requests, considerable information remains outstanding and uncorrected in the Environmental Statement. The Parish Council states that in the absence of a compliant Environmental Statement, the application fails to comply with the EIA Regulations and therefore planning permission cannot lawfully be granted.

The NPCJC wrote to your officers on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2023 acknowledging the existence of documents provided by the applicant in relation to the Environment Statement. The NPCJC consider that the new documents provided in relation to the Environment Statement should be subject to the EIA Regulations 2017 and be regarded as new environmental information that should be subject to the statutory publicity period

#### Officer Response:

Officers acknowledge the comments of the NPCJC although concluded that the information provided was clarification to the information previously submitted and subject to the statutory publicity period for EIA planning applications. As the information related to points of clarification and was not considered to be further or additional environmental information, a further statutory publicity period was not required. Officers consider therefore that the EIA Regulations 2017 have been complied with in reporting the application for determination by the Planning & Regulatory Committee on 17 July 2023.

The NPCJC wrote further correspondence to your officers on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2023 with a review of the published Officer's report. A complete copy of this review is appended to this addendum. The key points raised are as follows:

- The language used in relation to the availability of funding for the HIF1 scheme is not appropriate or impartial, objective or reasoned by bringing attention to an immaterial financial consideration that members are immediately advised to ignore when determining the planning application;
- Paragraph 7 recommends approval subject to referral to the Secretary of State for consideration as to whether the application should be called-in for their own determination. No explanation is given as to why this application requires referral to the Secretary of State;
- The report does not address Green Belt matters until para 275 treating it on par with key issues rather than as a matter of national significance and importance which is the reason for a referral to the Secretary of State in the event of the application being approved;
- The advice to Members on Green Belt is confusing, contradictory and misleading. The NPCJC do not agree with the very special circumstances presented in the report and that they are sufficient to address the application constituting inappropriate development in the Green Belt;
- There is no specific policy support for the HIF1 scheme other than the relevant Local Plans safeguarding land for it. The NPCJC consider that the fact that the

land is safeguarded does not mean that strong support should be afforded to the principle of development as set out in paragraph 94 of the officer's report. The NPCJC considers that the principle of development should be afforded only limited weight in view of publication of the latest iteration of the NPPF and the Council's LTCP that post-dated the adoption of the relevant Local Plans;

- The Officer's Report fails to report the full extent of the District Councils' concerns on the design and layout of parts of the proposal. Despite the views of the District Council's professional officers, the officer's report considers the design of the proposal to be in accordance with relevant design policy;
- The NPCJC concur with the comments raised by Councillor Hicks in relation to the LTCP not being adequately referred to in the report including reference to key targets such as replacing or removing 1 out of every 4 current car trips in Oxfordshire by 2030;
- The officer's report fails to report that the accuracy of the noise assessment has been challenged;
- The assessment of the impact on landscape and biodiversity are not convincing and are downplayed;
- Members do not have the benefit of fully drafted or agreed conditions, which conflicts with the requirements of the NPPF;
- The report fails to report significant findings of the Climate Change Commission (CCC) published in June 2023;
- The assertion that the scheme would lead to an overall carbon saving is wholly unsupported by the evidence;
- A Health Impact Assessment should have submitted;
- Misunderstanding of previous responses referring to a recent CPO Inspector's Report. The point being made is that the application runs the risk of not being fully delivered due to economic uncertainties at a local and national level;
- Concluding section of the report is highly unsatisfactory in terms of how the balance has been applied and the weighting afforded to identified conflicts.

#### Officer Response:

The comments from the NPCJC are noted. Having reviewed the comments, the points in relation to the LTCP are addressed in further detail in this addendum report in the response to the comments submitted by Councillor Hicks including amendments the Officer's Report.

To confirm why the application would need to be referred to the Secretary of State if approved, this is a requirement of the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2021 that under section 10 states that the direction applies where a local planning authority does not propose to refuse an application for planning permission to which this direction applies, the authority shall consult with the Secretary of State as to whether they want to call the application in for their decision. The direction lists the matters to which the Secretary of State should be consulted, which under section 4 includes inappropriate development in the Green Belt that would have a significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt, which is the case in respect of this planning application.

With respect to planning conditions, details of those proposed are included in the report and it is clear what each one is intended to do. The final wording remains to be agreed subject to any requirements stipulated by members of the committee if they resolve to grant planning permission, which is standard practice to delegate to the relevant senior officer. The Committee can also decide to require the final set of conditions to be brought back to another meeting meaning that there are sufficient procedural controls in place for conditions to be imposed that meet the NPPF requirements.

The other points raised are, in the view of officers, a different view on how planning judgments are applied on the various issues in the report. No new issues are raised that require the report to be amended and it will be a matter for members of the committee to apply their own judgements and weighting when making their decision on the application.

### **Representations from County Councillor**

County Councillor Charlie Hicks has commented on the officer's report summarised as follows:

1. the omission of reference to LTCP Policy 36 (Road Schemes), and specifically no reference to the policy to use "decide and provide" traffic modelling policy for new road schemes;
2. the misrepresentation of LTCP's position on the requirement of road schemes (the officer report claims the LTCP makes it clear that road schemes "will" be required, whereas the LTCP only says road schemes "may be required");
3. the omission of reference to headline LTCP targets on car use reduction despite that the transport assessment of this scheme predicts this will take us further away from the target.

#### **1 . Omission of Policy 36 (Road Schemes) "decide and provide" policy**

Policy 36 in the LTCP is the only specific policy in the LTCP on road schemes and is not mentioned explicitly anywhere in the officer report. Key in Policy 36 (parts b, d, and e) is that it is the council's policy to use "decide and provide" traffic modelling for new road schemes and to promote the use of "decide and provide" modelling for new developments. There is no mention of "decide and provide" modelling in the HIF1 planning application report. Rather, the traffic modelling that has been used (which is referenced throughout and underpins the case for the project) appears to be the 'predict and provide' modelling approach (i.e. the model predicts future demand based on historic levels of car trips), which the County Council explicitly says in the LTCP is not to be used for new road schemes.

To quote the LTCP: "*To ensure that any road schemes align with our transport vision, we will take a 'decide and provide' approach rather than the traditional 'predict and provide' approach.*" (page 105).

#### **2. Misrepresentation of the LTCP's position on road schemes**

I believe there is a factual inaccuracy in the planning application report regarding the strength of language used in how the LTCP's position on road schemes is represented. The planning application report says:

- in Part 4, para 136: "*the LTCP also identifies that there are situations where new road schemes and road capacity enhancements **will** be required*", and
- In Part 4, para 158 (the summary of Impact on Car Travel): "*The LTCP is clear that, despite the objective of reducing car use, there **will** continue to be situations where new road schemes and road capacity enhancements are required*"

On cross-referencing with the LTCP, there is no language that road schemes or road capacity enhancements "will" be required. The strongest language that is used is that "*road schemes **may** be required*" (see LTCP pages 105-107).

Along the same theme, in Part 4 (Assessment and Conclusions), paragraphs 88, 89, and 94 all appear to conflict with LTCP Policy 36, specifically to promote the 'decide and provide' approach to new developments (Policy 36, parts d and e). Put simply, the advice given by officers in these paragraphs is that new developments are assumed to be highly car-dependent, which is the antithesis of the 'decide and provide' approach.

Furthermore, Part 4 paragraphs 149 and 153 demonstrate how the 'decide and provide' approach has not been followed in this application.

### ***3. Omission of assessing the impact of the scheme against headline LTCP targets***

Tables on page 61, 62 and 63 in Appendix F show the AM (i.e. morning), Interpeak and PM (i.e. afternoon) peak counts of the traffic model used for HIF1 and show an increase in car traffic flows by around 42% in 2034 compared to 2020.

#### Officer response to Councillor Hicks's criticisms of the report

##### Point 1:

##### Supplementary Information to Paragraph 136:

Paragraph 136 of the committee report advises members that the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP), whilst not part of the development plan, is a material planning consideration. The paragraph explains that the LTCP sets a clear vision to deliver a net-zero transport and travel system in Oxfordshire and aims to enable the county to thrive whilst protecting the environment and improving quality of life. The LTCP seeks to achieve this through reducing the need to travel, discouraging private vehicle journeys and making sustainable and active travel the natural first choice. The LTCP includes a number of policies which it is stated are necessary to achieve this, including prioritising active and sustainable modes, improvements to public rights of way and green infrastructure, supporting healthy place-shaping and carbon reduction measures, and bus, rail and digital connectivity strategies.

Supplementary to the advice in the report, members are also advised that the LTCP includes headline targets. The targets are as follows:

By 2030:

- Replace or remove 1 out of every 4 current car trips in Oxfordshire
- Increase the number of cycle trips in Oxfordshire from 600,000 to 1 million cycle trips per week
- Reduce road fatalities or life changing injuries by 50%

By 2040:

- Deliver a net-zero transport network
- Replace or remove an additional 1 out of 3 car trips in Oxfordshire

By 2050:

- Deliver a transport network that contributes to a climate positive future
- Have zero, or as close as possible, road fatalities or life-changing injuries

Members are also advised that Policy 36 of the LTCP specifically refers to new road schemes. Policy 36 of the LTCP states that:

*“We will:*

- Only consider road capacity schemes after all other options have been explored.*
- Where appropriate, adopt a decide and provide approach to manage and develop the county’s road network.*
- Assess opportunities for traffic reduction as part of any junction or road route improvement schemes.*
- Require transport assessments accompanying planning applications for new development to follow the County Council’s ‘Implementing ‘Decide & Provide’: Requirements for Transport Assessments’ document.*
- Promote the use of the ‘decide and provide’ approach in planning policy development to support site assessment”.*

TDC advises that, as a Highway Authority, OCC must develop its strategies and schemes, as guided by all relevant National, Regional and Local policies at the time. There is a significant amount of time that passes between the inception of a large-scale infrastructure scheme, such as HIF1, through to its completion.

The inception of the HIF1 scheme started prior to the current LTCP, under the LTP4 2015-31. In Part 2 of this plan, the transport priorities for Science Vale were to improve access to the key employment sites and enable their economic growth, to plan ahead to manage the impact of future housing growth on the transport network and to improve connectivity between employment, services and areas of housing growth.

One of the main ways to achieving this was to improve opportunities for sustainable travel, on foot, by bike and using public transport to help to deliver a real step-change in the provision of alternative modes of travel to the car and therefore improving journeys across Science Vale.

Below are the relevant proposals that were identified in the Science Vale Area Strategy under LTP4 Part 2:

SV 2.1: Upgrade the cycle network and undertake maintenance on the existing network;

SV 2.2: Secure new bus services with associated infrastructure and improve existing bus services;

SV 2.6: Deliver the Didcot Science Bridge and widening of A4130 to relieve the already identified pressures on Manor Bridge and support the delivery of the allocated Didcot A and Valley Park Developments;

SV 2.13: Improve access to Culham Science Centre (Clifton Hampden Bypass);

SV 2.14: Promote schemes to provide relief to villages within Science Vale which are affected by high levels of through traffic.

SV 2.16: Deliver the Didcot to Culham river crossing; and

SV 2.21 and SV 2.22: Provide strategic cycle network to encourage the use of sustainable transport

During the drafting of the LTCP, each of these proposals were reviewed to ensure their concurrence with the emerging LTCP policies. In adopting the LTCP, the underlying principles of the LTP4 Science Vale Area Strategy are represented and the HIF1 Scheme is part of a wider strategic strategy, which is required to mitigate the impact of existing allocated growth across the Science Vale Area.

Importantly, the HIF1 Scheme was included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plans (IDPs) for both the SODC LP 2035 and VoWHDC Local Plan 2031 (Parts 1 and 2). The IDPs area wide impacts were modelled through the Evaluation of Transport Impacts to inform the evidence base of these plans, which were found to be sound by the Inspectorate.

As required by Policy 36 a), OCC undertook a stringent Assessment of the Alternatives, which are detailed in Chapter 3 of the ES. DfT guidance was followed throughout the optioneering process and all Options Assessment Reports (OAR) detail the rigorous Early Assessment Sifting that was undertaken for a range of various options. These options were publicly consulted on in November 2018, with a revised OAR taking into account an updated evidence base and options, including the consideration of multi-modal options, being produced.

The HIF1 Scheme is designed to improve access to future housing and employment growth in the local area, including access by walking, cycling and public transport. The Scheme is policy backed and is the cornerstone of mitigation for the planned growth in the area. The Scheme does not aim to provide unlimited highway capacity for cars, or to remove all congestion; it forms part of a balanced transport strategy which also provides high-quality walking and cycling infrastructure, helping to engender modal shift to more sustainable modes.

Whilst the modelling for HIF1 does not explicitly follow the methodology outlined in OCC's *'Implementing Decide and Provide – Requirements for Transport Assessments'*, noting that this was only adopted after the HIF1 planning application was submitted, it does contain 'Decide and Provide' principles within it that Highways Officers have deemed acceptable and in adherence to Policy 36 of the LTCP.

In the 2034 future year, the applicant decided that the model only assumes an 80% demand for all new growth on the network. In justifying this decision, the applicant, in agreement with OCC, assume that:

- Didcot Garden Town principles will continue to be enacted in this area over the next 14 years, increasing the usage of sustainable modes of travel.
- All new developments will benefit from ensuring active travel infrastructure is provided at the earliest stage of a development's build out, thus encouraging a step change towards active travel.
- The largest new development sites follow good spatial strategies and are in more sustainable locations near public transport hubs and / or are located nearer the growing employment areas – Didcot Gateway, Valley Park.
- Recently accepted trip rates as given planning permission at Didcot NE and Valley Park were lower than those used in the modelling and therefore a demand reduction is justified.

This emphasises the fact that the HIF1 planning application has not modelled for 100% of demand at residential development sites. It has planned for growth in active travel modes such as walking and cycling, as well as increased public transport use, to help to reduce the demand on the highway network and therefore traffic levels, by 'deciding' to assume this 20% reduction.

Point 2

#### Amendment to Paragraph 136

Paragraph 136 of the committee report includes a sentence that reads:

*"However, the LTCP also identifies that there are situations where new road schemes and road capacity enhancements will be required, albeit that these will be considered where all other options, including options for traffic reduction, have been explored"*

This sentence is replaced with the following text:

*"The LTCP also states that alongside managing the existing network, Oxfordshire County Council is also responsible for overseeing the delivery of new highways infrastructure. Whilst the County Council's priority, as set out in the LTCP, is on reducing car use and the need to travel, it is recognised in the LTCP that in some cases new roads, or widening roads and junctions may be necessary, to ensure a reliable and effective transport network. The LTCP notes that road schemes often generate new demand and quickly reach capacity again, and therefore concludes that road schemes are therefore not a sustainable long-term solution for Oxfordshire's transport network. The LTCP therefore outlines a new approach to the development of road schemes to ensure they contribute towards delivery of the LTCP vision and do not reinforce traditional transport planning approaches"*

#### Amendment to Paragraph 158

Paragraph 158 of the committee report states the following:

*“Taking all of the above into account, the development is considered to have a positive effect on enabling active and sustainable travel modes through the provision of new infrastructure for walkers and cyclists, and through reduced journey times and new infrastructure for buses. The LTCP is clear that, despite the objective of reducing car use, there will continue to be situations where new road schemes and road capacity enhancements are required. The proposed development is essential in enabling planned housing and employment growth to come forward without creating gridlock on the highway network and is listed in Appendix 1 to the LTCP as a key project being delivered as part of the Science Vale Area Strategy. Furthermore, it is one part of a wider strategy for managing movement by all modes in the Science Vale area and it has the support of TDC”.*

Paragraph 158 is amended to read as follows:

*“The LTCP acknowledges that, despite the objective of reducing car use, there may continue to be situations where new road schemes and road capacity enhancements may be required and Policy 36 of the LTCP states that new roads schemes will only be considered where all other options have been explored. The proposed development is essential in enabling planned housing and employment growth to come forward without creating gridlock on the highway network and is listed in Appendix 1 to the LTCP as a key project being delivered as part of the Science Vale Area Strategy. Furthermore, it is one part of a wider strategy for managing movement by all modes in the Science Vale area and it has the support of TDC. Therefore, the road scheme is considered to be necessary to ensure a reliable and effect transport network”.*

Point 3:

Councillor Hicks states:

*‘Tables on page 61, 62 and 63 in Appendix F show the AM (i.e. morning), Interpeak and PM (i.e. afternoon) peak counts of the traffic model used for HIF1 and show an increase in car traffic flows by around 42% in 2034 compared to 2020’.*

Firstly, the TDC Officer queries how the figure of 42% was reached and exactly what figures were used. Having looked over the same tables in Appendix F and using the Final Demand Totals in Tables 30 and 32 (which are for the AM and PM peak, noting that it is not standard practice to use the interpeak demands), they have not been able to ascertain how this figure was reached and whether it is the AM or PM peak hour that is referred to.

The TDC officer does not dispute the figures that Councillor Hicks has used, as referred to below:

*‘Of note, it says that in 2034, assuming the 15,825 units and 747,446 sqm of commercial floorspace are built out, an additional 19,588 car journeys would be expected on the network in each AM peak period and 21,048 in the PM*

*peak this is contrasted against a 2020 scenario of around 50,000 car journeys. (N.B. This excludes any HGV/LGV flows)'.*

Nevertheless, the TDC officer wishes to clarify that these additional extra trips on the network are not generated by the HIF1 Scheme, however, they are as a result of the Local Plans' allocated sites (some of which already have planning consent and have been implemented). Simply saying that the '*...42% increase in traffic flows...that are enabled by the road*' will make '*...it significantly more difficult to meet our 2030 and 2040 targets on car trip reduction in Oxfordshire*' is misleading.

What the HIF1 Scheme does, is ensure that there is a strategically planned transport network for all modes of transport, whilst taking into account the significant amount of planned growth in the area. The scheme provides very high-quality walking and cycling infrastructure, which helps to engender modal shift.

The TDC officer acknowledges that planning for the future is a challenge and as a Highway Authority the county council has to make decisions that are as robust as possible to a range of different possible futures. They are of the view that the HIF1 infrastructure allows this to happen and will create a transport network that is significantly better for active travel, resilient to adapting to ever changing policies and safe for all road users.

Councillor Hicks also provided and requested by way of e-mail received on 12<sup>th</sup> July that his formal objection and attached annex be circulated to all members of the committee prior to the meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> July. These are appended to this addendum.

### **Withdrawal of an objection**

The agent of FCC, owner of the old landfill at Sutton Courtney and other land interests that form part of the land required for the scheme subject to the application, formally withdraw their objection.

FCC can now advise that they support the principle of the application and withdraw their objection contingent to their concerns being addressed through the detailed design stage of the scheme and amendments to proposed conditions. In response, amendments are proposed to conditions as set out as follows:

#### **Amendment to Condition 3:**

Condition 3 states that:

*"Submission of Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) prior to commencement of each part of the development to be approved in writing by the CPA."*

The above wording is deleted and replaced with the following amended Condition 3:

*"Submission of Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) prior to commencement of each part of the development to be approved in writing by the CPA. This shall include reference to relevant accesses being maintained during the*

*construction period as well as details for how any settlement issues relating to restored landfill cells would be mitigated. ”*

Amendment to Condition 19:

Condition 19 states that:

*“Detailed surface water drainage scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the CPA prior to the commencement of each part of the development.”*

The above wording is deleted and replaced with the following amended Condition 19:

*“Detailed surface water drainage scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the CPA prior to the commencement of each part of the development. This will include reference to road drainage not discharging into the site’s surface water infrastructure.”*

Amendment to Condition 30:

Condition 30 states that:

*“No development to take place within the Didcot to Culham River Crossing section of the development until revised restoration and aftercare schemes have been submitted to and approved in writing by the CPA for Sutton Courtenay Landfill Site”.*

The above wording is deleted and replaced with the following amended Condition 30:

*“No development to take place within the Didcot to Culham River Crossing section of the development until revised restoration and aftercare schemes including relocation of existing monitoring boreholes have been submitted to and approved in writing by the CPA for Sutton Courtenay Landfill Site”.*

**Other Amendment to the report**

Amendment to Paragraph 230:

Paragraph 230 of the committee report includes a sentence that reads:

*“All Oxfordshire Local Authorities have declared a climate emergency in recognition of climate change, adding weight to policies that seek to reduce carbon emissions and protect against the effects of climate change”.*

The above sentence in paragraph 230 is deleted and replaced with the following text:

*“All Oxfordshire Local Authorities have either declared a climate emergency or acknowledged it in recognition of climate change, adding weight to policies that seek to reduce carbon emissions and protect against the effects of climate change. On 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2019, the County Council acknowledged a climate emergency and call for action; pledged to make Oxfordshire County Council carbon neutral by 2030, taking*

*account of both production and consumption emissions; agreed to call on Westminster to provide the powers and resources to make the 2030 target possible; to continue to work with partners across the county and region to deliver this new goal through all relevant strategies; and report to Council within six months with the actions the Council will take to address this emergency”.*