

## Supplementary Papers

### Oxfordshire Growth Board

To be held virtually on Tuesday, 28 July 2020 at 1.30 pm

The reports marked 'to follow' on the agenda published 15 July are attached. Please have these available along with the main agenda pack.

3. **Public participation** (Pages 193 - 196)

Three public questions and two public addresses received

4. **Growth Board Scrutiny Panel update** (Pages 197 - 205)

To receive the report and recommendations from the Growth Board Scrutiny Panel meeting held on Wednesday 22 July 2020.

# Public speakers

28 July 2020



## Questions

### 1. Charlie Hicks

To each board member, ask yourself: How old am I? How old will I be in 2050?

My name is Charlie, I'm 25. Born in the JR in May 1995. I grew up here, did my undergrad here, spent a few years in London and now I'm back living here. At university I was lucky enough to visit Silicon Valley and learn the best way to think like a designer - just like Apple, Google, Uber and the like. If Oxford - Cambridge and Oxfordshire within that is to become the 'Silicon Arc', it would probably be wise to adopt some thinking from California.

The context of the question is this:

What is the purpose of this group of people? What power do you hold between you? What will be impacted by the decisions you make? *Who* will be impacted by the decisions you make?

Good design principles fit for the 21st century - used by all the best tech companies in the world - always start with one thing: the user. The user is the person or people who use the product or service that is being created. Good design *obsesses* over the user: the every last detail of their journey, their need, their context, their background, their hopes, their dreams, their desires.

Good design has core to it an overwhelming empathy for the user. An empathy that can only happen through one thing: *listening* to the user.

So, the purpose of this group is to design an Oxfordshire for 2050.

So ask yourself this:

- How old am I today?
- How old will I be in 2050?
- Who are the working-age users of Oxfordshire in 2050?
- Where are their voices in any of the work that we are doing?
- Where are their voices in any of the decisions we make?

If they - people born after 1990 - are not central to everything you do, including as a part of this group, how can you even begin to have a hope of designing a future that will work for people in 2050?

So ... how old am I? Who is this group for? How are we designing for the future?

### 2. Helen Marshal on behalf of CPRE Oxfordshire.

CPRE Oxfordshire notes that the new Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) – this time known as an Oxfordshire Growth Needs Assessment (OGNA) – is continuing behind the scenes. (Agenda Item 7e)

Given that:

- The consultants working on it are the same as those that worked on the previous inflationary growth strategy
- The terms of reference have not been made publicly available
- It is likely to be influenced by the expansionist Local Industrial Strategy, drawn up by the unelected Local Enterprise Partnership and signed off by Government without any public consultation
- An Arc-wide sales prospectus, that is also likely to set aggressive growth targets, is being prepared entirely behind closed doors

What reassurance can the Growth Board give Oxfordshire residents that it will be able to 'prioritise sustainable development and quality of life' as per its newly defined purpose?

### **3. Julia Benning on behalf of Need Not Greed Oxfordshire, (to be put in absence)**

'Need not Greed Oxfordshire notes the proposed revised Terms of Reference for the Growth Board and welcomes the steps towards including social and environmental considerations within its purpose. However, this is largely meaningless whilst the emphasis is still only on managing the impacts of growth, not informing the actual level of growth that Oxfordshire can reasonably accommodate.

Fully embracing the Doughnut Economics model for the county in the way that Amsterdam has done would greatly assist in creating an Oxfordshire that is more respectful of our environment and wildlife, desists in concreting unnecessarily and creates an economy that provides sufficient wealth to deliver services and infrastructure that sustains quality of life for most and provides significant improvements for others. It would also contribute to a more balanced regional economy, supporting the Government's levelling up agenda.

Will the Growth Board therefore:

- Amend the proposed purpose of the Board (as set out Para 1.1, Appendix 1, Agenda Item 5) to seek only sufficient economic growth to support organic population growth rather than unconstrained business expansion and jobs growth (which is widely acknowledged and evidenced as such a major contributor to the climate emergency)?
- Ensure that this principle is enshrined in any Arc-wide prospectus (Para 7, Agenda Item 10, Arc update)?
- Ensure that any such prospectus does not pre-empt the considerations of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan and is prepared in an open and transparent manner, including public consultation and debate/vote at full council meetings?
- And meanwhile ensure that the terms of reference for the OxCam Arc Leaders Group and Executive Sub-Group are subject to public debate and consultation, with no further meetings of the OxCam Arc Leaders/Chief Executives/Executive Group taking place unless such meetings are held in public (virtually, if necessary), with published agendas and minutes, and with the opportunity for members of the public to ask questions and address the Groups?

## Addresses:

### 1. Professor David Rogers, (to be put in absence)

I refer to Agenda item 10 Oxford to Cambridge Arc Update, where the Oxfordshire Growth Board Director states:

*"The Arc Leadership Executive, which met for the first time on 02 July, strongly urged this work be completed at pace; in particular, that we develop a high level prospectus, similar to other regional pitches (e.g. West Midlands <https://www.wmca.org.uk/news/32-billion-blueprint-unveiled-to-kickstart-the-west-midlands-economic-recovery/>), that we can submit to Government ahead of an anticipated Comprehensive Spending Review in the autumn."*

The regional pitch referred to – called *'Recharge the West Midlands. Kickstarting the West Midlands' Economy'* - gives a whole list of targets for jobs, houses, projects etc., many of which are 'shovel ready'.

There is not a SINGLE mention of protecting or enhancing the natural environment of the West Midlands as all this development takes place. The terms 'biodiversity', 'net gain', 'ecosystem services' and 'natural capital' are all conspicuous by their absence from the entire document.

Is this really the model for Ox-Cam Arc development that the Arc leadership wishes to follow?

### 2. Cllr Kate Gregory

News reached the Thame community about a week ago that Growth Board funding for the dedicated cycle route to Haddenham station, a joint project with Buckinghamshire, has been withdrawn.

Our understanding is that certain criteria have been applied, on the basis of which cycle routes do not qualify as infrastructure that will support the provision of new homes in Thame.

As these criteria have been defined by the Government and the county council, we would like to ask on behalf of the community of Thame that the growth board seeks more flexibility in the use of Government infrastructure funding.

In our view the cycle route does support housing delivery, as moving to Thame becomes more attractive if prospective buyers can see a safe green cycle connection directly to the station.

The dedicated cycle route from Thame to Haddenham station is not a leisure trail, but a commuter connection to our local mainline station, which is only 2 and a half miles from Thame town centre. It would also support the Thame business community, allowing easy access for shopping from Haddenham on foot and by bike.

The main roads between Thame and Haddenham are 60 mph national trunk routes with no footpaths and are extremely dangerous for cyclists who have to cut across both carriageways to reach the station.

Crucially, building this greenway would take traffic off our roads. With both Thame and Haddenham growing in size by more than a third, the saving on road improvements to handle greater volumes of traffic is substantial.

It is also the case that the funding requirement for the cycle route can be significantly reduced by choosing a route that avoids the main roundabout outside Thame, also a route which the local community prefers.

An online survey on the Haddenham and Thame Greenway was conducted between 25th November and 9th December 2019, which received a total of 2012 responses. The responses showed overwhelming support for the project, a summary of the results has been published online:

[www.buckscc.gov.uk/services/transport-and-roads/cycling-and-walking/new-walking-and-cycling-routes/haddenham-and-thame-greenway](http://www.buckscc.gov.uk/services/transport-and-roads/cycling-and-walking/new-walking-and-cycling-routes/haddenham-and-thame-greenway)

Please consider our request on behalf of both Thame and Haddenham to renegotiate with those who made this decision and find a way to invest your board's funds in a high-profile, green and popular project.

Kate Gregory, (SODC and Thame Town Council), Pieter-Paul Barker (SODC Cabinet member for partnership) and David Bretherton (SODC chair and Thame Town Council)

**To:** Oxfordshire Growth Board  
**Date:** 28 July 2020  
**Report of:** Growth Board Scrutiny Panel  
**Title of Report:** Recommendations from the Scrutiny Panel meeting of 22 July 2020

<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To present recommendations from the Growth Board Scrutiny Panel meeting held on 22 July 2020 to the Growth Board.
<b>Scrutiny Lead:</b>	Councillor Andrew Gant, Chair of the Oxfordshire Growth Board Scrutiny Panel.
<b>Recommendation:</b>	That the Oxfordshire Growth Board states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in the body of this report.

### Introduction and overview

1. The Scrutiny Panel would like to thank Nigel Tipple (Chief Executive– Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership), Bev Hindle (Growth Board Director), Owen Jenkins (Director of Growth and Economy – Oxfordshire County Council), Hannah Doney (Head of Corporate Finance – Oxfordshire County Council), Stefan Robinson (Growth Board Manager), Susan Harbour (Strategic Partnerships Manager - South and Vale District Councils), Anita Bradley (Monitoring Officer – Oxford City Council) for attending the meeting to answer questions.
2. The Panel considered a report from Nigel Tipple – Chief Executive of Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership and Bev Hindle – Growth Board Director on the Covid – 19 economic recovery approach across Oxfordshire. The Panel showed its support towards collective action in line with the principles of recovery as agreed by the C40 Mayors. The Panel also debated the need to focus on renewal of economic plans rather than recovery with regards to transportation, infrastructure, environment, public health, essential workers, climate change, businesses and tourism.

**Recommendation 1: That the Growth Board, in considering its role in the Post-Covid-19 recovery, supports the principles of recovery as agreed by the C40 Mayors:**

- The recovery should not be a return to 'business as usual' - because that is a world on track for 3°C or more of over-heating;
  - The recovery, above all, must be guided by an adherence to public health and scientific expertise, in order to assure the safety of those who live in our cities;
  - Excellent public services, public investment and increased community resilience will form the most effective basis for the recovery;
  - The recovery must address issues of equity that have been laid bare by the impact of the crisis – for example, workers who are now recognised as essential should be celebrated and compensated accordingly and policies must support people living in informal settlements;
  - The recovery must improve the resilience of our cities and communities. Therefore, investments should be made to protect against future threats – including the climate crisis – and to support those people impacted by climate and health risks;
  - Climate action can help accelerate economic recovery and enhance social equity, using new technologies and the creation of new industries and new jobs. These will drive wider benefits for our residents, workers, students, businesses and visitors;
  - We commit to doing everything in our power and the power of our city governments to ensure that the recovery from COVID-19 is healthy, equitable and sustainable;
  - We commit to using our collective voices and individual actions to ensure that national governments support both cities and the investments needed in cities, to deliver an economic recovery that is healthy, equitable and sustainable;
  - We commit to using our collective voices and individual actions to ensure that international and regional institutions invest directly in cities to support a healthy, equitable and sustainable recovery.
3. The Panel also emphasised its view on the importance of science & technology industries aiding economic recovery and renewal especially those sectors contributing towards the environment and healthy living in a post Covid-19 Oxfordshire.

**Recommendation 2: That the Growth Board, in considering its role in the Post-Covid-19 recovery, champions the role of the science and technology industries in delivering economic recovery and renewal, especially where those sectors can contribute towards our local environmental and healthy living ambitions; areas that the Panel felt were not sufficiently recognised within the report presented to them.**

4. The Panel received a report from Bev Hindle – Growth Board Director on the implementation of the Growth Board Review Stage 1. On the protocol for Freedom of Information requests the Panel felt that this process should be autonomous to the input of other authorities and should not permit consultation

with other authorities in a bid for more transparency and highlighting gaps in governance as a result of differing responses.

**Recommendation 3: That the Growth Board revise its Freedom of Information Request Procedure to remove references that permit local authorities to consult other local authorities on how they intend to respond; this would ensure the responses are transparent and highlight any gaps in governance or policy related issues.**

5. The Panel requested an update from the Growth Board on the Local Nature Partnership specifically on timelines, remit and content, as this would be a part of an emerging wider environmental workstream. The Panel also would like more clarity on the conduit role of representatives to the Sub-groups and how this would be carried out within their local authorities.

**Recommendation 4: That the Growth Board provide the Scrutiny Panel with an update at its next meeting concerning the development of a Local nature Partnership for Oxfordshire**

**Recommendation 5: That the Growth Board provides clarity about how members of its Advisory Sub-Group will be expected to carry out their conduit role between that group and their local authority, as suggested in the Terms of Reference for those groups.**

6. The Panel also made a couple of requests to the Growth Board with regards to transparency and ease of access to Growth Board related meetings.

**Recommendation 6: That the Growth Board ensures that the Advisory Subgroups have access to the minutes of the Scrutiny Panel meetings.**

**Recommendation 7: That the Growth Board make visible on its website's home page how the public can register to speak at future meetings of the Board.**

7. The Panel revisited its discussion on the definitions of Affordable Housing and arrived at a conclusion that current definitions do not reflect truly affordable houses; according to NPPF affordable houses should be 80%(or lower) of market rate which could be up to 8 times annual household income, where in the current mortgage market lenders terms usually only allow for lending to be made up to 4.5 to 5 times of annual household income. The Panel would like to ask the Growth Board to further investigate this matter ensuring more realistic figures are depicted in its reports.

**Recommendation 8: That the Growth Board in its reporting for the Housing Sub-group categorise Affordable Housing in two sub-categories:**

- i) **Affordable Housing: 80% market rate (NPPF)**
- ii) **Affordable Housing: 5 x median household income (mortgage rates)**

Thus, giving the actual number of affordable houses as per the median household income in Oxfordshire.



8. The Panel also discussed the impact of housing developments in Green Belt protected areas especially in reference to Oxford City urban sprawl leading to higher risk of flooding in neighbouring rural countryside areas. The Panel emphasised the need for Flood risk areas to be revisited within the environmental issues covered in Oxfordshire Plan 2050.

**Recommendation 9: That the Growth Board in its work with Oxfordshire Plan 2050 re-examine the boundaries of Green Belt with a focus on countryside housing developments and its impact on flood risk areas.**

9. The Panel discussed the need to attract capital investment from private sector organisations to fund public Infrastructure Projects with the help of concessions and incentives. This kind of collective investment from the private sector would reduce financial pressures on these projects.

**Recommendation 10: That the Growth Board investigate ways of funding public infrastructure projects by incentivising private sector organisations in order to attract private capital investment; decreasing budgetary pressures on these projects.**

#### Future Work

10. As well as reviewing the Growth Board's response to these recommendations at its next meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> September 2020, the Panel will also be considering in detail:
- The Growth Board Review Stage 2
  - Supporting Oxfordshire's Tourism and Visitor Economy
  - Oxford-Cambridge Arc Update
  - Q1 Housing and Growth Deal Progress Report and Financial summary

<b>Report authors</b>	Councillor Andrew Gant Chair of the Growth Board Scrutiny Panel <a href="mailto:Cllragant@Oxford.gov.uk">Cllragant@Oxford.gov.uk</a>
<b>Officer contact</b>	Amit Alva Oxfordshire Growth Board Scrutiny Officer <a href="mailto:amit.alva@southandvale.gov.uk">amit.alva@southandvale.gov.uk</a>

## Growth Board Draft response to recommendations of the Growth Board Scrutiny Panel Recommendations made on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2020

The Growth Board is requested to provide a draft response to the recommendations of the Scrutiny Panel, to be published as a supplement collectively with the Scrutiny Panel's report, for decision at its meeting on 28 July 2020.

<b><i>Recommendation</i></b>	<b><i>Agree ?</i></b>	<b><i>Comment</i></b>
<p>Recommendation 1. That the Growth Board, in considering its role in the Post-Covid-19 recovery, supports the principles of recovery as agreed by the C40 Mayors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The recovery should not be a return to 'business as usual' - because that is a world on track for 3°C or more of over-heating;</li> <li>• The recovery, above all, must be guided by an adherence to public health and scientific expertise, in order to assure the safety of those who live in our cities;</li> <li>• Excellent public services, public investment and increased community resilience will form the most effective basis for the recovery;</li> <li>• The recovery must address issues of equity that have been laid bare by the impact of the crisis – for example, workers who are now recognised as essential should be celebrated and compensated accordingly and policies</li> </ul>		

<p>must support people living in informal settlements;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The recovery must improve the resilience of our cities and communities. Therefore, investments should be made to protect against future threats – including the climate crisis – and to support those people impacted by climate and health risks;</li><li>• Climate action can help accelerate economic recovery and enhance social equity, using new technologies and the creation of new industries and new jobs. These will drive wider benefits for our residents, workers, students, businesses and visitors;</li><li>• We commit to doing everything in our power and the power of our city governments to ensure that the recovery from COVID-19 is healthy, equitable and sustainable;</li><li>• We commit to using our collective voices and individual actions to ensure that national governments support both cities and the investments needed in cities, to deliver an economic recovery that is healthy, equitable and sustainable;</li><li>• We commit to using our collective voices and individual actions to ensure that international and regional institutions invest directly in cities to support a healthy, equitable and sustainable recovery.</li></ul>		
---	--	--

## Appendix 1

<p>Recommendation 2. That the Growth Board, in considering its role in the Post-Covid-19 recovery, champions the role of the science and technology industries in delivering economic recovery and renewal, especially where those sectors can contribute towards our local environmental and healthy living ambitions; areas that the Panel felt were not sufficiently recognised within the report presented to them.</p>		
<p>Recommendation 3. That the Growth Board revise its Freedom of Information Request Procedure to remove references that permit local authorities to consult other local authorities on how they intend to respond; this would ensure the responses are transparent and highlight any gaps in governance or policy related issues.</p>		
<p>Recommendation 4. That the Growth Board provide the Scrutiny Panel with an update at its next meeting concerning the development of a Local nature Partnership for Oxfordshire.</p>		
<p>Recommendation 5. That the Growth Board provides clarity about how members of its Advisory Sub-Group will be expected to carry out their conduit role between that group and their local authority, as suggested in the Terms of Reference for those groups.</p>		

## Appendix 1

<p>Recommendation 6. That the Growth Board ensures that the Advisory Subgroups have access to the minutes of the Scrutiny Panel meetings.</p>		
<p>Recommendation 7. That the Growth Board make visible on its website's home page how the public can register to speak at future meetings of the Board.</p>		
<p>Recommendation 8: That the Growth Board in its reporting for the Housing Sub-group categorise Affordable Housing in two sub-categories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i) Affordable Housing: 80% market rate (NPPF)</li><li>ii) Affordable Housing: 5 x median household income (mortgage rates)</li></ul> <p>Thus, giving the actual number of truly affordable houses as per the median household income in Oxfordshire.</p>		
<p>Recommendation 9: That the Growth Board in its work with Oxfordshire Plan 2050 re-examine the boundaries of Green Belt with a focus on countryside housing developments and its impact on flood risk areas.</p>		

## Appendix 1

Recommendation 10: That the Growth Board investigate ways of funding public infrastructure projects by incentivising private sector organisations in order to attract capital investment; decreasing budgetary pressures on these projects.		
---	--	--