

Supplementary Papers

The Future Oxfordshire Partnership

held in the Council Chamber, Cherwell District Council, Bodicote House,
Bodicote, Banbury, OX15 4AA
on Monday, 13 June 2022 at 2.00 pm

4. **Public participation** (Pages 140 - 149)

The final responses of the Future Oxfordshire Partnership to the questions and addressed submitted to the meeting held on 13 June 2022.

5. **Future Oxfordshire Partnership Scrutiny Panel update** (Pages 150 - 155)

The final response of the Future Oxfordshire Partnership to the recommendations made by the Future Oxfordshire Scrutiny Panel at its meeting held on 7 June 2022.

Public speakers

13 June 2022

1. John Hill has asked the following question:

The Oxfordshire Plan 2050 (OP2050) Regulation 18 Part 2 Consultation contains a table (“the Table”) on Page 107 taken from the Oxford Growth Needs Assessment (“OGNA”) which shows five employment projections. In Para. 384 the Table is confusingly described as showing a “range of forecasts”.

These two descriptions of what is contained in the table are incompatible. A forecast in general terms is based on certain assumptions expected to be in place and is much firmer than a projection which is more hypothetical. A projection is often just based on following past performance. Compared to what is shown on the Table the actual growth in employment in Oxfordshire over the last decade has been sluggish so I want to know the assumptions on which the projected growth in employment is based. I am interested to know also why all the projections/ forecasts are linear in the Table.

The recent independent ORS report concerning the OGNA which has been published by Cherwell Development Watch Alliance states in Paragraph 1.10: “*Very little information is given about the assumptions or source data underlying the jobs growth scenarios and source data references are inadequate e.g., “ONS, Cambridge Econometrics”. This makes it virtually impossible to understand in any detail how the trajectories have been constructed*”.

Economic forecasting is very unreliable and one would expect similar factors to apply to the employment forecasts /projections in the Plan but what these are is not disclosed.

The Table and the projections/ forecasts are described as evidence to be used in the preparation of the Plan. As I cannot find the basis and assumptions behind these, on 26 November 2021, I contacted the Oxfordshire Plan Team (“OPT”) for their help. After months of correspondence with OPT I am no further forward.

In response I have been informed repeatedly that the information I am asking for is within the OGNA. This has remained the situation despite having sent OPT numerous lengthy and detailed emails explaining that this is not the case and they having been referred to the ORS report. I was eventually informed by email on 24 February 2022 that if I was still unhappy, I should contact the Freedom of Information Team. I am at a loss to understand why the OPT can’t/won’t answer my straightforward questions (even if they need to revert to the author of the OGNA to do so).

Can the Partnership please help me obtain answers to the following:

- What are the assumptions behind the forecasts/ projections in the Plan.
- In the Table what are projections, what are forecasts and what, such as I believe the transformational trajectory is, are targets.
- Are the projections/ forecasts still valid in view of the changed economic situation.
- Are they reliable enough to be any part of the evidence base for the Plan.

(Please see combined answer to questions 1 and 2 below)

2. David Young has asked the following question on behalf of Need Not Greed Oxfordshire

Further to the Future Oxfordshire Partnership (FOP) response to our question about the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan at its last meeting, Need not Greed Oxfordshire (NNGO) fully understands that the final decisions on housing numbers etc will be taken by individual councils. But to suggest that each individual council is separately considering an Oxfordshire Growth Needs Assessment peer review, the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 timetable and whether to undertake a third Regulation 18 Consultation seems to make no sense. The whole point of the FOP is that it co-ordinates the councils work on the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 via the Advisory Group.

We therefore ask again:

- What is the project timetable for the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan?
- What is the OP2050 team currently working on? How can they be developing a spatial strategy without agreeing the number of houses to be built?
- How will criticisms of the growth options presented in the Oxfordshire Growth Needs Assessment and the Reg 18 consultation be addressed? What assessment has the FOP/Advisory Group made of the recently published report into the OGNA by Opinion Research Services which found that *"The unjustified use of adjustments made to official projections and the Standard Method together with the lack of a conventional central economic forecast call into question the soundness of this document as supporting evidence for the development of the Oxfordshire Plan"*.
- Will the Advisory Group be recommending - as we think they should - a further Reg 18 consultation?

Although we feel our challenges are justified, we remain supportive of the principle of an Oxfordshire Plan 2050 and hope that we can work constructively with the FOP/Advisory Group to achieve a strong and robust Plan for the benefit of existing and future local residents.

Response:

We are grateful to all the members of the public who responded to last year's consultation. We have listened carefully to all of the wide-ranging views that were put forward and will continue to discuss these at the members' advisory group meetings.

David Young has asked about the timetable for the plan. I'm pleased that we have recently agreed with the Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities that we can amend the timescale, with the goal of submitting the plan to the government before the end of December 2023 to undergo a public examination. The examination timetable will then be in the hands of the inspector. This now gives us an opportunity to review the work programme and to consider whether to carry out an additional Regulation 18 consultation. Members and officers are actively discussing this point and we expect to be able to give more details on the project timetable shortly. We are very conscious that there has been a lull in information about progress on the plan since the first Regulation 18 consultation, which is frustrating for councillors as well as stakeholders such as our two speakers, and communication is something the advisory group are keen to improve.

Both our speakers have asked about the evidence base for the plan. We have heard the comments made by Need Not Greed Oxfordshire and others. Obviously, we need our evidence to be up to date so we are commissioning additional work – including on OGNA - to

help inform the plan policies. A number of individual members have read the report by Opinion Research Services and if it is submitted in response to our next consultation, we will be happy to give formal consideration to the report. At the time of our next consultation we will in any case publish a report explaining how we have taken on board the views of stakeholders at the previous Regulation 18 Part 2 consultation in helping to shape the plan.

The Future Oxfordshire Partnership and its Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Advisory Group will continue to coordinate the programme and to seek consensus among members before any process of formal decision making which will take place within each city and district council through the usual processes of council meetings.

Although we know there are still some difficult conversations to come, it's worth reflecting that there is already a strong commitment among all the councils to an ambitious environment agenda in support of the Strategic Vision for Oxfordshire which we all agreed last year.

3. Robin Tucker on behalf of the Coalition for Health Streets and Active Travel, (CoHSAT) has submitted the following address in writing (not attending):

CoHSAT is a group of voluntary and campaigning organisations working across Oxfordshire to create attractive, accessible and people-friendly streets.

It is proposed to cut the funds for Banbury Road and Woodstock Road programmes due to over-spends elsewhere.

However, these are two of the few schemes that encourage sustainable transport, rather than increasing private car use. These roads are both currently poor for walking, wheeling and cycling with a mix of poorly designed facilities in poor condition, and these schemes would improve them in most aspects. The scheme for Banbury Road was developed with a high level of stakeholder co-production, and in consultation received a high level of support.

These schemes are in line with the strategy of the County, City and District Councils making this partnership, and with the need to tackle climate and public health emergencies and should be retained.

Other schemes, for road expansions create problems for healthy forms of transport.

- The A40 dualling will bring more cars through the gap between Eynsham and Salt Cross, creating a severed development unless two underpasses are built to allow easy passage on desire lines.
- Large and expensive roundabouts, built to inappropriate 'DB32' standards, at the entrance of housing developments provide barriers to cycling and walking. (Recent examples in Bicester, Didcot).

Instead of dropping schemes that promote sustainable transport, you should de-scope or drop schemes that encourage motor traffic and that make active travel harder.

Response

It is correct that the proposed re-allocation of funding – as with previous re-allocations over the previous 4 years since the Housing & Growth Deal was agreed - is to offset cost pressures across the programme while maximising the agreed aims of Homes from Infrastructure [Hfi] programme.

Unfortunately, the funding allocated to many infrastructure schemes elsewhere in the County – such as the A40 dualling you mentioned – is not transferable and so the Hfl funding is a fixed total allocation.

You are also correct to highlight the excellent co-production work which has happened to date on both the Woodstock Rd and Banbury Rd Corridors. This work will all be factored into the Central Oxfordshire Transport Strategy and while it's accurate to say consensus had not been reached through the co-production process, the progress and work to date will not be lost.

Many of the schemes being recommended to receive additional funding – Banbury Tramway Improvements, North Oxford Corridor (Cassington to Loop Farm), North Oxford Corridor (Kidlington) – are designed to encourage sustainable transport, both in terms of improved Active Travel provision as well as modal shift.

Therefore, these recommendations are designed to maximise the delivery of Active Travel schemes across Oxfordshire - within the limitations and agreed criteria of the Housing & Growth Deal funding.

4. Peter Barnett has submitted the following address in writing (not attending):

I am disappointed to see in agenda item 7a that the Future Oxford Partnership is abandoning one of the key policies of the Fair Deal Alliance: to promote active travel. To transfer funds from a badly needed upgrade of the Woodstock and Banbury roads to projects which upgrade roads optimally for motor vehicles and sub-optimally for active travel, flies in the face of all sense: more, better roads equals more motor vehicles, more congestion.

The fair deal alliance should be diverting funds from roads projects to active travel: HiF2 and CIL funds. Projects which should be funded which would make a tremendous difference to active travel and reduce motor vehicle demand could be: a Wolvercote Roundabout cycle Hovenring, a Barton Park bridge crossing (as required by Oxfordshire County Council's LTCP where there is a "Presumption against at-grade pedestrian crossings" on Class 2a: Strategic Primary Routes such as the A40.). Oxfordshire County Council should pause all road upgrade projects and re-think.

As Oxfordshire County Council move forward with a Vision Zero agenda, there is a need for a different mindset when it comes to infrastructure policy and design which priorities a re-allocation of road space from motor vehicles to active travel (as required by the DfT in Gear Change). Oxfordshire County Council need to think seriously about what cultural norms it is setting by moving forward with major road projects and not active travel, and realise that Vision Zero requires a paradigm shift and a change in organisation practices. Otherwise Vision Zero is just words.

Please re-think.

Response

Many of the schemes being recommended to receive additional funding – Banbury Tramway Improvements, North Oxford Corridor (Cassington to Loop Farm), North Oxford Corridor (Kidlington) – are designed to encourage sustainable transport, both in terms of improved Active Travel provision as well as modal shift.

Unfortunately, the funding allocated to many infrastructure schemes elsewhere in the County – such as the HIF2 programme you mentioned – is not transferable and so the Hfl funding is a fixed total allocation.

Therefore, these recommendations are designed to maximise the delivery of Active Travel schemes across Oxfordshire - within the limitations and agreed criteria of the Housing & Growth Deal funding.

5. Councillor Charlie Hicks has asked the following question:

CONTEXT

The Oxfordshire Fair Deal Alliance has passed a budget for 2022/23 with the stated corporate priorities including:

- 1. Put action to address the climate emergency at the heart of our work.
- 5. Invest in an inclusive, integrated and sustainable transport network.

The Leader of Oxfordshire County Council frequently says that the Fair Deal Alliance that she leads will put climate at the heart of everything it does. She has recently taken part in a film for UK 100 about the Council's plans for zero carbon Oxfordshire, and she attended the launch of Zero Institute/Mini Tesa at Oxford University - a new institute that will tackle climate change on a global scale.

The County Council's Climate Action Programme sets out a strategy to implement the key findings of the Pathways to a Zero Carbon Oxfordshire (PaZCO). On building new road infrastructure, PaZCO states:

"Road building, particularly to support new developments which may then be more car-dependent, is short-sighted when it has become clear that the transition to zero carbon vehicle technologies is insufficient to reach net-zero within the timescales set by the Paris Agreement or most local governments. Local policy-makers recognise this, and, as climate policy was strengthened over the past two years, the decision was made to revisit the Infrastructure Strategy. In developing the fifth LTCP and revising OXIS, there is consensus around seeking opportunities to accelerate the decarbonisation of transport."

And the upcoming Local Transport and Connectivity Plan 5 has a headline target to reduce car use by 1 in 4 journeys by 2030.

All the above is excellent rhetoric and ambition to follow an evidence-based pathway to a Zero Carbon Oxfordshire.

However, it does not appear that this rhetoric or ambition is being backed up by action or money, where it really matters. Rather, the FOP / Oxfordshire County Council seem to be doing precisely the opposite of what they say they will do, by proposing to take money away from active travel infrastructure and put more money into infrastructure that will increase car capacity. The Review of Homes from Infrastructure (Hfl) Programme report details how £12.5 million is proposed to be taken out of building new active travel infrastructure on the Woodstock and Banbury Roads, and instead be put it into road-building and car-infrastructure schemes, including the Benson Relief Road and widening of the A40.

QUESTION

Can the FOP please explain this paradox? How could this decision to take money away from active travel infrastructure and put it into car-based infrastructure be in line with the very publicly-made statements on Climate and Sustainable, Inclusive, and Integrated transport pledges? When will the decisions and budget allocations made by the FOP and Oxfordshire County Council begin to reflect the ambition and rhetoric put out about Climate and Transport?

Response

The decisions and budget allocations discussed by the Future Oxfordshire Partnership and made formally by Oxfordshire County Council do reflect the ambition and rhetoric around Climate and Transport. This is why the schemes being recommended to receive the majority of the additional funding are specifically being designed to encourage sustainable transport, both in terms of improved Active Travel provision as well as modal shift.

Banbury Tramway Improvements – is an Active Travel supporting scheme, about improved cycling and walking infrastructure as well as promoting modal shift through bus access to the train station. It is also a good example of re-purposing existing road space.

North Oxford Corridor (NOC Cassington) – is again around cycling, walking and bus prioritisation – and only uses the existing highways boundary.

Environmentally, all schemes will have opportunities for biodiversity net gains, with NOC Cassington looking to improve on existing vegetation to improve the species richness and NOC Kidlington being designed to maximise retention of mature trees. The Banbury Tramway Improvements will reduce traffic, waiting times and particularly idling on Cherwell Street

The Homes from Infrastructure programme was agreed 5 years ago and while you are correct to say priorities have changed since then, these recommendations are designed to maximise the delivery of Active Travel schemes across Oxfordshire - within the existing limitations and already agreed criteria of the Housing & Growth Deal funding.

6. Mary Kroll has submitted the following address in writing (not attending):

As the representative of the Oxford Civic Society on the recent Woodstock and Banbury Roads co-production, I ask the Partnership to reconsider the proposal to cancel the funding for the planned improvements to Woodstock Road.

Decent cycling provision for the Northern radial route is urgently needed, both for local traffic and for commuters into Oxford from the new housing developments to the north-west of the city. The Woodstock Road corridor is particularly suitable, as it has relatively few side roads. With a fast safe continuous cycle route, pedal or electric cycling would be an attractive choice for commuters.

Including representatives of many local groups, the co-production was intended to embody the best principles of local planning. It was nearly unanimous in supporting the Woodstock Road cycle route. Much time was spent in producing a careful and detailed design, and the public consultation was positive. It would seem perverse to waste all this effort and good will by cancelling the project now.

Response

You are correct to highlight the excellent co-production work which has happened to date on both the Woodstock Rd and Banbury Rd Corridors. This work will all be factored into Central

Oxfordshire Transport Strategy and while its accurate to say consensus had not been reached through the co-production process, the progress and work to date will not be lost.

7. Graham Smith has submitted the following address in writing:

I am Graham Smith, a Cyclox and Cycling UK member and representative. I have a longstanding professional interest in roads layout design and provision for Sustainable Movement. I formerly taught at Oxford Brookes in Urban Design.

I object to the proposal for removal of further funding from two schemes currently within the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal programme – Woodstock Road Corridor and Banbury Road Corridor

These major axes could and should be carrying a significantly greater amount of active travel movements. Their current condition is unsupportive of modal shift towards active travel and thus in support of local and national policies.

Even with 'COTS', or Connecting Oxford as was, most people would be unlikely to choose to ride - in these roads - (new riders especially). So, the starting point of the project is currently relevant. The removal of the specific funding is most likely to kill the project. An uncertain future in a much wider COTS programme will dilute the importance and likelihood of improvement of these axes.

This major project to enable greater number of movements by Active Travel, is notable for its focus on coherence and continuity for cycling. Notable for its conformance with Manuals for Streets and to the authoritative LTN1/20 guidance and in line with the 'Gear Change', July 2020. This stands in stark contrast with current major County schemes where cycling as a mode is effectively deprioritised and made less safe, for the benefit of driving. These projects, HiF, etc, illogically cherry-pick national guidance. The gear change called for by Government will not be delivered by Highways Engineers sticking with irrelevant concepts rooted in misreading of Motorways and Trunk Roads: DMRB.

I am concerned about mention of Kidlington Roundabout: a simply dreadful '1960s' design which very effectively deters use by all but the most determined cyclists and pedestrians. At a superficial level any changes for the benefit of active travel should be funded by developers: Begbroke (University) and Stratford Brake (Oxford United). Kidlington roundabout itself is already effectively part of an urban area and will be more so with future development, it does need to be reconceived as an urban junction and not as a semi-motorway provision. It is not part of a 'Trunk Road'.

Graham Smith,
Dip AD, MA (RCA), MA Urban Design

Response

You are correct that improvements to the Woodstock Road corridor and Banbury Road corridor remain vital. This work carried out to date on both projects will be factored into Central Oxfordshire Transport Strategy which is a priority area of work for Oxfordshire County Council.

The Homes from Infrastructure programme was agreed 5 years ago, and these recommendations are designed to maximise the delivery of Active Travel schemes across all of Oxfordshire - within the existing limitations and already agreed criteria of the Housing & Growth Deal funding.

As was mentioned during the FOP session, a further review of the Kidlington Roundabout design will be undertaken to ensure it is encouraging for increased cycle traffic

8. Sebastian Balcombe, on behalf Oxford University Development Ltd and Jon Williams on behalf of I-Transport has submitted the following questions:

- Woodstock Road Corridor / Banbury Road Corridor improvements directly support the delivery of new housing associated with the PR sites to the north of Oxford in terms of addressing modal shift and reducing congestion. Safe cycling infrastructure is essential given recent cycle fatalities. One of which was close to Oxford Parkway station. Improvements to cycle infrastructure has far wider implications over and above reducing urban traffic congestion, including tackling the Climate Emergency, improving health and wellbeing, Improving air quality and reducing traffic noise -and as such to meet the aspirations of the Local Transport Plan investment in cycle infrastructure should be a priority. Indeed, a recent DfT publication¹ states that “one can confidently conclude that sustainable travel and walking and cycling in particular regularly offer high and very high value for money.”
- The proposed works to Banbury Road and Woodstock Road would link with the proposed A44/Pear Tree and Kidlington Roundabout schemes and provide comprehensive routes between PR8 and the City Centre.
- Given the level of housing proposed at the North Oxford PR sites, and the proposed expansion of the Begbroke Science Park on land removed from the green belt for that purpose, it is a serious concern that the Growth Deal investment allocated for improving both the Banbury and Woodstock Roads is being withdrawn and re-allocated to other schemes.
- Early delivery of these comprehensive routes is considered essential to establishing travel patterns early in the development.
- OUD/The University of Oxford would therefore request that this proposed funding action is reconsidered.

Questions

The Active and Healthy Travel Strategy (AHTS) set out that Oxfordshire County Council plan to increase the number of cycle trips in Oxfordshire from 600,000 to 1 million cycle trips per week by 2031, while the Oxford LCCWIP identifies 2 targets to increase both commuter cycling and all cycling trips in Oxford by 50% by 2031. To achieve these targets, there needs to be 25,000 new cyclists, including 9,000 everyday cyclists and 8,000 weekly cyclists in Oxford by 2031. How will these targets be met if funding for key cycle corridors such as Woodstock Road Corridor / Banbury Road Corridor are reallocated?

Response

To help to meet these challenging targets the schemes being recommended to receive the majority of the additional funding are specifically being designed to encourage sustainable transport - both in terms of improved Active Travel provision as well as modal shift. e.g North Oxford Corridor (NOC Cassington) – is again around cycling, walking and bus prioritisation – and only uses the existing highways boundary.

If the proposal to re-allocate the residual funding away from the Woodstock Road Corridor and the Banbury Road Corridor is agreed and the projects are considered as part of COTS (Central Oxfordshire Transport Strategy) can clarification be provided on how COTS schemes will be funded?

Response

The delivery of any COTS schemes is presently unfunded.

If funding has to be reallocated, why has funding been reallocated to the Benson Relief Road? Following any reallocation to; North Oxford Corridor (NOC) – A44 Cassington to Loop Farm, North Oxford Corridor (NOC) – Kidlington Roundabout and Access to Witney shouldn't any residual funding be retained and used to fund improvements on the Woodstock Road Corridor / Banbury Road Corridor, on a phased basis?

Response

The recommendation was reflective of the agreed criteria of the Homes from Infrastructure [Hfi] programme and reflected scheme maturity and ability to accelerate housing within agreed periods.

The PR sites have already submitted a joint letter to Oxfordshire County Council raising concerns with the design of Kidlington Roundabout and that it is not in accordance with latest design standards and a more ambitious design solution for active travel should be sought. Has consideration been given to retaining the Woodstock Road and Banbury Road schemes and delaying the Kidlington Roundabout scheme instead?

Response

As was mentioned during the FOP session, a further review of the Kidlington Roundabout design will be undertaken to ensure it is encouraging for increased cycle traffic.

9. Councillor Laurence Fouweather has submitted the following statement:

Good afternoon and thank you Chair for this opportunity to raise the serious concerns I and many of my ward residents have about the proposal to remove funding from the improvements to Woodstock and Banbury Roads. These roads both pass through my ward and are used by many residents for their journeys into and around Oxford. In particular they are used by very many young cyclists travelling to and from local schools with little or no segregation from the heavy commuter traffic.

To say I was surprised to hear from County colleagues that both of these schemes were now in danger of being scrapped is a gross understatement. I am incensed by this proposal and even more incensed that it is being proposed by officers, who presumably were the same officers who developed the plans we were briefed about last year. Where is the democratic oversight here? Where is the pressure coming from to cancel? I am amazed that this is being presented as a deferment – if the earmarked money is spent elsewhere then it seems extremely unlikely that the present Government will be giving any more.

These schemes were allocated funds in the Hfi stream of the Growth deal in 2018 and have already had a lot of money and resources spent on them – is this to be thrown away in favour of other schemes that are nowhere near the same stage of development?

I can understand why they need to be aligned with other strategic Core schemes but surely this is not a reason for cancellation. It should be an opportunity to fine tune them before going out to a wider consultation with local people and key stakeholders.

I am very concerned about the impact of the new developments at Oxford North and the Kidlington Gap which will bring a large increase in traffic in the area. Are you seriously proposing that the current inadequate infrastructure of Banbury and Woodstock Roads are in any way suitable for this increase in all types of traffic without improvements being put in place as soon as possible?

Oxford is supposed to be a cycling city. On a recent visit to Belgium I noted that even small towns had an active travel infrastructure far better than anything in Oxford. Segregated cycle lanes with smooth well maintained surfaces and properly marked out junctions with priority for pedestrians and cyclists. Continuous and clearly marked cycle lanes with no abrupt stops. I would be ashamed to show any Belgians what passes for active travel in Oxford.

These schemes would be a very good start to improving things for the residents of Oxford and those in Oxfordshire who use these roads. To cancel them would be a very retrograde step. Please do not agree to this proposal.

Response

As you have noted, the funding for schemes in the Hfl programme was agreed in 2018 but have been reviewed and adjusted at various points in the time since.

The money and resources spent to date on both the Woodstock Rd and Banbury Rd Corridors – as well as the excellent co-production work - will not be lost but will factor into the Central Oxfordshire Transport Strategy.

Schemes where there is a recommendation for additional funding to be allocated are all at a greater stage of maturity and development than either the Woodstock Rd or Banbury Rd corridors.

Future Oxfordshire Partnership response to recommendations of the Partnership Scrutiny Panel made on 7 June 2022

The Future Oxfordshire Partnership is requested to provide a response to the recommendations of the Scrutiny Panel for decision at its meeting on 13 June 2022.

Page 150

| Recommendation | Comment |
|---|--|
| <p><u>Consideration of Oxfordshire Plan 2050 consultation responses</u></p> <p>The Panel in acknowledging the requirements to follow appropriate legislation and guidance (including the NPPF), in the analysis of consultation responses, was concerned that the analysis of Oxfordshire Plan 2050 responses fully take account of both quantitative and qualitative factors and that the contributions of community groups, individuals or developers and others all be considered equally on their merits. Moreover, that the Partnership is made aware of the risk of ‘regulatory capture’ in the consultation process.</p> <p>1. That the Future Oxfordshire Partnership in its presentation of consultation responses include both qualitative and quantitative data as ‘not everything that matters can be measured’. This includes:</p> | <p>Whilst not a decision of the Future Oxfordshire Partnership (FOP), we nonetheless welcome the intention of the Oxfordshire LPAs to carry out a Regulation 18 (Part 3) consultation for the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 (the Plan).</p> <p>The analysis of the responses- whether they be quantitative or qualitative- to the consultation will be comprehensive. All comments received will be logged, analysed, considered carefully, and carry equal weight regardless of their origin. This ensures that all opinions are given equal weight in the consultation. A summary of the consultation responses will also be published, so interested parties can have sight of the full range of views received.</p> <p>In response to the points raised:</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The total number of responses to a particular question. b. The number of members an organization represents. c. Verbatim quotes extracted from consultation feedback received. d. A summary of the analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data. e. Acknowledgement in the analysis that there may be variations of opinion within groups, and that points made by small numbers of respondents are not of lower value. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Consideration will be given to providing detail on the total number of responses received under each policy or theme of the Plan in the consultation report. b) In the consultation report, an explanation of different types of consultees will be provided together with a brief description e.g., government bodies, community groups (and explain they made up of members and representative of etc). We will also set out in the consultation report how community groups have responded to the consultation. c) The selective use of verbatim quotes is not perceived as best practice or proper because it can suggest perceived bias. d) The analysis of the consultation responses must be both legally compliant and proportionate. The consultation report will include pie charts and tables summarising the number of responses by age, respondent type, geographic spread and degree of support or objection to the emerging policy approaches set out in the Regulation 18 (Part 3) version of the Plan. However, it will not provide any other detailed breakdown of the consultation results, as this goes beyond what is required and does not in our view add value. Instead, we believe it better to provide clear explanations as to how representations have shaped the Plan. e) We do not agree that because a point or comment is made by a small number of respondents, that it is necessarily of lesser value than wider made points. The value of the comment is intrinsic to the point made, not the number of people making it. Nevertheless, by carefully noting and analysing all responses equally and then showing how such responses shape our thinking it will be clear how we have responded to the various views offered by respondents |
| <p>2. That in order to make Oxfordshire Plan 2050 formal consultation documents more accessible to the general public, the Future Oxfordshire Partnership also ensure the provision of documents in formats which are abridged and/or</p> | <p>We recognise that both the number and range of responses we receive to the Oxfordshire Plan Regulation 18 (Part 3) consultation will be crucial to its success and we are committed to ensuring its accessibility to all sections of our community.</p> <p>So, whilst we believe that the on-line platform for consultation that worked well for the Regulation 18 (Part 1 and 2) consultations was a successful tool for ensuring that accessibility, we will also be considering how we can offer other consultation routes that complement and maximise this accessibility. We also recognise that the use of non-</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>expressed in as much non-technical terms as possible.</p> <p>3. That in order to reach as wide a cross section of society, the Future Oxfordshire Partnership also ensure the availability of non online mechanism for the public to engage with and respond to future Oxfordshire Plan 2050 consultations.</p> | <p>technical language, minimising the use of acronyms etc. will be a part of this ambition and will for example be ensuring that both the Plan and the supporting evidence base technical documents that support it will include non-technical summaries at the beginning explaining what they cover.</p> |
| <p><u>Review of Homes from Infrastructure (Hfi) Programme</u></p> <p>The Panel whilst acknowledging the need to review the Hfi Programme within the limited confines of the terms of the Housing and Growth Deal, was extremely concerned with the proposals to remove funding from the creation of segregated cycling infrastructure on the Woodstock Road Corridor and Banbury Road Schemes. This is on the basis that reallocation of funding away from these schemes is to those schemes that are focused on improving road infrastructure for cars contrary to the County Council's strategic priorities to address the climate emergency and promote active travel. The panel felt that reallocating the funding away from these schemes will negatively impact the councils' reputation as a delivery partner for future transportation infrastructure funding in the context of climate change. It was noted that the Woodstock Road cycling infrastructure is essential to nearby proposed major developments in Oxford North.</p> | <p>FOP do not agree that the difficult decision to remove the Housing and Growth Deal (the Deal) funding from the active travel schemes at Woodstock and Banbury Road should be seen as the councils moving away from their commitments to active and/or low carbon travel or addressing the climate change emergency. As was made clear at the last FOP meeting in June, active travel options stay at the core of our thinking for the future travel in and around Oxford and will be embedded in the developing Central Oxfordshire Transport Strategy that will set out a holistic plan for travel in the centre of the county.</p> <p>The decisions to reallocate the Deal funding from these schemes instead reflects the constrained criteria for scheme funding that the Housing and Growth Deal requires, and that Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) have to consider when making such decisions, these being accelerated housing and scheme deliverability within the relatively short time window that the Deal applies. Sadly, when examined against these criteria the schemes could not demonstrate a continued case for funding.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the schemes remain central to our thinking for travel into and around Oxford and OCC and partners will continue to seek alternative funding arrangements to bring them forward.</p> |

4. That the Future Oxfordshire Partnership be strongly requested not to endorse the proposal to the Oxfordshire County Council Cabinet for the removal of further funding from two schemes currently within the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal Homes from Infrastructure programme – Woodstock Road Corridor and Banbury Road Corridor.
5. That the Future Oxfordshire Partnership be requested not to endorse the proposal to Oxfordshire County Council for the re-allocation of the remaining funding from Woodstock Road Corridor and Banbury Road Corridor across a number of car-orientated infrastructure schemes in the Housing from Infrastructure programme which are projecting cost pressures.
6. That the Future Oxfordshire Partnership acknowledge that BSIP funding does not change the urgent demand and need for segregated cycling infrastructure on the Woodstock and Banbury road corridors.
7. That if the proposed changes are regrettably agreed by Oxfordshire County Council, the Future Oxfordshire Partnership support accelerated efforts to identify and secure alternative funding for the Woodstock Road

FOP endorsed the recommended changes to the Homes from Infrastructure programme at its June 2022 meeting.

FOP do not agree that the difficult decisions to reallocate Deal funds to alternative projects are to car-oriented schemes. As highlighted earlier the criteria for funding from the Deal is accelerating already planned housing to address the housing crisis, together with deliverability within the agreed Deal period. These are the only criteria alongside value for money that govern reallocation decisions. It should be noted however that, of the schemes recommended to receive additional Deal funding, the Banbury Tramway Improvements, NOC Cassington and NOC Kidlington schemes are all active travel and modal shifting supporting schemes.

FOP supports the need for safe cycling provision in the Woodstock Road and Banbury Road corridors.

FOP will of course continue to support all efforts to secure necessary investment in Oxfordshire's infrastructure

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Corridor and Banbury Road Corridor schemes.</p> <p>8. That if the proposed changes are regrettably agreed by Oxfordshire County Council, the Future Oxfordshire Partnership urgently support the provision of temporary segregated cycle lanes on the Woodstock Road e.g., through an e-Traffic Regulation Orders.</p> <p>9. That the Future Oxfordshire Partnership lobby HM Government to increase funding for the Homes from Infrastructure Programme given the unprecedented impact of inflationary cost pressures on all capital projects.</p> | <p>OCC, as the transport and infrastructure authority alongside Oxford Council and other partners will consider this as part of the developing Central Oxfordshire Travel Strategy</p> <p>Unfortunately, it has been confirmed by government that no additional funding is available for this programme.</p> |
| <p><u>Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership Update</u></p> <p>The Panel strongly welcomed the establishment of the OIEP and proposed Inclusive Economy Charter, but asked that in the finalisation of the draft Charter, the following matters be considered for inclusion by the Future Oxfordshire Partnership:</p> <p>10. The need to ensure due emphasis within the opening statement of the Charter relate to inequalities within the whole county of Oxfordshire and not only within the city of Oxford.</p> | <p>The Future Oxfordshire Partnership notes and supports the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership's decision to incorporate Countywide examples of inequalities as well as City examples in the opening statement of the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership Charter.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>11. The importance of the development of technical skills through apprenticeships, including in manufacturing and engineering.</p> <p>12. Recognition within the text of the Charter of the contribution of all employer types to addressing inequality, including a specific mention of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. the positive contribution of social enterprise and co-operative employers.b. Women and minority owned businesses. | <p>The Future Oxfordshire Partnership notes and supports the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership's decision to refer this recommendation to its Employers and Educational Attainment Working Groups for their consideration in proposal development and also as potential examples of the Pledges as part of the Charter.</p> <p>The Future Oxfordshire Partnership notes that the Charter recognises the contribution of all employer types and the work of the Social Value and Procurement Working Group and its activity, pledge examples make direct links to community wealth building, cooperative models and social value/enterprise.</p> <p>The Charter also recognises barriers to inclusion for all groups and does not seek to highlight some protected characteristics over others in order not to seem exclusive, however the emphasis on support to women entrepreneurs and minority owned businesses is referred to the working group leads of the Inclusive Employers Working Group and subgroups for consideration in proposal development and also as potential examples of the Pledges as part of the Charter.</p> |
|--|--|