

Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE



The Future Oxfordshire Partnership

HELD ON MONDAY 13 JUNE 2022 AT 2.00 PM

COUNCIL CHAMBER, CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL, BODICOTE HOUSE, BODICOTE, BANBURY, OX15 4AA

Present:

Councillor Barry Wood (Chair), (Cherwell District Council), Councillor Susan Brown, (Oxford City Council), Emma Hill, (Environment Agency), Councillor Liz Leffman, (Oxfordshire County Council), Adrian Lockwood, (Oxfordshire Skills Board Chair), Jeremy Long, (OxLEP - Chair), Peter Nolan, (OxLEP business representative - Oxford City Council), Councillor David Rouane, (South Oxfordshire District Council), Councillor Geoff Saul, (West Oxfordshire District Council), Councillor Emily Smith (Vale of White Horse District Council) and Catherine Turner, (Homes England).

Officers: Andrew Down, (Future Oxfordshire Partnership), Nathan Elvery (Cherwell District Council), Caroline Green (Oxford City Council), Susan Harbour, (South and Vale Councils), Giles Hughes (West Oxfordshire District Council), Kevin Jacob, (Future Oxfordshire Council), Alex Jeffery (Future Oxfordshire Partnership), Clayton Lavallin, (Oxford City Council), John McLauchlan, (Oxfordshire County Council), Babatunde Ogundele (Future Oxfordshire Partnership), Paul Staines (Oxfordshire Growth Deal Team) and Nigel Tipple (Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership)

Other councillors: Councillor Katherine Miles, Chair of the Future Oxfordshire Partnership Scrutiny Panel.

1. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair for the 2022/2023 year

Kevin Jacob, Senior Democratic Services Officer for the Future Oxfordshire Partnership opened the meeting and welcomed those present before calling for nominations for the office of Chair.

Councillor Susan Brown proposed Councillor Barry Wood as Chair of the Future Oxfordshire Partnership for the year 2022/2023 and this was seconded by Councillor Liz Leffman. There being no other nominations this was confirmed by the voting members present.

RESOLVED: That Councillor Barry Wood be elected as Chair of the Future Oxfordshire Partnership for the 2022/2033 year.

Councillor Wood took the Chair at this point and proposed that Councillor Brown be elected as Vice-Chair of the Future Oxfordshire Partnership for the year 2022/2023. This was duly seconded and upon there being no other nominations this was confirmed by the voting members present.

RESOLVED: That Councillor Susan Brown be elected as Vice-Chair of the Future Oxfordshire Partnership for the 2022/2023 year.

2. Apologies for absence; declarations of interest and Chair's announcement

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillor Andy Graham, West Oxfordshire District Council, Professor Alistair Fitt, Universities' representative, Dr David Chapman, Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group and Miranda Markham, OxLEP business representative, Bicester.

There were no declarations of interest.

The Chair paid tribute to Councillor Michele Mead who had chaired the Partnership during the previous year for her service and hard work and commented that he intended to write a letter on behalf of the Partnership to express its thanks.

The Chair also remarked that Adrian Lockwood was standing down as Chair of the Oxfordshire Skills Board and that this was therefore his last Partnership meeting. The Chair paid tribute to Adrian and thanked him on behalf of all the members of the Partnership for all his contributions. With the permission of the Chair, Adrian addressed the Partnership and thanked them.

The Chair commented that with the permission of the meeting it was intended to vary the order of items on the Agenda to deal with the Oxford to Cambridge Arc update and annual appointments.

3. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the informal meetings of members of the Future Oxfordshire Partnership held on 25 January 2022 and 22 March 2022 be approved as a correct record of those meetings.

4. Public participation

John Hill asked a question about the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Regulation 18 Part 2 consultation. Along with others, he had questioned policy option 22 within the Plan consultation document, specifically a table on page 107 taken from the Oxfordshire Growth Needs Assessment, (OGNA) which set out five employment projections. In his view, the time available for public consultation had been limited, and it had not been possible to obtain any detailed information as to the assumptions made in the preparation of the employment projections despite contacting the Oxfordshire Plan Team over an extended period as set out in his full written question.

The Partnership was asked to provide an answer to:

- The assumptions behind the forecasts/ projections in the Oxfordshire Plan 2050.

- In the table what are projections, what are forecasts and what are targets.
- Were the projections/ forecasts still valid in view of the changed economic situation.
- Are the forecasts/projections reliable enough to be any part of the evidence base for the Plan.

At the invitation of the Chair, Giles Hughes, Senior Responsible Officer for the Oxfordshire Plan 2050, and Chief Executive of West Oxfordshire District Council provided an initial response to the first question. He commented that the purpose of including projections within the Plan consultation document had been to help the public and councils understand the range of possible futures that might be planned for within the Oxfordshire Plan. It had not been the purpose of the consultation document to set out a definitive position or 'right answer', rather its purpose was to explain the range of scenarios. It was recognised that a review of the evidence base that would support the Plan would be necessary and this was an ongoing exercise in light of comments made during the consultation and also the current economic circumstances.

David Young asked a question on behalf of Need Not Greed Oxfordshire, (NNGO) in reference to the response given by the Partnership to a previous question. NNGO understood that final decisions around the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 would be taken by the individual councils. However, in NNGO's opinion to suggest that individual councils would consider a peer review of the OGNA was not logical and that it was NNGO's view that the Partnership could and should have a role in coordinating an OGNA peer review. The Partnership was asked:

- What is the project timetable for the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan?
- What is the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 team currently working on?
- How could they be developing a spatial strategy without agreeing the number of houses to be built?
- How would criticisms of the growth options presented in the Oxfordshire Growth Needs Assessment and the Reg 18 consultation be addressed?
- What assessment has the Future Oxfordshire Partnership/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"*.
- Would the Oxfordshire Plan Advisory Group be recommending a further Regulation 18 consultation?

Councillor Emily Smith responded to Mr Young's question, also referring to the points raised by Mr Hill in his question. She indicated that the Partnership was grateful to all members of the public who had responded to the Regulation 18 Part 2 consultation. A wide range of views had been expressed which had been considered carefully including by the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Advisory Group.

It was now possible to confirm that the Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities had agreed that the timescale of the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 could be amended with the goal of submitting the Plan to HM Government before the end of December 2023 to undergo a public examination. The examination timetable would then be in the hands of the planning inspector. As a result of amendment of the timetable the opportunity was being taken to consider whether to undertake a further Regulation 18 Part 3 consultation. It was acknowledged that there had been a lull in information since the first

Regulation 18 consultation, which had been frustrating for councillors as well as stakeholders and communication was something the advisory group are keen to improve.

Councillor Smith continued that with regard to the Plan's evidence base, the comments made by NNGO and others had been heard and it was acknowledged that the Plan's evidence needed to be up to date so additional work was being commissioned including that related to the OGNA to help inform plan policies. If the report written by Opinion Research Services regarding the OGNA was submitted as part of a future public consultation it could be taken into formal consideration and it was planned to publish a report explaining how the views of stakeholders had been taken on board at the previous Regulation 18 Part 2 consultation in helping to shape the current plan.

The Future Oxfordshire Partnership and its Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Advisory Group would continue to coordinate the programme and to seek consensus among members before any process of formal decision making which would take place within each city and district council through the usual processes of council meetings. Although it was accepted that there were still some difficult conversations to come, it was worth reflecting that there was already a strong commitment among all the councils to an ambitious environment agenda in support of the Strategic Vision for Oxfordshire agreed by all councils in 2021.

At this point the Chair indicated that a grouped response would be given at the meeting to public questions and addresses submitted to the Partnership in relation to proposed changes to the Homes from Infrastructure Programme in light of the similar nature of the points made.

Robin Tucker had submitted an address on behalf of the Coalition for Health Streets and Active Travel, (CoHSAT) which was taken as read at the meeting in his absence. The address highlighted the poor current condition of the Banbury Road and Woodstock Road with regards to walking, wheeling, and cycling and called for the proposed decision relating to the reallocation of funding from the Banbury Road and Woodstock Road, Oxford schemes to other schemes within the Homes from the Infrastructure Programme to not be supported.

Peter Barnett had submitted an address which was taken as read at the meeting in his absence. The address expressed the view that the reallocation of funding from the Banbury Road and Woodstock Road schemes to schemes which upgraded roads optimally for motor vehicles was nonsensical and would encourage more vehicles and congestion. Mr Barnett called for the diversion of funding from road projects to those supporting active travel and a change in mindset to infrastructure policy and design which prioritises a re-allocation of road space from motor vehicles to active travel.

Councillor Charlie Hicks, Oxfordshire County Council referred to what he considered to be a paradox between the stated corporate priorities of Oxfordshire County Council around putting the climate emergency at the heart of its work through investment in an inclusive, integrated, and sustainable transport network and the proposed reallocation of funding from the Banbury Road and Woodstock Road schemes. The Partnership was asked how the proposals were considered to be in line with publicly-made statements on Climate and Sustainable, Inclusive, and Integrated transport pledges and when decisions and budget allocations made by the Partnership and Oxfordshire County Council reflect the ambition and rhetoric put out about Climate and Transport?

Mary Kroll made an address in which she stated that decent cycling provision was urgently needed on the Northern radial route 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 was particularly suitable, as it had relatively few side roads. With a fast safe continuous cycle route, pedal or electric cycling would be an attractive choice for commuters. The co-production of the proposals which had many local groups had intended to embody the best principles of local planning and it was regarded to be perverse and waste of that effort to cancel the projects at this stage.

Graham Smith made an address in which he objected to the proposals regarding the Banbury Road and Woodstock Road schemes as a Cyclox and Cycling UK member and in light of his former professional background in teaching urban design. He made the point that the Banbury and Woodstock Roads as major axes could and should be carrying significantly more active travel movements which would encourage a modal shift in support of local and national policies. Even with the Central Oxfordshire Transport Strategy the roads needed segregated provision to generate greater levels of cycling and the re-allocation of the funding from the schemes would likely end the project and dilute the likely improvement for those roads. The project had been exceptional for its focus on coherence and continuity of cycling and would help promote fairness in transport, healthy travel to schools and travel by protected user groups. Attention was also drawn to the hidden and visible equality related aspects of the schemes and impacts of cancellation including pollution and climate change. The schemes followed the LTN1/20 'Gear Change' guidance in contrast with current major County Council schemes which were rooted in out of date guidance. Concerns were also raised in relation to the Kidlington Roundabout project.

Sebastian Balcombe asked a question on behalf of Oxford University Development Ltd which referred to the Oxfordshire County Council's Healthy Travel Strategy which set out that it planned to increase the number of cycle trips in Oxfordshire from 600,000 to 1 million cycle trips per week by 2031 and that the Oxford Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan had identified two targets to increase both commuter cycling and all cycling trips in Oxford by 50% by 2031. To achieve these targets, there needed to be 25,000 new cyclists, including 9,000 everyday cyclists and 8,000 weekly cyclists in Oxford by 2031. The Partnership was asked how these targets would be met if funding for key cycle corridors such as Woodstock Road Corridor / Banbury Road Corridor were reallocated?

Councillor Laurence Fouweather, Oxford City Council made a statement expressing strong support for the retention of the Banbury Road and Woodstock Road schemes within the Housing from Infrastructure Programme and expressing concern over what was felt to be a lack of democratic oversight over the proposals to remove the schemes from the Homes from Infrastructure programme. Concern was expressed that the roads were used by many residents including children on their way to school with no or little segregation from commuter traffic and that the money and resources already directed to the scheme would be lost if the schemes were removed. It was felt that the existing infrastructure in Banbury Road and Woodstock Roads was inadequate to cope with new developments and that Oxford despite its promotion as a cycling city, compared poorly with countries such as Belgium.

Councillor Liz Leffman, Leader of Oxfordshire County Council thanked everyone that had submitted questions and addresses regarding the proposed changes to the Home from Infrastructure programme. Councillor Leffman commented that she agreed with the points made that there was a need for sustainable, active travel across the whole county, but that

the Banbury Road and Woodstock Road schemes were not being cancelled and would be delivered. Unfortunately, because of the circumstances of the last couple of years including the impact of Covid and inflationary pressures, it was necessary to review the programme in light of the current available resources and the time available to deliver it. The schemes had originally been added to the Hfl programme in 2018 and the situation had changed significantly since then. If funds were not used within the parameters of the programme, they had to be returned to HM Government and it was not considered likely based on previous experience that HM Government would agree to any extension.

Several of the points raised had mentioned the need to work with other partners across Oxford and the county to find alternative funding for the schemes and there was a commitment to do so, but HM Government was not the only option. Discussions would be held with a number of partners across the county including a number of the large developers involved in projects on the outskirts of Oxford in a way that would support the delivery of those developments in the required timeframe.

If the schemes had been at a more advanced stage, it was likely that they would also be facing significant cost pressures and it was stressed that it was not the case that funds were being taken out of Active Travel schemes and diverted to road bearing scheme. There were other Active Travel schemes around the county to which the funds would be reallocated to including the Banbury Tramway improvements and The North Oxford Corridor (Cassington) projects.

In terms of the points made relating to environmental considerations, these were being looked at closely and all the North Oxford Corridor schemes included an opportunity for bio-diversity net gain, particularly the Cassington project where opportunities to improve on low value vegetation that currently exists with more varieties that are species rich were being examined. Part of the reason for additional money being requested for NOC Kidlington was a revised design to retain existing mature trees on the roundabout. The Banbury Tramway scheme was intended to reduce traffic, waiting times, and particularly idling on Cherwell Street, Banbury. Funds from the Hfl programme were not being diverted into the A40 project as this had its own separate funding and was focussed on bus travel.

The good work undertaken in the co-production of the Banbury Road and Woodstock Road scheme would not be lost and would be factored into the Central Oxfordshire Transport Strategy, (COTS). It was correct that COTS was not funded at present to deliver its eventual outputs but it was collective thinking that will allow future bids for funding and also work with others across the county.

As with all previous changes to Housing and Growth Deal funding allocations, it was recognised there were hard and difficult decisions, but the Partnership was bound by the criteria and limitations of the original deal signed up to.

Given the changing construction environment the recommendations should not be viewed or represented as moving away from Active Travel priorities. Rather they were designed to maximise the delivery of Active Travel schemes across Oxfordshire - within the limitations of the Housing and Growth Deal – and also enabling COTS to take a more holistic view of the overall traffic issues in Oxford (and beyond) - including the Wolvercote Roundabout as highlighted in some of the submissions.

Councillor Brown welcomed Councillor Leffman's response and commented that a contributory factor to the present situation was the time limited nature of the Housing and

Growth Deal, notwithstanding the significant benefits it had brought in terms of additional funding and transport infrastructure for Oxfordshire. It was acknowledged that the Housing and Growth Deal had never been a panacea for a strategic approach to transport and investment in Active Travel. Oxford City Council was committed to seeking to find alternative funding for cycling, public transport, and Active Travel. Those involved in the co-production of the schemes were thanked and it was stressed that this work would not be lost. The City Council still wished to see improved bus and active provision on the Banbury and Woodstock Road Corridor and these remained vital in dealing with existing issues and the impact of future development. It was important that a strategic approach was taken to improving transport in and around Oxford. The recognition in the paper of the work to assess the cost pressures facing the Oxpens Bridge project was welcomed and that a further change report would be brought to the Partnership in due course.

The Chair also endorsed the remarks made by Councillor Leffman, commenting that the Partnership had been faced with similar issues before as a result of the need to reallocate funding from one scheme to another. He also emphasised that the Housing and Growth Deal has always been designed to encourage housing and that construction costs for all capital projects were rising. Faced with this, it was necessary for infrastructure programmes to be reviewed.

5. Oxford to Cambridge Arc Update

The Partnership considered a supplementary report under this item which set out the basis of which appointments could be made to represent the Future Oxfordshire Partnership covering the area currently known as the Oxford to Cambridge Arc. In introducing the report, the Chair also commented that if there were groups or boards emerging from the revised arrangement across the Arc that the Partnership would have representation on, it should seek the appointment of two representatives rather than one if at all possible.

RESOLVED: That the Future Oxfordshire Partnership agrees the principles that:

1. the Chair should be its representative on any emerging Arc collaboration board.
2. in the event that the Chair is unavailable or is a member of the collaboration board in another capacity, the Vice-Chair should be the FOP's representative.

6. Other Future Oxfordshire Partnership related appointments

The Chair proposed and it was duly seconded that the following Future Oxfordshire Partnership appointments be made en bloc for the 2022/2023 year.

- a) Future Oxfordshire Partnership Housing Advisory Group Chair – Councillor Susan Brown.
- b) Future Oxfordshire Partnership Environment Advisory Group Chair – Councillor David Rouane.
- c) Future Oxfordshire Partnership Infrastructure Advisory Group Chair – Councillor Liz Leffman.
- d) Future Oxfordshire Partnership Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Advisory Group Chair – Councillor Emily Smith and;

- e) To confirm that the England's Economic Heartland Strategic Transport Forum nomination will continue to rotate with the chairing of the Future Oxfordshire Partnership – Councillor Barry Wood.

In light of the principles agreed in the previous item regarding the Partnership's appointment to any emerging Arc collaboration board, Councillor Brown suggested formalising the approach that would be taken in the event that it was possible to appoint two rather than one representative. This was supported.

RESOLVED: That the following Future Oxfordshire Partnership related appointments be made for the 2022/2023 Future Oxfordshire Partnership year:

1. Emerging Arc Collaboration Board,
 - a. Single appointment - Councillor Barry Wood as Chair of the Partnership, Councillor Susan Brown standing deputy as Vice-Chair or;
 - b. Multiple appointments – Councillors Barry Wood as Chair and Councillor Susan Brown as Vice-Chair of the Partnership. Any voting member of the Partnership authorised to act as standing deputy for the Chair or Vice-Chair of the Partnership.
2. Future Oxfordshire Partnership Housing Advisory Group Chair – Councillor Susan Brown.
3. Future Oxfordshire Partnership Environment Advisory Group Chair – Councillor David Rouane.
4. Future Oxfordshire Partnership Infrastructure Advisory Group Chair – Councillor Liz Leffman.
5. Future Oxfordshire Partnership 2050 Advisory Group Chair – Councillor Emily Smith and;
6. To confirm that the England's Economic Heartland Strategic Transport Forum nomination will continue to rotate with the chairing of the Future Oxfordshire Partnership. –Councillor Barry Wood.

7. Future Oxfordshire Partnership Scrutiny Panel update

The Chair invited Councillor Katherine Miles, Chair of the Future Oxfordshire Partnership Scrutiny Panel, to present the recommendations from the Panel's meeting held on 7 June 2022 which had been circulated in advance.

Councillor Miles explained that the Panel's recommendations related to three main areas. The Oxfordshire Plan 2050 consultation feedback, the Homes from Infrastructure Programme and the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership which are summarised below:

Consideration of Oxfordshire Plan 2050 consultation responses

1. That the Future Oxfordshire include both qualitative and quantitative data as 'not everything that matters can be measured', ensure the provision of documents in

formats which are abridged and/or expressed in as much non-technical terms as possible and ensure the availability of a non online mechanism for the public to engage with and respond to future Oxfordshire Plan 2050 consultations.

Review of Homes from Infrastructure (Hfi) Programme

2. That the Future Oxfordshire Partnership:
 - a. Be strongly requested not to endorse the proposal to the Oxfordshire County Council Cabinet for the Woodstock Road Corridor and Banbury Road Corridor and not endorse the re-allocation of the remaining funding.
 - b. acknowledge that BSIP funding does not change the urgent demand and need for segregated cycling infrastructure on the Woodstock and Banbury road corridor and that if proposed changes were agreed by Oxfordshire County Council, the Future Oxfordshire Partnership support accelerated efforts to identify and secure alternative funding for the Woodstock Road.
 - c. lobby HM Government to increase funding for the Homes from Infrastructure Programme given the unprecedented impact of inflationary cost pressures on all capital projects.

Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership Update

3. 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, the need within the document to recognise the importance of the development of technical skills through apprenticeships and the need for recognition within the text of the Charter of the contribution of all employer types to addressing inequality.

The Chair welcomed Councillor Miles and congratulated her on becoming Chair of the Scrutiny Panel. The recommendations of the Panel were welcomed and the Partnership looked forward to continuing its close and co-operative relationship with it including attending meetings if they were requested to. He commented that full responses to the recommendations would be supplied in writing.

8. Oxfordshire Economic Recovery Plan

The Partnership considered a report which set out an update on the progress of the Oxfordshire Economic Recovery Plan, (ERP) and the headline performance of Oxfordshire's economy as it emerged from the challenges of the Covid-19 pandemic. It also identified the need for a system wide approach to responding to the Levelling Up and UK Shared Prosperity programmes published by HM Government in order to maximise resources to support the locality.

Nigel Tipple, Chief Executive of OxLEP and Jeremy Long, Chair of OxLEP presented the report and responded to questions. It was highlighted that:

- It had been an objective to develop an ERP that was reflective of the contributions of the whole system, not only OxLEP
- The approach to securing HM Government had been adapted to support business during Covid.

- There was investment in the development of green skills and climate change, as well as supporting areas such as the visitor economy and other challenges
- It had been possible to utilise and bring forward Business Investment Funds
- The Oxfordshire economy had bounced back strongly from Covid, but working with its partners, OxLEP would continue to seek to address the challenges that remained such as the repositioning of town centres
- Under OxLEP's social contract programme it was working closely with initiatives under the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership to support those who found it difficult to enter the workplace including groups of young people.

The Chair commented on the value and breadth of the joint activity and scale of investment being undertaken between OxLEP and local authorities as set out in the ERP Monitoring Plan, including the £750,000 for skills development and the £3.3m within the Outbreak Management Fund. Councillor Brown referred to the importance of the Inclusive Economy Charter and stressed the importance of promoting it to employers so that they had the workforce they needed and that no populations within the county were left behind.

Councillor Rouane asked whether the labour shortages referred to within the report arose through vacancies for high skilled jobs which would require additional training or were those vacancies comprised of lower skilled roles which were not being filled. Nigel Tipple responded that there was a combination of factors at play including a nationwide shortage of staff in the hospitality sectors, which had traditionally relied on a non-UK workforce who had not returned to the UK following the pandemic and Brexit. Other workers had moved into sectors with other sectors where they assessed the terms and conditions were better and were reluctant to move back.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Future Oxfordshire Partnership notes the progress being made in delivering the Economic Recovery Plan and the key issues facing the economy
2. That the Future Oxfordshire Partnership maintains its support for continued whole-system working, through the Economic Recovery Task Group, to address the economic challenges faced in Oxfordshire. In so doing ensure the co-ordination of resources across the "whole system" structures to support investment in businesses and local communities.

9. Housing and Growth Deal Reports

(a) Review of Homes from Infrastructure (Hfi) Programme

The Panel considered a report which set out the results of a review of the Housing and Growth Deal Homes from Infrastructure Programme and recommended changes to the funding allocations. John McLauchlan, Head of Service, Infrastructure Programme Office, Oxfordshire County Council presented the report and answered member questions.

In discussion members acknowledged the difficulty of the decision but commented on the importance of making the best use of the limited resources available with the parameters of the Housing and Growth Deal. Councillor Leffman added that it was acknowledged that the Central Oxfordshire Transport Strategy, (COTS) should be cognitive of bus routes as both the Banbury and Woodstock Road were key bus routes and the need to connect Oxford to all parts of the county for everyone, not just cyclists was fully recognised. Although at an early stage, the COTS would cover a number of headings including

measures such as bus filters, bus lanes and active travel facilities. Consultation would also be undertaken and funding opportunities would be pursued holistically.

RESOLVED: That the Future Oxfordshire Partnership:

1. Endorse the removal of further funding from two schemes currently within the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal programme – Woodstock Road Corridor and Banbury Road Corridor
2. Endorse the re-allocation of the remaining funding from Woodstock Road Corridor and Banbury Road Corridor across a number of schemes in the programme which are projecting cost pressures – especially those entering their Construction phases
3. Note the intended timescale for the formal consideration of these proposals at the Oxfordshire County Council Cabinet meeting on 19 July 2022.
4. Note that a second change report will now also come forward – intended for meeting of the Future Oxfordshire Partnership on 26 July 2022 and then Oxfordshire County Council Cabinet on 20 September 2022 – allowing for a further review of the current programme's pressures and also an assessment of any additional schemes identified as being suitable for inclusion in the programme.

(b) Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal, Homes from Infrastructure (Hfi) Programme- Lessons Learned

The Partnership considered a report which set out the findings of a recent lessons learned review of the Housing and Growth Deal Homes from Infrastructure, (Hfi) programme. The report was introduced by Paul Staines, Interim Head of Programme who highlighted that:

- The findings of the review had reflected many comments that many members of the Partnership were likely to be previously aware of.
- In considering the report in a context of a lessons learnt review, it was also important to be cognisant of the success including the delivery of a Hfi programme which remained above the targets agreed with HM Government.
- The Housing and Growth Deal was an important, but relatively modest funding stream, with the majority of successful housing delivery work taking place within local planning authorities through local plans and developer engagement.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

(c) Infrastructure Advisory Group update

Councillor Leffman referred to the notes of the meeting of the Infrastructure Advisory Group held on 28 February 2022 and highlighted that the application for Bus Service Improvement Plan, (BSIP) had been returned to HM Government for consideration. Oxfordshire had been fortunate to provisionally secure some £12m funding through the BSIP bid process and a response was hoped for soon.

RESOLVED: That the update report be noted.

(d) Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Advisory Group update

Councillor Smith referred to the notes of the meetings of the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Advisory Group held on 17 February, 17 March and 29 April 2022. It was highlighted that a

second joint workshop between council leaders and members of the advisory group was expected to take place in July. Communication around the Plan remained an area of focus.

RESOLVED: That the update report be noted.

(e) Environment Advisory Group update

Councillor David Rouane referred to the notes of the meeting of the Environment Advisory Group held on 24 March 2022. He highlighted the issue of solar farms, in light of the growth in planning applications and issues around housing, farming and land use and suggested that this was an item the Partnership might wish to examine in some way. Councillor Smith commented that it was an open question whether solar farm policy best sat at Oxfordshire Plan or Local Plan level, but there was a need as an Oxfordshire system to give the issues raised due consideration.

The Chair undertook to discuss with others how the issue might most appropriately be taken forward and considered within the Partnership.

Councillor Brown also suggested that consideration should also be given to the impact of food strategy and how this might most appropriately be considered at the Oxfordshire level as this also had cross cutting sustainability and inclusivity implications.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

10. Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership Update

The Partnership considered a report which provided an update on the progress of Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership, (OIEP). The report was presented by Clayton Lavallin, Principal Regeneration and Economic Officer, Oxford City Council.

Jeremy Long, Chair of OxLEP paid tribute to Clayton Lavallin for his work in supporting the OIEP and highlighted that the OIEP and the Inclusivity Charter was an Oxfordshire wide programme and which had good innovative support from the business community and which now needed to be promoted.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

11. Updates to the Future Oxfordshire Partnership Terms of Reference, Memorandum of Understanding and advisory groups Terms of Reference

The Partnership considered a report which set out minor technical changes to the Future Oxfordshire Partnership Terms of Reference, Memorandum of Understanding and the Terms of Reference of the Future Oxfordshire Partnership advisory groups. Kevin Jacob, Senior Democratic Services Officer for the Future Oxfordshire Partnership presented the report.

RESOLVED: That the Future Oxfordshire Partnership approve:

1. The amendment of para 2.2 of the Partnership's Terms of Reference by the replacement of a representative from the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group with a representative from the Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire, and West Berkshire Integrated Care Board as set out in Appendix 1.

2. An updated Memorandum of Understanding to reflect the name change from Oxfordshire Growth Board to Future Oxfordshire Partnership as set out in Appendix 2.
3. The amendment of para 2.3 of the Terms of Reference of the Housing Advisory subgroup, Infrastructure Advisory subgroup and Environment Advisory subgroup and para 2.4 of the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Advisory subgroup in respect of the appointment of substitute members, as set out in Appendices 3-6.

12. Future Oxfordshire Partnership Forward Plan

Kevin Jacob, Senior Democratic Services Officer, presented the Partnership's Forward Plan.

The Chair commented that along with officers, he would be reviewing the Forward Programme to see if opportunities for dedicated topic work could be undertaken and that he had asked officers to do all that they could to around the timeliness of the availability of Partnership and advisory group papers.

RESOLVED: That the Future Oxfordshire Partnership Forward Programme be noted.

13. Updates on matters relevant to the Future Oxfordshire Partnership

No matters were raised which had not been covered within the Agenda.

14. Dates of next meetings

The Future Oxfordshire Partnership noted the date of Future meetings as set out in the Agenda.

The meeting closed at 4.00 pm