

Supplementary Papers

Contact Officer: Kevin Jacob, Growth Board Democratic Services Officer
Tel: 01235 422 191

FOR THE MEETING OF

Oxfordshire Growth Board

held in the Didcot Civic Hall, Britwell Road, Didcot, OX11 7JN

on Tuesday 26 March 2019 at 2.00 pm

The reports marked 'to follow' on the agenda published on Monday 18th March 2019 are attached. Please bring these with you to the meeting.

- 1 **One Public Estate** (Pages 2 - 6)
To receive an update from Yvonne Rees and Bev Hindle.
- 1 **Oxfordshire Plan 2050 (JSSP) sub-group update** (Pages 7 - 9)
To receive an update from the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 (JSSP) Sub-Group.

March 2019

Oxfordshire One Public Estate Programme

Purpose / Recommendation

1. The purpose of this report is to provide details of the One Public Estate programme and note recent success in attracting further funding from government for new partnership projects.
2. The Growth Board is asked to;
 - a. note the report,
 - b. support the progress of the OPE programme and
 - c. consider the opportunity to take an oversight role over the Partnership.

Executive Summary

3. The Oxfordshire Public Estate Partnership brings together a wide range of public sector organisations locally and is driving the co-location and asset rationalisation agenda.
4. Government seed funding incentivises partners to come to the table to consider opportunities and establish the viability of delivering partnership property projects. It does not offer capital funding to deliver schemes.
5. Oxfordshire now has seven projects as part of the OPE programme in all areas of the county.
6. There is an opportunity to build on this success and identify other ways in which the public sector in Oxfordshire can work together to align their estates planning and develop a pipeline of future projects.

Background

7. One Public Estate is a collaboration between the Office of Government Property (Cabinet Office) and the Local Government Association (LGA). It began in 2013 and Oxfordshire joined the programme in 2018 when we were awarded funding for four projects.
8. We have been successful in bidding for funding again this year and awarded funding for three new projects.
9. Oxfordshire's OPE Partnership was established in 2018 initially to bid for central government funding for partnership projects and has since grown to explore further opportunities for joint working. This includes how public sector organisations can use

their land assets to maximise the delivery of affordable housing to support the Oxfordshire Growth Deal. Annex A sets out the details of the membership of the Partnership.

10. Oxfordshire County Council is the accountable body for the Partnership and has provided in-kind resource to manage the projects to date. The Partnership's terms of reference draw a link to the Growth Board but this has not been developed in practice and visibility of the OPE work has been fairly limited to date.

Key Issues

11. Given the growth of the programme and aspiration to build on success to date the Partnership has agreed to the use of programme management funding to appoint a fixed term programme manager. This will ensure that the projects are progressed in line with our agreed timetable with government. Once this limited funding runs out the Partnership will need to consider whether it wishes to continue to fund the work which could be done by contribution by partners.
12. OPE funding is only for feasibility type work and does not provide capital funding to deliver projects. As our first phase of projects start to report on viability there will be a challenge as to how projects should be progressed such as through joint ventures between relevant partners and how funding contributions will be managed where complicated ownership and capital receipt issues arise. This will likely be managed on a case by case basis but will demand commitment from partner organisations to the principles of a One Public Estate and creativity to overcome inevitable governance challenges.

Programme Details

13. The table below outlines the details of our OPE projects

Project	Funding	Partners	Summary
Witney Welch Way (2018)	£60,000	OCC, WODC, Oxford Health NHS FT, TVP, OCCG, Nuffield Health Centre, OUH NHS FT	There are multiple public sector assets on Welch Way. There is an opportunity to rationalise these, create a community hub and release land. Discussions ongoing with Health Centre owners and brief to commission option appraisal being finalised.
Bicester Queens Avenue (2018)	£65,000	OCC, Homes England, TVP	Homes England wish to dispose of the old Magistrates Court. OCC owns the adjacent site and has the opportunity to purchase the Magistrates for development and consolidation of service delivery potentially alongside other partners. Valuation exercise in progress and HE keen for resolution asap.

<p>Joint Depot (2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Witney - Potentially Oxford 	£80,000	WODC, OCC, TVP	<p>A review of depot related activity across all organisations was conducted and concluded that there were several asset related opportunities to be investigated further with the additional potential for organisations to work together to rationalise service delivery. Option appraisal for co-located depot in Witney for district, police and fire purposes has just been commissioned.</p>
<p>Abingdon Guildhall (2018)</p>	£50,000	OCC, VOWHDC, Abingdon TC, Oxford Health NHS FT, OCCG, Malthouse surgery	<p>Outcome of option appraisal to create a community hub in Abingdon and maximise use of a range of public sector assets has recently been produced. Main findings are for OCC and VOWHDC to consider and agree next steps. Scheme shows viability but will require detailed governance.</p>
<p>Programme Management</p> <p>(2018)</p> <p>(2019)</p>	£60,000		<p>Partnership has agreed to recruit a fixed term programme manager to manage projects and enable the partnership to develop a pipeline of future work.</p>
<p>Didcot Public Asset Review (2019)</p>	£85,000	SODC, OCC, Oxford Health NHS FT, Homes England	<p>Consolidation of services onto a reduced number of sites to enable housing delivery, unblocking of the Didcot Gateway development (primarily HE land) and to maximise use of the Didcot hospital site. Additionally, there is scope to co-locate the police and fire stations onto one site.</p>
<p>East Oxford Public Asset Review (Cowley) (2019)</p>	£90,000	OCC, Ox City Council, Oxford Health NHS FT, TVP	<p>The aspiration is to enable the release of one or more sites for housing as a result of co-location of services. These include the potential for co-location of the Police and Fire service (Cowley Police Station and Slade Fire Station) and mental health and social care services (Manzil Way Resource Centre and Oxford Community Support Service).</p>
<p>Kidlington Exeter Close (2019)</p>	£50,000	Kidlington PC, OCCG, Key Medical Centre, OCC, CDC, Oxford Health NHS FT	<p>Project proposes creation of a new community hub including co-location of the community centre, library and increased primary care provision at Exeter Close (Kidlington parish council owned)</p>

14. In addition to the formal OPE projects there is a wealth of partnership asset related activity going on in the county such as co-location of fire and police services, office sharing arrangements, district led regeneration projects and master-planning exercises.

Risk Management

15. There are a number of risks to the successful delivery of the programme due to the financial viability and governance challenges that will need to be overcome in most cases. These are being mitigated through a strong partnership, regular reporting and the commitment to deliver co-located public services for the people of Oxfordshire.

Communications

16. Communications around OPE have been limited to date as funding is for feasibility work and we have yet to establish the viability of these projects. However there is considerable member interest in assets in their communities and a desire across the board to see services provided in the most effective way.
17. Communication within and between partner organisations around the projects has to be managed carefully as the progress of each project will be subject to governance processes of all those organisations involved.
18. It is proposed that regular updates on the OPE programme are provided to the Growth Board and their challenge to the progress of the programme is welcomed.

Report by: Claire Phillips, Asset and Investment Manager, Oxfordshire County Council

March 2019

Annex A: Oxfordshire One Public Estate Partnership Membership

- Oxfordshire County Council
- Oxford City Council
- Cherwell DC
- South Oxfordshire DC
- Vale of White Horse DC
- West Oxfordshire DC
- Thames Valley Police
- Oxford University
- Oxford Brookes University
- Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group
- Oxford University Hospitals NHS FT
- Oxford Health NHS FT
- South Central Ambulance Service
- Homes England

Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Advisory Sub-Group

Thursday 24 January 2019, 10:00

Committee Room Two, West Oxfordshire District Council Offices

Present:

Councillor James Mills (JM), Oxfordshire Growth Board/West Oxfordshire District Council
Councillor Colin Clarke (CC), Cherwell District Council
Councillor Jeff Haine (JH), West Oxfordshire District Council
Councillor Anthony Hayward (AH), Vale of White Horse District Council
Councillor Alex Hollingsworth (AH), Oxford City Council
Councillor Ian Snowdon (WH), South Oxfordshire District Council

In attendance:

Giles Hughes (GH), West Oxfordshire District Council
Rachel Williams (RW), Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Project Lead
Peter Truman (PT), Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Communications & Engagement Officer

Apologies:

Councillor Will Hall (WH), South Oxfordshire District Council
Councillor Mike Fox-Davies (MF-D), Oxfordshire County Council
Councillor Jeannette Matelot (JMa), Oxfordshire County Council

1. Notes of meeting held 20 December 2018

The sub-group **AGREED** the notes of the previous meeting.

2. Apologies for absence

See above. Also noted – that Councillor Ian Snowdon would be a permanent substitute for Councillor Will Hall.

3. Declarations of Interest

None.

4. Statement of Community Involvement

It was highlighted that the Statement of Community Involvement made reference to the plan throughout as the Joint Statutory Spatial Plan (JSSP) which raised some concern given the re-branding of the plan as the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. It was agreed however that it was appropriate to use the formal name (JSSP) given the technical nature of the SCI document and the various review stages it had gone through to date.

5. Oxfordshire Plan Draft Consultation Document (Regulation 18)

The sub-group was reminded that a report to sign off the draft consultation document for the first part of Regulation 18 consultation would go before executives/cabinets of each of the councils in the coming weeks.

The draft consultation document has been reported through Oxford City Council's Scrutiny Committee and through City Executive Board. Two particular issues

surfaced in the discussion, a wish for greater emphasis on environmental issues and recognition of the importance of social housing. There were some suggestions for minor amendments to the document which the Heads of Planning of the Councils would consider making prior to publication.

6. Consultation Plans

RW set out that the key objectives of this initial consultation were to raise awareness of the plan and to start to build a database of consultees.

PT then explained the consultation strategy in detail. The sub-group sought to ensure that the choice of locations for the events was robust. It was explained that the locations had been staggered across the county as much as possible while taking into account accessibility, potential to take advantage of market days / other key events and roadshow timing constraints.

It was requested that members attend the events if possible.

A discussion then took place around how to ensure the most meaningful engagement with key stakeholders, including the potential convening of a consultation panel. RW advised that the practicalities of this would be explored.

PT outlined the plans for publicising the consultation which would go over and above the statutory requirements. The advantages of using social media particularly for reaching a wider audience were particularly emphasised. A judgement had also been made as to the potential effectiveness of particular social media platforms, with Facebook and Twitter considered to be the most resource effective compared with Instagram or YouTube.

It was agreed among the sub-group members that engagement through the Growth Board social media platforms, as opposed to setting up new Oxfordshire Plan accounts, was a reasonable approach and that all social media content needed to be meaningful and engaging. It was also agreed that social media activity should be moderated as appropriate and monitored to ensure that publicity was effective.

The sub-group also welcomed plans for publicity through the use of bus and rail advertisements, hyper-local advertising, trade publications and engagement through wider networks.

7. Update on Expressway Discussions with MCHLG

GH reported that a meeting had been held with government officials from MHCLG the previous week, where it was explained that there was continued concern over the uncertainty around the Oxford – Cambridge Expressway, its potential route and misalignment of project timescales.

It was agreed that a note be provided to the ministry to set out in further detail the potential implications for the plan's progress. The sub-group also agreed that this would likely be a common issue raised through the forthcoming consultation and there needed to be a clear message conveyed that it was not within the remit of the Oxfordshire Plan to determine the Expressway route. It was thought that the extent that this proved to be an issue for respondents in the consultation should be measured to provide further evidence of the challenges faced.

The sub-group further agreed that officers should consider whether it would be necessary to use capacity funding for legal advice at this stage.

8. Forward Work Plan

It was reported that Oxfordshire County Council had advised that work on the Local Transport Plan had been delayed. Further, there was ongoing debate around whether this would be a refresh of LTP4 or a LTP5. The advice was that work would commence in the Spring.

9. Future Meetings

It was noted that the next meetings of the sub-group were scheduled for Thursdays 21 February and 21 March 2019 (both at 10a.m.), and that one of those meetings would include an update on the Local Transport Plan.

10. AOB

Concern was raised over the detail contained in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Scoping Report that was currently out to consultation. Specifically, it appeared that options were being tested prematurely. RW reassured members that at this stage no policy options had been tested and explained the iterative process of SA, the scoping stage of which merely set out baseline data and the assessment framework.

Members requested that feedback from the launch event be shared, and PT advised that this would be circulated by the end of the day (24 January).

The meeting finished at 11:45 a.m.