

# Agenda



## Oxfordshire Growth Board

**Tuesday 27 November 2018 at 2.00 pm**  
**Didcot Civic Hall, Britwell Road, Didcot, OX11 7JN**

From 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019, the Oxfordshire Growth Board meetings are managed by South Oxfordshire District Council.

Contact: Steve Culliford

E-mail: [democratic.services@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@southandvale.gov.uk)

Telephone: 01235 422520

Website: [www.oxfordshiregrowthboard.org](http://www.oxfordshiregrowthboard.org)

### Voting members 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019

Leader of South Oxfordshire District Council  
(which holds the chairmanship)

Leader of Vale of White Horse District Council  
(which holds the vice-chairmanship)

Leader of Cherwell District Council

Leader of Oxford City Council

Leader of Oxfordshire County Council

Leader of West Oxfordshire District Council

Councillor Jane Murphy

Councillor Roger Cox

Councillor Barry Wood

Councillor Susan Brown

Councillor Ian Hudspeth

Councillor James Mills

### Non-voting members 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019

Chairman of OxLEP

Vice-Chairman and Skills Board representative

Universities representative

OxLEP business representative - Bicester

OxLEP business representative – Oxford City

OxLEP business representative – Science Vale

Homes England representative

Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group  
representative

Environment Agency representative

Jeremy Long

Adrian Lockwood

Professor Alistair Fitt

Phil Shadbolt

Peter Nolan

Angus Horner

Catherine Turner/Kevin Bournier

Louise Patten

Lesley Tims

*Note: Members of the Board may be accompanied at the table by senior officers from their organisation.*

As a matter of courtesy, if you intend to record the meeting please let the contact officer know in advance of this meeting.

# **AGENDA**

## **PART ONE – PUBLIC BUSINESS**

- 1 Apologies for absence**
- 2 Chairman's announcements**
- 3 Declarations of interest**
- 4 Minutes** (Pages 6 - 11)

To adopt as a correct record the minutes of the Oxfordshire Growth Board meeting held on 25 September 2018.

### **5 Public participation**

Members of the public may ask questions of the Chairman of the Growth Board, or address the Growth Board on any substantive item at a meeting, subject to the restrictions set out in the public participation scheme.

The total amount of time allowed for public participation at a meeting shall not exceed 30 minutes, unless the Chairman consents to extend that time in the interests of the proper conduct of the business of the Growth Board.

A person speaking to the Growth Board may speak for up to three minutes. Board members may ask questions for clarification.

#### **Asking a question**

Questions (in full and in writing) must be received **by 5pm on Wednesday 21 November 2018**. A written or verbal answer will be provided by the Chairman at the meeting. The questioner may ask a supplementary question directly related to either the original question or the reply received.

#### **Addressing the Board**

Notice of a wish to address the Growth Board by making a statement must be received **by 12 noon on Monday 26 November 2018**.

#### **Petitions**

Petitions on matters directly relevant to matters in which the Growth Board has powers and duties must be received **by 5pm on Wednesday 21 November 2018**. The representative of the petitioners may speak. Petitions are referred without discussion to the next meeting.

Questions, petitions and notice of addresses must be submitted to [democratic.services@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@southandvale.gov.uk) or delivered/posted to Democratic Services, South Oxfordshire District Council, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton, OX14 4SB.

### **6 Feedback from the scrutiny panel**

To receive feedback from the chairman of the Scrutiny Panel.

## **7 Feedback from the sub-groups** (Pages 12 - 16)

To receive feedback from the chairmen of the sub-groups:

- Joint Statutory Spatial Plan Sub-Group (18 October notes attached; November notes not yet available)
- Housing Sub-Group (12 November notes to follow)
- Infrastructure Sub-Group

## **8 Healthy place-shaping in the wider growth agenda** (Pages 17 - 24)

To consider the attached report from the Chief Executive Officers of Cherwell District Council/Oxfordshire County Council, South Oxfordshire District Council/Vale of the White Horse District Council, Oxford City Council, West Oxfordshire District Council, Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group, and The Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership.

## **9 Energy strategy**

To receive a presentation from the Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership on taking forward the energy strategy.

## **10 Housing and Growth Deal delivery** (Pages 25 - 37)

To update the Board on progress with the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal and to receive feedback from the chairs of the sub-groups and scrutiny panel:

- Quarter two reports on the following strands:
  - Affordable housing
  - Infrastructure
  - The Joint Statutory Spatial Plan
  - Productivity
- Years 2 and 3 affordable housing programme
- Years 2 to 5 infrastructure programme

## **11 Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership update**

To receive an update from Nigel Tipple, the Chief Executive of the Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership.

## **12 Growth Board Forward Plan**

To review the Growth Board's Forward Plan. **TO FOLLOW**

## **13 Updates on matters relevant to the Growth Board**

Growth Board members and officers may verbally update the Board on progress on matters previously before the Board for consideration, listed in the forward plan, or relevant to the Board's future decisions. This is for the sharing of information and no decisions will be taken.

## **14    Dates of next meetings**

The dates of future Growth Board meetings are below. These will be held on Tuesdays at 2pm in Didcot Civic Hall.

- 29 January 2019
- 26 March
- 4 June

## **Councillors' duties on declaring interests**

### **General duty**

You must declare any disclosable pecuniary interests when the meeting reaches the item on the agenda headed "Declarations of Interest" or as soon as it becomes apparent to you.

### **What is a disclosable pecuniary interest?**

Disclosable pecuniary interests relate to your\* employment; sponsorship (ie payment for expenses incurred by you in carrying out your duties as a councillor or towards your election expenses); contracts; land in the council's area; licences for land in the council's area; corporate tenancies; and securities. These declarations must be recorded in each councillor's register of interests which is publicly available on the council's website.

### **Declaring an interest**

Where any matter disclosed in your register of interests is being considered at a meeting, you must declare that you have an interest. You should also disclose the nature as well as the existence of the interest. If you have a disclosable pecuniary interest, after having declared it at the meeting you must not participate in discussion or voting on the item and must withdraw from the meeting whilst the matter is discussed.

### **Member's Code of Conduct and public perception**

Even if you do not have a disclosable pecuniary interest in a matter, the Councillors' Code of Conduct says that a member "must serve only the public interest and must never improperly confer an advantage or disadvantage on any person including yourself" and that "you must not place yourself in situations where your honesty and integrity may be questioned". What this means is that the matter of interests must be viewed within the context of the code as a whole and regard should continue to be paid to the perception of the public.

\*Disclosable pecuniary interests that must be declared are not only those of the member her or himself but also those of the member's spouse, civil partner or person they are living with as husband or wife or as if they were civil partners.

# Minutes

## OF A MEETING OF THE

# Oxfordshire Growth Board



**HELD ON TUESDAY 25 SEPTEMBER 2018 AT 2.00 PM**

**DIDCOT CIVIC HALL, BRITWELL ROAD, DIDCOT, OX11 7JN**

### **Present:**

**Voting members:** Councillors Jane Murphy (Chairman), Roger Cox, Susan Brown, Ian Hudspeth, James Mills and Barry Wood

**Non-voting members:** Professor Alistair Fitt (Universities' Representative), Angus Horner (Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership business representative for Science Vale), Adrian Lockwood (OxLEP Vice-Chairman and Skills Board Representative), Jeremy Long (Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership), Louise Patten (Clinical Commissioning Group Chief Executive), Lesley Tims (Environment Agency Strategic Planning and Engagement Manager for Thames Area), and Catherine Turner (Homes and Communities Agency)

**Officers:** Peter Clark (Oxfordshire County Council Chief Executive), Steve Culliford (South Oxfordshire District Council), Andrew Down (South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils), Christine Gore (West Oxfordshire District Council Chief Executive), Caroline Green (Oxford City Council), Sue Halliwell (Oxfordshire County Council), Bev Hindle (Oxfordshire County Council), Gordon Mitchell (Oxford City Council Chief Executive), Yvonne Rees (Cherwell District Council Chief Executive), and Paul Staines (Oxfordshire Growth Board)

**Also present:** Andrew Gant (Oxford City Council and Chairman of the Oxfordshire Growth Board Scrutiny Panel) and Nigel Tipple (Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership)

### **17 Apologies for absence**

None

### **18 Declarations of interest**

None

### **19 Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** The minutes of the Oxfordshire Growth Board's meeting held on 31 July 2018 were signed and adopted as a correct record.

## 20 Chairman's announcements

The chairman asked all present to silence their mobile telephones and advised of emergency evacuation arrangements.

The chairman also announced that Peter Clark, Chief Executive of Oxfordshire County Council, was retiring and this would be his last meeting. The Growth Board thanked Mr Clark for his work.

## 21 Public participation

Mr Adrian Townsend made a statement about the threat of development to Garsington village. He believed that it was unnecessary to build a new motorway through the Green Belt and near to Garsington. Other areas were in greater need of investment. The proposed motorway was both unwanted and unneeded. He urged the Growth Board to adopt this as its response to the National Infrastructure Commission.

The chairman thanked Mr Townsend for his statement.

## 22 Presentation from the Environment Agency

Joe Cuthbertson, of the Environment Agency, gave a presentation on behalf of the Defra group, which also included the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, Natural England and the Forestry Commission. He spoke about the need to include environmental considerations into the planned growth for Oxfordshire and urged the Growth Board to involve the Environment Agency in its early discussions. He believed that there did not have to be a choice between development and the environment; they could help each other.

**RESOLVED:** to welcome the Environment Agency's proposal for early engagement in planning for Oxfordshire's growth and ask officers to take this into account.

## 23 Presentation from Active Oxfordshire

Keith Johnston, of Active Oxfordshire, gave a presentation on the need to create increased physical activity as a daily habit. He outlined how the Growth Board could help with this challenge by:

- embedding the goal of creating an active population in the Growth Board's vision and strategies for Oxfordshire
- considering the impact on inactivity in decisions the Growth Board and its partner councils made
- creating new 'active environments' in new housing developments
- actively supporting opportunities for collaboration

The Growth Board supported Active Oxfordshire's aims. The Environment Agency and the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group concurred. The Growth Board's Housing Sub-Group had already discussed the need to design active living into new housing developments. Examples of this were cited at Bicester and Barton.

**RESOLVED:** to welcome the aims of Active Oxfordshire and to encourage better design of new housing developments to increase physical activity of Oxfordshire's population.

## 24 Oxford to Cambridge expressway corridor

The Growth Board considered a report on the Government's recent announcement on the preferred corridor for the proposed Oxford to Cambridge Expressway. Although there was some disappointment that the announcement did not end uncertainty on the route, the Growth Board welcomed the principle of the proposed expressway as it should relieve traffic pressure on the A34 and separate local traffic from national traffic. However, once the route had been decided, the Growth Board would work with local communities to mitigate its impacts.

The Growth Board agreed a set of principles to allow Oxfordshire to have an overall strategic position and make clear the main issues requiring further consideration. These were to:

1. help secure a more sustainable and integrated Oxfordshire transport network by:
  - providing enhanced local connections to reduce transport pressures on local roads around key settlements;
  - linking with and strengthening key transport hubs, such as integrated bus, rail and Park and Ride facilities;
  - securing opportunities for the development of new Park and Ride connections to Oxford, Milton Keynes and Cambridge and rapid bus links between the three cities and surrounding market towns;
2. minimise its environmental damage and avoid sensitive areas such as areas with sites of special scientific interest and protected habitats;
3. support growth and the investigation of new settlement options through joint spatial plans; and
4. be future proofed, in terms of taking account of modal shift and innovation such as the rise of autonomous vehicles.

**RESOLVED:** to

- (a) agree that the chairman writes to Homes England and the Department for Transport to ask that the four principles above be taken into account in further decision-making on the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway; and
- (b) first circulate the draft letter to Growth Board members for comment.

## 25 Housing and Growth Deal delivery update

A report was presented on progress made with the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal. The focus had been on the delivery of the year one programmes and working on future years programmes. Officers had also been implementing the planning freedoms and flexibilities announced by the Government in September. The Growth Board noted that its three sub-groups and the Scrutiny Panel had all held their first meetings in September. An engagement event had been organised for 18 October to explore opportunities and innovations for affordable housing.

**RESOLVED:** to note the progress made towards the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal milestones, set out in the deal's Delivery Plan.



## 26 Planning freedoms and flexibilities

The Growth Board received a report on the Government's announcement confirming the planning freedoms and flexibilities afforded to Oxfordshire. This was announced through a written ministerial statement. This set the requirement for the district councils' housing land supply at three years. This was effective from 12 September 2018 and would continue in place for each district until the adoption of the Oxfordshire Spatial Plan.

The Growth Board welcomed the Government's announcement but recognised the importance of delivering the spatial plan.

**RESOLVED:** to note the report and to welcome the Government's written ministerial statement on Oxfordshire's planning freedoms and flexibilities.

## 27 Feedback from Scrutiny Panel and Advisory Sub-Groups

The Growth Board received verbal updates from the chairmen of its Scrutiny Panel and the three sub-groups.

### Scrutiny Panel

Councillor Andrew Gant, of Oxford City Council, had been appointed as chairman of the Scrutiny Panel. He reported that the panel aimed to add value to the work of the Growth Board. Its first meeting had concentrated on process, timing of meetings, and membership. The panel had agreed to meet on the Thursday before each Growth Board meeting. The panel asked that the Growth Board's agenda was published in sufficient time to allow for effective scrutiny.

The panel aimed to compile a forward plan and asked that this was published on the Growth Board's website alongside the panel's agendas and minutes.

The panel had identified the need for greater public engagement in Growth Board matters such as affordable housing, the local industrial strategy, and the route of the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway.

### Joint Spatial Plan Sub-Group

Councillor James Mills, chairman of the Joint Spatial Plan Sub-Group reported that the first meeting had been effective, setting parameters and ensuring that the spatial plan followed the statutory framework. The group proposed public engagement on the draft plan through the sub-groups and key stakeholders. It would prepare a forward plan to lead its work and aimed to meet monthly, at least for the remainder of 2018, to prepare for the Regulation 18 consultation.

### Housing Sub-Group

Councillor Susan Brown, chairman of the Housing Sub-Group, reported that the first meeting had been productive. The sub-group would prepare a forward plan. The members wished to share best practice and had looked at modular build and self-build concepts and healthy living design for new developments, tying in with the aims of Active Oxfordshire and the Environment Agency.

## **Infrastructure Sub-Group**

Councillor Ian Hudspeth, chairman of the Infrastructure Sub-group, reported that its first meeting had looked at which infrastructure should be prioritised to unlock new development. Such decisions should be in line with the Housing Infrastructure Fund bids submitted to Government and the need to tie in with the route of the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway and other infrastructure. The sub-group had identified the need for greater flexibility in decision-making.

**RESOLVED:** to note the feedback from the Scrutiny Panel and the three sub-groups.

## **28 Oxfordshire local plans progress**

The Growth Board considered a report updating on progress with the Local Plans. It was noted that Oxford City Council would meet in October to consider its plan for consultation under Regulation 19. South Oxfordshire would be doing likewise in December.

**RESOLVED:** to note the progress on the Local Plans.

## **29 Local Enterprise Partnership update**

The Growth Board received an update from the Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership's chief executive on the Government's review of local enterprise partnerships, on progress with the Local Industrial Strategy, and on cross-corridor work with other local enterprise partnerships.

The chairman thanked the chief executive, Mr Tipple, for his update.

## **30 Sub-National Transport Body**

The Growth Board received an update on the Sub-National Transport Body that was meeting in September to develop a shared vision across the Oxford to Cambridge corridor. At the next Growth Board meeting there would be a further written report.

## **31 Rail Connectivity Update**

The Growth Board noted that the rail connectivity study was progressing, using Government funding. Presentation slides were displayed giving the detail.

In answer to a question from a Growth Board member, it was noted that the study would not stop at Charlbury but would extend across West Oxfordshire and on to Hereford and Worcester.

## **32 Updates on matters relevant to the Growth Board**

None

## **33 Dates of next meetings**

The dates of future Growth Board meetings are below. These will be held on Tuesdays at 2pm in Didcot Civic Hall.

- 27 November 2018
- 29 January 2019
- 26 March
- 4 June

The meeting closed at 3.25 pm

Chairman

Date

# JSSP Advisory Sub-Group

**Thursday 18 October 2018, 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 Alex Hollingsworth (AH), Oxford City Council  
Councillor Mike Fox-Davies (MF-D), Oxfordshire County Council  
Councillor Jeff Haine (JH), West Oxfordshire District Council  
Councillor Jeanette Matelot (JMa), Oxfordshire County Council

**In attendance:**

Giles Hughes (GH), West Oxfordshire District Council  
Rachel Williams (RW), Oxford City Council

**Apologies:**

Councillor Anthony Hayward (AH), Vale of White Horse District Council  
Councillor Will Hall (WH), South Oxfordshire District Council

**1. Notes of meeting held 6 September 2018**

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

**2. Apologies for absence**

See above

**3. Declarations of Interest**

None.

**4. Updates**

(a) Council approvals of Local Development Scheme, Statement of Community Involvement and Scoping Document

GH introduced a number of minor changes which had been agreed by the respective Heads of Planning in line with the relevant Council resolutions and which were considered necessary for added clarity. These are included in the [Appendix](#) to these notes.

In relation to the proposed change to paragraph 7.1 (a) of the scoping document, AH queried why the added wording was needed. GH explained that because Local Planning Authorities were not bound by the NPPF to follow the Housing Need Methodology the additional wording was necessary to set out that the NPPF as a whole needed to be accorded to.

**AGREED:** That the minor changes made to the documents be noted.

(b) Recruitment to JSSP Team

RW announced that there was significant interest expressed with 57 CVs received and a very strong field of candidates interviewed.

For the Communications and Engagement Officer role, an offer had been made.

For the Project Support Officer, an offer had been accepted.

Conversations were ongoing with five planners with offers of specific roles expected to be finalised by the end of the following week (26 October).

The team would be primarily based at Speedwell House, Oxford.

CC asked what the cost implications for recruitment would be, and it was explained that recruitment would initially be funded out of the £2.5m allocated to the JSSP. However there was no certainty at this stage given that the timetable could change (as discussed under agenda item 7).

## **5. The Growth Agenda**

RW presented the main elements of the JSSP including the key messages to be communicated. The following aspects were discussed:

In respect of alignment to a new transport vision it was re-affirmed that this would not be a refresh of the Local Transport Plan (LTP) which remained the remit of the County Council. The transport vision would develop in liaison with County Council colleagues. The importance of both visionary and evidence elements was emphasised. Similarly, the emerging Local Industrial Strategy (LIS), Ox-Cam corridor work and England's Economic Heartland strategy would also inform the JSSP in an evidencing capacity.

A discussion followed around the JSSP's role in calculating housing need and the challenge of projecting housing need to 2050. RW explained that certainty would reduce towards the latter stages of the plan and that plan reviews would therefore be necessary. AH recognised the potential opportunity for JSSP reviews to coincide with Local Plan reviews and increase efficiency for both processes.

The Sub-Group agreed that a piece of work was necessary to translate to the wider public the importance of the economic elements of the growth deal, and the LIS, in terms of issues that mattered most (e.g. job creation / housing provision / environmental benefits). It was also agreed that strong, consistent messages were needed for local communities, as was the need to influence positive public perception, as raised by JMa. MF-D emphasised that the messages sent out should be succinct and appropriate for the intended audience.

## **6. JSSP Launch Event**

A stakeholder launch event would be scheduled for the end of November. The first draft invite list was discussed with the need to manage numbers whilst ensuring a fair representation of stakeholders highlighted. It was agreed that stakeholders from the following groups would be added where appropriate:

- Key land owners and agents
- Housing Associations
- University colleges
- MHCLG
- Chief Planner (Steve Quartermain)
- Department for Transport
- Local MPs

Any further thoughts on the invite list were welcome and could be forwarded to RW.

The Sub-Group noted the benefit of implementing the text software that had been successful in a trial launch event.

It was also agreed that the JSSP website would be launched at the same time as the event.

**7. JSSP Timetable: Proposed alignment to Expressway decision**

GH explained that Highways England's timescale for the Expressway did not fit with the JSSP timescale and that greater clarity was needed on the potential route options. A paper had been sent to MHCLG requesting discussion of this. The importance of bringing DfT into these conversations had also been emphasised, which the Sub-Group agreed was vital.

JM further highlighted the need for early progress on the JSSP to reduce any risks that could arise as a result of any central government changes. RW emphasised that work on the JSSP would continue in line with the Forward Work Plan until a decision was made by MHCLG. Concerns were however expressed by AH that timescales in the FWP were tight (discussed further under item 8). RW acknowledged that time for more comprehensive early engagement would be useful.

**AGREED:** That a response from MHCLG was awaited. If discussions with civil servants were unsatisfactory, concerns would be taken higher to the Chief Planner.

**8. Forward Work Plan**

Further to earlier comments (see item 7), AH queried whether the JSSP team was still on schedule for bringing a Regulation 18 document to the Sub-Group meeting on 15 November 2018. RW explained that this would be a skeletal document, however what the document would say was broadly known— at this stage it was only testing options.

AH was also concerned that taking the Regulation 18 document to each of the Councils in January was a particularly tight deadline.

It was also a concern that a Vale of White Horse District representative had not been present at the meetings to date.

**AGREED that:**

Work to bring the Regulation 18 document to the Sub-Group on 15 November 2018 be continued.

RW would speak to Committee Secretaries to ensure that it was feasible for each of the Councils to approve the Regulation 18 document by 24 January 2019.

**9. Future Meetings**

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Sub-Group would be held on 15 November 2018 (10a.m.) as set out in the FWP.

The meeting finished at 11.30am.

## Appendix

# Oxfordshire Joint Spatial Plan

As part of making minor and presentational changes, the Heads of Planning agreed the following changes to the Local Development Scheme and Scoping document in order to finalise these documents:

## 1. Local Development Scheme

Para.	Existing text	Proposed change (bold or deletions)
3.	The LDS will be revised as necessary and rolled forward.....	The LDS will be revised <b>in agreement with each council</b> as necessary and rolled forward.....
7.	the documents which are to be Development Plan Documents	the <b>local development</b> documents which are to be <b>development plan</b> documents
	the subject matter and geographical area to which each Development Plan Document is to relate;	the subject matter and geographical area to which each <b>development plan</b> document is to relate;
	which documents are to be development plan documents	<del>which documents are to be development plan documents</del>
	which Development Plan Documents are to be prepared jointly with one or more other local planning authorities;	which <b>development plan</b> documents are to be prepared jointly with one or more other local planning authorities;
	any matter or area in respect of which the authorities have agreed (or propose to agree) to the constitution of a joint committee	any matter or area in respect of which the authorities have agreed (or propose to agree) to the constitution of a joint committee <b>under section 29*</b>  <b>* a joint committee is not proposed in Oxfordshire, decision making will lie with individual local planning authorities</b>
	the timetable for the preparation and revision of the Development Plan Documents; and	the timetable for the preparation and revision of the <b>development plan</b> documents; and

## 2. Scoping Document

Para.	Existing text	Proposed change
3.7	The JSSP's strategic policies will cover the following matters:	The JSSP's strategic policies ( <b>in accordance with the definition in the NPPF</b> ) will cover the following matters:
3.10	Whilst the JSSP will determine the spatial strategy and strategic growth locations it is unlikely to allocate sites.	Whilst the JSSP will determine the spatial strategy and strategic growth <b>areas, it will not allocate sites except at the request of the relevant local planning authority.</b>
3.10	The following diagram is taken from the West of England Plan as one example of how this could be illustrated.  Key diagram illustration	<del>The following diagram is taken from the West of England Plan as one example of how this could be illustrated.</del>  Remove Key Diagram illustration
6.1 (d)	Spatial Strategy – overall quantum of development for housing and employment together with strategic development locations and opportunities and the necessary strategic infrastructure to support this, including a key diagram.	Spatial Strategy – overall quantum of development for housing and employment together with strategic <b>growth areas</b> and the necessary strategic infrastructure to support this, including a key diagram.
7.1 (a)	Oxfordshire Local Housing Need calculation	Oxfordshire Local Housing Need calculation <b>in accordance with the NPPF</b>
8.0	Highways England are now taking forward more detailed development of the Expressway proposals and have identified three potential board corridors for its route which affect Oxfordshire in different ways	Highways England are now taking forward more detailed development of the Expressway proposals and have identified <b>corridor route B and sub-routes B1 and B3</b> <del>three potential board corridors for its route</del> which affect Oxfordshire in different ways
9.6	September 18 – as part the project launch	<b>September 18 – initial discussion</b> <b>October/November 18 – as part of the project launch</b>



## Oxfordshire Growth Board

### Healthy Place-shaping in the Wider Growth Agenda

#### Introduction

There is growing evidence that significant benefits for local people can be achieved through bringing together planning for housing, infrastructure and the economy with planning for residents' health and wellbeing.

No single aspect of people's lives determines their health and wellbeing. Factors as varied as employment status, transport options, quality of housing and access to green space all affect people's health outcomes.

Making sustainable change for the better requires a local approach, aiming to change the behaviour and health status of individuals in communities. *This paper sets out how we can achieve these benefits both at scale and locally by including the concept of 'healthy place-shaping' in our strategic planning frameworks.* Combining a strategic approach with one which is locally sustainable is key to success.

This means that as we seize the growth agenda in Oxfordshire, we can simultaneously create lasting benefits for the health and wellbeing of future generations of local people. This approach also promises to improve productivity, improve efficiency and provide better value for tax-payers.

This paper builds on our local experience and sets out clear proposals for how we can bring together planning for housing, the economy and infrastructure with planning for health and wellbeing. In summary we are proposing:

1. to produce, on behalf of the Growth Board, a strategy for how healthy place-shaping can ensure that development supports the creation of healthy communities.
2. to insert the approach to healthy place-shaping into the governance structure and workstreams of the Growth Deal and Growth Board and the strategies which underpin them (the Joint Statutory Spatial Plan, the Local Industrial Strategy and the Environmental Strategy). Each of these strategies has a major role to play in taking forward healthy place-shaping and will ensure a mutual influence between these important strategic building blocks and will help to unite them as a cohesive whole.
3. to create a network of officers from across our respective organisations to take this work forward, and to appoint a lead officer to coordinate this approach.
4. to hold a countywide workshop for senior Councillors and officers on this topic as set out in the programme for the Joint Statutory Spatial Plan (JSSP) prior to its public consultation in February 2019.

#### Our Local Experience

The principle of bringing together planning for 'place' and planning for 'health' has been acknowledged in Oxfordshire through a variety of routes in the last two years. For example:

- Leaders of Local Authorities making a commitment to find ways to spread the learning from the Healthy New Towns initiatives in Cherwell and the City to other areas in the County at a workshop for Leaders and senior officers held in Bicester in April 2018. This learning from the 'grassroots up' is fundamental as it tells us at a micro-level the types of change we need to make to improve local people's health, increase their use of services and be actively engaged in the planning of their local communities. This learning is at the heart of healthy place-shaping.
- Discussions between Chief Officers of Local Authorities, the NHS the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and the Universities over the last two years aiming to integrate health and social care planning with local planning.
- The NHS's proposals to re-design community services in various parts of the County alongside Local Authority services with the involvement of local people. This initiative is being taken forward under the auspices of the Health and Wellbeing Board.
- Improvements made to services for homeless people and victims of domestic abuse through the combined efforts of all Local Authorities, the NHS and the voluntary and community sector.
- Building the principles of active travel into our Local Transport Plan and recognising the positive impact of this on the health of local people.
- The importance to the local economy of health care and social services and the impact on these services of high house prices, workforce shortages and increasing travel times. Senior officers have long realised that no single organisation acting alone can hope to ameliorate these factors.

### **A unique opportunity for action**

District, City and County Leaders are uniquely placed to take these issues forward because of the unique opportunities available to Oxfordshire at this point in time. These are:

- The presence of two out of the ten national Healthy New Town pilot sites and the practical learning gained from them.
- The successful conclusion of the Growth Deal with Central Government.
- The current work to create a Joint Statutory Spatial Plan a Local Industrial Strategy and a 25 Year Environment Plan.
- The potential to generalise this learning through re-framing local planning policy.
- The forthcoming Housing and Infrastructure Fund proposals
- The re-launching of the Health and Wellbeing Board, its commitment to strengthen Local Authority membership, its support for healthy place-shaping as one of its priorities and its commitment to oversee the local transformation of community services.
- The emerging UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF), the successor to EU funding, which is expected to be deployed in 2021. Social and economic inclusion, as well as skills and training opportunities are expected to feature in UKSPF. Whilst policy has yet to be finalised it's expected UKSPF will be deployed via LEPs
- Oxon 2050 as an umbrella strategy, if pursued.

This presents Leaders with a window of opportunity. Action now can crystallise these opportunities and create a unified planning framework which will benefit local people and local communities over the coming decades.

We can also secure a valuable complementarity and coordination of action between the Growth Board and the Health and Wellbeing Board. This helps to bring together the work of two of our most strategic Boards under the banner of healthy place-shaping. The concept of healthy place-shaping also includes aspects of community safety. The third strategic partnership of relevance to this agenda is therefore the Community Safety Partnership. Taking this first step, as set out in this paper, may also open the door to future discussions between the Growth Board, Health and Wellbeing Board and Community Safety Partnership seeking to unify our approaches to residents' health, wellbeing, prosperity and safety across these three strategic Boards.

Taking this approach will also maximise the spend of the 'Oxfordshire £' with District and County services working in a joined-up approach with the NHS to create healthy communities for local people.

### **How can this be achieved?**

We can do this through taking the local learning from the Healthy New Towns and the concept of '*healthy place-shaping*' and systematically applying it to our current strategic planning through the Growth Deal mechanisms and through influencing our future local plans.

### **What is healthy place-shaping?**

Healthy place-shaping is a practical mechanism for creating healthier communities through unified planning. It can be defined as an approach to planning as follows:

***'Healthy place-shaping is a collaborative process which aims to create sustainable, well-designed communities where healthy behaviours are the norm and which provide a sense of belonging and safety, a sense of identity and a sense of community.'***

***It is also a means of shaping local services, infrastructure and the economy through the application of knowledge about what creates good health, improves productivity and benefits the economy, thus providing efficiencies for the taxpayer.'***

Healthy place-shaping is based on 3 concepts:

1. Shaping the built environment, green spaces and infrastructure at a local level to improve health and wellbeing.
2. Working with local people and local organisations, schools etc to engage them in planning places, facilities and services through 'community activation'.
3. Re-shaping health, wellbeing and care services and the infrastructure which supports them to achieve health benefits, including health services, social care, leisure and recreation services, community centres etc.

Crucially, healthy place-shaping is not just about new developments; it applies to any geographical area experiencing significant change or growth so that all residents have the opportunity to benefit in terms of health and wellbeing.

It also applies to how we connect new developments to existing communities, as there is growing evidence showing that loneliness and social isolation (often transport related or due to commuter towns) are impacting the health of rural populations across the UK, and not just the elderly – often this involves those as little as a mile from a local centre of population as without access to transport, it may as well be 20 miles.

*Thus, healthy place-shaping is an **approach** to planning healthy communities which can be applied in many ways at many levels. In Oxfordshire it can be applied at 3 geographical levels:*

**1) Level 1. Town/village/ new development level.**

Healthy place-shaping applied to all new and existing developments within Districts and the City so as to create healthy communities in the broadest sense. This draws directly on application of the learning from the Healthy New Towns approach. It involves very local changes to individual's behaviour, lifestyles and engagement alongside changes to local infrastructure and services. This is fundamental as a concept and underpins the two approaches below.

**2) Level 2. Locality level.**

The applies to the re-design and transformation of services in localities covering larger populations (approximately 100,000-150,000). This approach considers how the services of many organisations (including NHS, Local Authority and voluntary sector organisations) and their built assets and supporting infrastructure interlock to benefit the health and wellbeing of local residents.

**3) Level 3. County level and beyond.**

This applies the approach to health and wellbeing issues affecting larger strategic infrastructure plans. It covers for example travel and transport planning, workforce planning, the development of the local economy and productivity issues. These factors are integral to the health and wellbeing of local residents and the development of future health and care services.

In Oxfordshire for example we have successfully supported the implementation of Community Employment Plans (CEP) through Planning Policy where major development has taken place, this practice could be adopted more widely. The impact of this would be to create opportunities to ensure communities share the benefits of improved prosperity, associated mobility and housing choice and in so doing promote improved personal and family wellbeing.

**How does this approach deliver benefits?**

The approach offers much because it tackles head-on many of the current challenges society faces. The challenges and potential improvements to be made are summarised in the table below:

<b>Challenge</b>	<b>Potential Improvement</b>	<b>Geographical Level</b>
Lack of coordinated planning between statutory organisations	Unites organisations, services and the public behind a common purpose.	1,2,3
Separate planning systems for 'health' and 'place'	Unites all planning systems under a single banner.	1,2,3
All organisations are under financial constraints.	Assists overburdened NHS and Local Government services through shared efficiencies.	1,2,3
The growing number of cases of dementia in an ageing population.	Creating dementia friendly communities.	1,2

Reducing levels of physical activity which leads to obesity and chronic disease.	Creating cyclepaths, delineated walks, safe and attractive green spaces and walking and cycle friendly routes and pedestrian zones.	1,2
Increasing rates of chronic disease such as diabetes.	As above plus prevention-orientated health services and social prescribing such as the prescription of exercise.	1,2
Lack of social cohesion.	Community involvement in planning, planning communal spaces and facilities, improving community safety and supporting community activation.	1
Lack of community engagement in local planning.	Community activation which works to involve local people, organisations and groups in planning.	1
Lack of social contact and loneliness.	Planning communal areas and facilities. Social prescribing. Supporting community development.	1,2
Increasing rates of minor mental health problems.	Facilitating physical activity and community participation. Social prescribing. Prevention work in schools and workplaces.	1,2
Failure to engage and coordinate the activities of schools, practices, leisure centres and libraries.	Building engagement of local services into local planning methodology.	1
Getting people with health problems back into work.	Targeted approaches with local health services and support for wellbeing-at-work schemes.	1
Persistent social disadvantage and inequality.	Services targeted to meet local needs for specific areas or groups that engages with and draws on the insight of those with greatest needs.	1,2
Difficulties in engaging 'hard to reach' groups.	Services targeted to meet local needs for specific areas or groups based on local insight.	1,2
Unifying preventative services into a single 'offer' for the public.	Through closer joint working between Local Authorities, the NHS and the voluntary and community sector.	1,2,3
Reducing environmental pollution and carbon emissions. Concerns over health effects of particulates in the air.	Better planning and design of housing and transport. Promotion of and support for Active Travel.	1,2,3
Disconnected and duplicative local services from uncoordinated estate.	Incorporates the principles of 'one public estate' within the planning system.	1,2
Increasing travel times for service delivery to people's homes and home to work travel times.	Development of neighbourhood models of service provision. Consideration of travel times in strategic infrastructure planning. Considering the siting and character of businesses.	2,3
Workforce shortages for nursing and home care staff.	Delivery of affordable homes. Development of attractive communities that will encourage recruitment and retention of staff.	2,3

Flows of urgent cases to hospitals within and beyond the County	Better planning and design of housing, transport and health services. Considering these factors in strategic infrastructure planning.	3
Local skills shortages leading to future recruitment difficulties.	Consideration of these matters in forward planning with higher education providers, planning for the local economy and planning the nature and siting of local businesses	3
Planning for the health estate separate from planning for new housing.	Planning for housing growth supporting the planning for the health estate alongside other community assets.	1,2,3
Disconnection between regional hospital planning and infrastructure planning.	Closer joint working between health and planning. Consideration of these factors in strategic infrastructure planning.	3

### What is the evidence that this approach would work?

The evidence exists at three levels.

1. There is emerging evidence from local and national experience with Healthy New Towns that these are constructive and powerful ways to engage local people and improve health. We have two years' practical experience of what really makes a difference to local people through the implementation of initiatives in Barton and Bicester, and though it is too early to be precise, the results are very encouraging.

2. There is good national research evidence linking the benefits of increased active and health lifestyles to economic benefits, benefits to productivity, benefits to the workforce and a reduced need for health care services.

There is good evidence linking the benefits to an individual's health with benefits to the economy, productivity and value for money through for initiatives such as active travel and social engagement.

The health effects of factors such as air pollution are also well documented.

3. There is considerable local experience among Leaders and senior officers of the synergies and efficiencies that can be gained from better joined-up planning. Examples of this include the Growth Deal itself, multiple initiatives joining up health and social care and recent local experience with services such as domestic abuse.

However, it should be noted that we are proposing here to create a comprehensive planning *framework* for the future. The benefits gained cannot be precisely defined at this stage – that is the work of the next few years – but the opportunity to create such a framework is a unique one and the time to consider such a decision is now.

Creating such a framework would enable these potential benefits to be realised.

This comes down to a matter of political and managerial judgement. We believe that the managerial case is strong enough to support the proposals in this paper. We are seeking the views and approval of Leaders to proceed forward from this point.

The box below provides a selection of facts regarding the challenges we face and the benefits to be gained, drawn from national sources.

- 1 in 5 people in the UK often feel lonely which is a risk factor for poor health. (The Health Foundation) 5% often or always feel lonely (Public Health England)
- Befriending services payback £3.75 in reduced mental health service costs for every £1 spent. (King's Fund)
- Children in deprived areas are nine times less likely to have access to green spaces and places to play. (The Health Foundation)
- Increasing access to parks and open spaces could reduce NHS costs by 2Bn p.a. (King's Fund)
- Only 10% of our health and wellbeing is determined by access to health care. The rest is influenced by housing, the quality of our work, income, education and skills, the food we eat, transport, family, friends and communities. (The Health Foundation)
- Younger generations are becoming obese at earlier ages and staying obese into adulthood. Obesity is twice as common in the 10% most socially deprived children compared with the 10% least deprived. (Public Health England)
- Over half of adults are now overweight or obese. (Public Health England)
- The annual costs associated with obesity to the wider economy, NHS and social care systems are estimated to be £27 billion, £6.1 billion a year and £352 million respectively. (Public Health England)
- There are 3.8 million people in England with type 2 diabetes (obesity being a major cause). There are 200,000 new diagnoses per year. This costs just under 9% of the NHS budget. (Public Health England)
- Dementia in the UK costs 10.3Bn in social care 4.3Bn to health care and 11.6Bn on unpaid care. There are 850,000 people with dementia in the UK. By 2050 the figure will exceed 2 million. (Public Health England)
- Regular physical activity reduces the risk of dementia by 30%, mortality by 30%, type 2 diabetes by 40% and hip fractures by up to 68% (Public Health England)
- 2 in 5 people think people in their neighbourhood can be trusted (Public Health England)
- Every person moving from worklessness to work saves the economy £12,000 p.a. (public Health England)
- 1 in 3 current UK employees have a chronic medical condition. 1 in 8 have a mental health condition. (Public Health England)
- The economic cost of working age ill health is £100bn a year to the national economy, with 131m working days lost. (Public Health England)
- School-based health interventions e.g. smoking prevention can save £15 for every £1 spent. (King's Fund)
- Housing interventions to keep people warm, safe and free from cold and damp save the NHS £70 over ten years for every £1 spent (King's Fund)
- The estimated cost of poor housing to the NHS in England is 1.4Bn p.a. (Public Health England)
- Nearly 80% of car trips of less than 5 miles could be replaced by active travel. (King's Fund)
- The cost to society of transport-induced poor air quality, ill health and road accidents exceeds 40Bn per year. Getting one child to walk or cycle to school could pay back £768. (King's Fund)

### What are our proposals?

The thrust of our proposals is to insert the approach to healthy place-shaping into the governance structure and workstreams of the Growth Deal and Growth Board, so that over time, this approach becomes part of normal planning considerations, and influences the production of local plans.

We therefore propose:

1. that the Growth Board requests the production of a strategy for how healthy place shaping can ensure that development supports the creation of healthy communities. This will inform the work of the Growth Deal and Growth Board workstreams across the board.
2. that officers with a remit for healthy place-shaping are embedded into the Growth Board sub-structures including the Growth Deal Programme Board and the workstreams for the JSSP, infrastructure, housing and productivity working with the LEP.
3. that healthy place-shaping is embedded into the development of the JSSP, the local industrial strategy and the environment strategy. This will ensure influence over the strategic design and siting of local communities and local industry and will also embrace environmental concerns. This will also enable the principles of healthy place-shaping to be incorporated into the Local Plans of the future in the City and Districts.
4. to create a network of officers from across our respective organisations whose role (in addition to their other duties) will be to understand and keep up to date with the developments in the approach to healthy place-shaping and its evolving evidence-base. The intention is that healthy place-shaping becomes a routine part of planning in the County, and so the network will be drawn from officers with specialist knowledge of implementing healthy place-shaping and our various Local Authority planning departments as well as from the NHS, public health and other partners. We also propose to appoint a lead officer and CEO sponsor to coordinate this approach across the work of the Growth Board and Growth Deal.
5. to hold a countywide workshop for senior Councillors and officers on this topic as set out in programme for the Joint Statutory Spatial Plan. This will scope further the potential for this approach and will help to define how it will be included in the JSSP when it goes for public consultation in February 2019. We propose convening this jointly with the Health and Wellbeing Board which will further serve to strengthen joined-up planning across all organisations.

**Recommendation**

Leaders are asked to approve these proposals.

*Chief Executive Officers of:*

*Cherwell District Council/ Oxfordshire County Council, South Oxfordshire District Council/ Vale of the White Horse District Council, Oxford City Council, West Oxfordshire District Council, Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group, The Local Enterprise Partnership.*

18/11/2018



## **REPORT TO OXFORDSHIRE GROWTH BOARD OXFORDSHIRE HOUSING AND GROWTH DEAL**

### **1 REPORT PURPOSE**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update the Board on progress at Quarter 2, Year 1 (2018/19) with the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal (the Deal), agreed with Government, to note and endorse the proposed amendments to the year one programme for infrastructure and note and approve the years 2 and 3 affordable housing programme.
- 1.2 The report provides a summary of the Quarter 2 2018/19 reports on the following strands:
- Infrastructure programme
  - Affordable Housing programme
  - The Joint Statutory Spatial Plan
  - Productivity
- 1.3 Detailed quarterly reports have been considered and discussed by the Infrastructure, Housing and JSSP sub groups to the Growth Board, who have endorsed the recommendations to the Growth Board.

### **2 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 *That the Growth Board;*
- *notes the progress at Quarter 2 2018/19 towards the Housing and Growth Deal Milestones set out under each of the work streams*
  - *notes the summary indicative years 2-3 Affordable Housing Programme*
  - *endorses the year 2-5 Infrastructure Delivery Programme*

### **3 INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PROGRAMME**

#### **Summary of progress at Q2 against milestones**

##### Year 1 Infrastructure Programme

- 3.1 The year 1 infrastructure programme agreed by the Growth Deal Partner authorities (the partners) and endorsed by the Growth Board in March 2018 consists of £30 million spend across 20 Infrastructure Schemes.
- 3.2 Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) are the lead delivery partner for the infrastructure work strand, which is being delivered through OCC's capital projects governance framework and project lifecycle. Monitoring, reporting and control of project and work-stream level performance is supported by OCC process, tools and techniques and is reported on monthly to the Growth Deal Programme Board.
- 3.3 During Q1 of 2018/19 an assurance exercise was undertaken to review the deliverability of the 2018/19 infrastructure delivery programme to ensure the programme could both

mobilise and start delivering at the same time. This exercise identified potential delays with some schemes, largely due to third party delays (for example developers delayed in agreeing scope or contracts with other third parties). In addition, one scheme was linked to the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) bid for the A40 Smart Corridor, which is now in co-production stage with Homes England and will therefore not be commenced in year. As a consequence, a projected underspend of circa £10m against the planned programme was reported to the Growth Board.

- 3.4 At end of Q2 2018/19, it is now confirmed that 4 of the 20 projects will not be started in the current year. The forecast underspend has marginally improved by £200k to a forecast underspend of £9.8m against the planned programme.
- 3.5 The deliverability assessment undertaken by the County Council in Q2 2018/19 demonstrates a high level of confidence in profiled spend of the projects remaining in the year one programme and that £20.2m of spend will be incurred on these schemes by the end of 2018/19 and £30m by Q3 in 2019/20.
- 3.6 Discussions with Homes England and MHCLG have taken place on options to address the underspend against the planned year one programme. The preferred approach is to forward fund alternative schemes across the county that do not relate to the existing year 1 infrastructure schemes but are classified as infrastructure spend, are associated with, and support, housing growth and are deliverable within year one. The County will then apply the funding originally planned for these schemes to the Deal programme to fund planned year one schemes in future years. This would ensure that the full £30m would be spent in year one in accordance with the Deal criteria and that the identified Deal schemes will come forward in year two. MHCLG officials have confirmed that this approach is acceptable, subject to assessment of the schemes by Homes England. This assessment is now underway.

#### Year 1 Housing from Infrastructure Delivery

- 3.7 Discussions with Homes England about the arrangements for monitoring performance against the Housing from Infrastructure delivery targets as set out in the Deal Delivery Plan have been ongoing since May. .
- 3.8 Oxfordshire councils have completed an extensive data capture exercise which maps housing sites to infrastructure projects. However, developing the methodology for the proportion of housing on these sites that will be accelerated by investment under the Deal has proved challenging since there is no existing established national methodology and no other authorities are being monitored on accelerated housing delivery against infrastructure provision in this way. However, an approach has now been agreed between the Oxfordshire councils, Homes England and MHCLG and is now being applied. The outcomes of this exercise will be tested and validated with Homes England. As a result, progress against housing delivery targets is not being required by Homes England for Q2, but will be reported in Q3.

Year 2-5 Infrastructure Programme

- 3.9 The Deal Delivery Plan requires that the Years 2-5 Infrastructure Programme be developed in Quarter 1&2 2018/19 for approval by the Oxfordshire Growth Board in Quarter 3 in 2018/19, subsequent agreement with HMG and subsequent amendment of Oxfordshire County Council's Capital Programme in Quarter 4 2018/19.
- 3.10 In accordance with this, during Quarters 1&2, a long list of schemes for consideration under years 2 -5 was devised from OxIS by the Oxfordshire councils. AECOM was commissioned to support Growth Deal partners to prioritise the indicative list of schemes in line with the agreed assessment criteria within the Deal Delivery Plan, as follows:
- Deliverability, in terms of: readiness / completion of design;
  - Consultation or approvals/permissions required.
  - Value for Money – measured against number of houses scheme will support.
  - Strategic Fit as identified in OxIS and Local Plans.
  - Interrelationship with other infrastructure proposals/schemes –including sequencing
  - Predicated Transport and other strategic outcomes, for example changes in trip patterns.
- 3.11 The list of suggested projects was tested with the Infrastructure Programme Board, which includes officers from all councils and the Locality Leads for each council. The two bids for Housing Infrastructure Funding – the Didcot Garden Town and the A40 Smart Corridor – have been separated from this Growth Deal ranking exercise.
- 3.12 The resulting proposed schedule of schemes proposed for the 2-5 year infrastructure delivery programme is at Appendix One to this report. This has been reviewed and agreed by the Growth Deal Programme Board on the basis that the proposed programme delivers the best outputs in terms of number of homes, value for money and are in line with both local and county wide infrastructure priorities and strategies, thus maximising benefits across the county. The recommended programme was discussed and endorsed by the Infrastructure sub-group at the meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> November and is presented to the Growth Board for endorsement.
- 3.13 The delivery plan for the Year 2-5 programme will now be developed with network management input to provide assurance of delivery and so that the works are planned logically and allow a smooth programme of works that minimises the effects of major construction works on the highway network, before agreement with government.

Risk and Issue Management

- 3.14 Specific risks to schemes within the Infrastructure Programme are managed through the County's risk management processes and reported to the Deal Infrastructure Board and Programme board on a monthly basis.
- 3.15 Programme wide risks include

- Securing agreement from Homes England to the substitute schemes in year 1. Information on the schemes has been provided to Homes England and officers are pursuing a response.
- Ability to demonstrate achievement of housing delivery from infrastructure targets. An approach has now been agreed and will be tested with Homes England, as discussed at para above.
- The Oxfordshire authorities do not directly build the homes which comprise the housing delivery figures released by the infrastructure fund and delivery may be affected by circumstances beyond the Oxfordshire Partners' control - such as economic downturn, adverse market conditions. This is acknowledged in the Delivery Plan which says they will be taken into account if they affect ability to achieve the milestones in full for each year.

## **4 AFFORDABLE HOUSING DELIVERY PROGRAMME**

### **Overview**

4.1 The targets agreed in the Housing and Growth Deal, together with the current Programme are as follows:

	Year One	Year two	Year three	Total
Agreed targets	148	464	710	1320
Current gross programme	329	528	837	1694

### **Summary of progress at Q2 against milestones**

#### Year 1 Affordable Housing Programme

Year 1 Affordable Housing Programme Q2 position	Number of Units
Agreed targets	148
Current gross programme	329
Assessed as having strong probability of delivery in year one	152

- 4.2 The target for year one of the programme agreed in the Deal is 148 units. At the end of the Quarter 2 2018/19, partners have developed a total, or gross, programme (units with potential to be included in the year one programme) of 329 units, compared to 229 at the end of the first quarter. Currently, of the year one programme of 329 units, the partners are confident that 152 have a strong probability (RAG rating of Green or Green /Amber) of achieving the agreed delivery milestone – contractual start on site- by 31/3/19. This has increased from 111 at the end of quarter one.
- 4.3 Of the remaining 177 units in year one schemes, approximately 50 % are badged as Amber/Red because they have funding challenges that, although being considered by partners have not been resolved and will not be within year one. The remaining 50% are considered financially viable and achievable but cannot be guaranteed to come forward

in year one due to time pressures. Partners are working where possible to tackle these issues and bring them forward, however, if that is not possible, these schemes are likely to come forward in year two.

4.4 The Affordable Housing Quarter 2 review meeting with Homes England took place in October 2018 and confirmed positive progress towards the year one programme.

4.5 The Quarter 3 review meeting with Home England will take place in January 2019, at which point we will confirm all projects that will be contracted to start on site by 31 March 2019. That will also confirm the total grant payment to the programme for year 1.

#### Years 2- 3 Affordable Housing Programme

4.6 The Deal Delivery Plan milestones required the development of an indicative affordable housing programme for years 2 and 3 by 30/09/18. Achievement of this milestone has been confirmed by Homes England.

4.7 The years 2 and 3 Programme comprises schemes that have been put forward by each of the District and City councils. They comprise schemes that, in the opinion of the councils have the potential to come forward and deliver additional affordable housing above that which would otherwise be delivered on schemes that can achieve start on site by March 2021.

#### Indicative affordable housing gross programme years 2-3

	<b>Cherwell</b>	<b>Oxford</b>	<b>South</b>	<b>Vale</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Year 2</b>	18	169	28	95	218	<b>528</b>
<b>Year 3</b>	30	420	63	114	210	<b>837</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>589</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>1365</b>

4.8 The programme for future years is at this stage indicative and further work is required to improve our confidence in the delivery of the projects within the programme. There is flexibility to allow additional schemes to be added into the programme and indeed this will be required to ensure we have sufficient schemes in the pipeline.

4.9 Over the three years of the programme, the current gross programme proposes 1694 homes against a target of 1320 homes. This is an encouraging position as this stage, however it is acknowledged that we need to further develop the gross programme and identify additional schemes to allow for slippage and other circumstances that may cause schemes not to come forward Part of our ongoing work will be to ensure that we have a ready supply of schemes that we can bring into the Programme, should circumstances require it to ensure that we deliver the agreed targets.

#### Scheme launch and Prospectus

4.10 During quarter 2 2018/19 the Affordable Housing Programme was officially launched with the production of a Prospectus and an event attended by 40 organisations, including Registered Providers, developers and landowners who gathered to receive presentations

on how the Programme could work for them and to take part in a discussion about how we could work in partnership together to maximise the impact of the Programme.

- 4.11 The launch event successfully developed interest amongst many partners and the officers have been establishing ongoing discussions with attendees to maintain momentum.
- 4.12 The next steps are the finalising of the grant application process, thus allowing the year one schemes to be confirmed. Officers will be focussing upon this in the coming weeks

#### Budget and grant funding

- 4.13 The total budget for the Programme agreed in the Housing and Growth Deal is £60 Million, over three years.
- 4.14 The breakdown of the budget as per the indicative Programme agreed with Government is as follows.

	Year One	Year two	Year three	Total
Units	148	464	710	1322
Budget	£6.765m	£21.620m	£32.225	60.61m

- 4.15 Under the terms the Deal are grant funding is payable in arrears by Homes England at the end of the financial year, based upon agreed activity in that year as concluded at the third quarter review meeting which will this year be held on 21st January 2019. At this meeting the Programme delivery to 31/12/18 will be concluded and an estimate of completed activity in the final quarter agreed.

#### Risk and Issue Management

- 4.16 The key risks to delivery of individual schemes within the programme are from delays in planning and tender processes, financial challenges to schemes and funding gaps. These risks all need to be managed at district/city level.
- 4.17 In addition to these site-specific risks, there are more general risks identified for the Programme, these are
- (i) The risks to the Programme of the National Strategic Partnerships being developed by Homes England (HE). These have the potential to lessen the attractiveness of the Programme to Registered Providers and to cream off homes that otherwise we could develop through the Programme. Officers have raised this concern with HE and are working with HE to agree how the two schemes can complement each other rather than compete.
  - (ii) The risks to the Programme of a downturn in the economy, slowing completion rates and thence the affordable units developed. This risk is a double-edged sword however as it may also provide opportunities to bulk purchase units as affordable housing from developers, keen to offload unsold stock and bolster cash flows and retain tradesman on site

- (iii) Innovation is a key aspect of the Programme agreed with Government. The risk however is that the focus upon completion of targets does not allow space for innovative product, delivery or working practices. Officers are very aware of this risk and intend to focus upon scoping innovation in the third quarter.

## **5 JOINT STATUTORY SPATIAL PLAN AND PLANNING FLEXIBILITIES**

### Summary

- 5.1 During quarter 2 activities have focussed on preparatory work for the JSSP project. A Local Development Scheme, Statement of Community Involvement and Scoping Document have been considered by the relevant Councils. The JSSP Sub-Group had its first meeting and progress has been made on staff recruitment and accommodation.
- 5.2 The Government delivered a temporary 3-year housing land supply planning flexibility for Oxfordshire in September. This was originally expected in July, according to the Deal Delivery Plan.
- 5.3 Key project issues include the impact of the recent expressway announcement on the JSSP timetable, and the impact of the slightly later delivery of the planning flexibilities.

### Approved JSSP Timetable

- 5.4 The overall programme for the JSSP is set out in the approved Local Development Scheme. This is consistent with the following milestones in the Housing and Growth Deal Delivery Plan:
- Principle of JSSP agreed through the Approval of Deal – January 2018 - achieved
  - Draft Oxfordshire-wide Statement of Common Ground - 31 March 2018 - achieved
  - Joint JSSP Project Board established to take forward JSSP under Section 28 – July 2018 - achieved
  - All Local Plans submitted for examination-- 1 April 2019
  - Draft JSSP published for formal consultation - 30 October 2019
  - Submission of JSSP - 31 March 2020
  - JSSP Adoption (subject to examination)- 31 March 2021

### Progress on Milestones

- 5.5 The Housing and Growth Deal year 1 milestones relating to approval of the Deal, draft Statement of Common Ground, and JSSP Project Board have been met.
- 5.6 South Oxfordshire District Council and Oxford City Council have made significant progress on the preparation of their respective Local Plans. These Local Plans are expected to be submitted for examination before April 2019, in accordance with the Delivery Plan milestone.

5.7 The Housing and Growth Deal contained a commitment from Government to explore the options for time limited planning flexibilities. The Delivery Plan recognised that the milestones attached to the work on the JSSP are contingent on securing planning flexibilities. The Secretary of State made a written statement on the 12th September 2018 implementing a temporary change to housing land supply policies as they apply in Oxfordshire. This Statement was originally expected in July and the later timing has had some impact on the timing of the preparatory work for the JSSP.

#### JSSP Progress – Quarter 2

5.8 In September and October 2018 all of the Local Planning Authorities signed off the JSSP's Local Development Scheme, Statement of Community Involvement and Scoping Document. These documents provide a firm foundation for the JSSP project.

5.9 The JSSP Sub-Group, which involves member representatives from all of the Councils, had its first meeting in September. This Sub-Group will provide advice and guidance to aid the development of the JSSP. The Sub-Group's meeting programme is under development and will be aligned with the detailed JSSP work programme.

5.10 A JSSP Officer Project Board has also been established and this first met in August 2018. This board involves the various Councils Heads of Planning and in future will also involve representatives from Homes England and Government. This Board helps support the work of the Sub-Group and the project.

5.11 During the quarter a range of roles in the JSSP project team were advertised, interviews followed in October and a number of appointments have been made.

#### Budget

5.12 The initial spend on the JSSP project is estimated at £2.5 million. This will be funded from the capacity funds provided by the Government through the Housing and Growth Deal. The profile of spend is:

	Year(s)	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Comments
JSSP PROJECT TEAM	<b>PLAN</b>	£246,000	£466,000	£395,000	
	<b>FORECAST</b>	£115,000	£355,000	£320,000	
OTHER PROJECT SPEND	<b>PLAN</b>	£464,000	£559,000	£370,000	
	<b>FORECAST</b>	£125,000	£929,000	£539,000	
TOTAL PROJECT SPEND	<b>PLAN</b>	£710,000	£1,025,000	£765,000	
	<b>FORECAST</b>	£252,000	1,347,000	£901,000	Includes contingency of 5%

5.12 No expenditure will be incurred beyond the £2.5million without prior consent of all partner authorities.



## Risk and Issue Management

### Oxford to Cambridge Expressway

- 5.13 In September, the Department for Transport and Highways England announced their preferred Corridor for the “missing link” of the proposed Expressway between Oxfordshire and Milton Keynes. The Highways England programme had previously indicated that the announcement would identify a preferred Corridor for the Expressway, but instead the announcement retained two sub-options around Oxford for further consideration. These are B1 west of Oxford (including a possible on-line upgrade of the existing A34) and B3 to the

south and east of Oxford. Therefore, there is uncertainty as to where the route of the Expressway will be at this stage. The level of uncertainty around Oxford is significantly greater than for other parts of the Corridor.

- 5.14 The indicative timeline for the Expressway envisages that public consultation on route options will take place in autumn 2019, and that the preferred route will be announced in 2020. Officers are engaging with Government officials on how we can align the JSSP and Expressway work programmes. The future Expressway route options may unlock different strategic growth opportunities and an integrated approach would allow this to be assessed through the JSSP process and then taken into account in the final decision on the Expressway route.

### Timing of Planning Flexibilities

- 5.15 The delivery of the planning flexibilities in September, rather than in July as anticipated, has had some impact on the timing of the preparatory work for the JSSP. The delivery plan made it clear that the formal commencement of the JSSP process was linked to progress in securing the freedoms and flexibilities. The timing of the Councils’ consideration of the Local Development Scheme, Statement of Community Involvement and Scoping Document was therefore moved from August/ September to September/ October.
- 5.16 As a consequence the date for the early Stakeholder Engagement has now moved to December, rather than the October date shown on the approved Local Development Scheme. The timing of recruitment processes for the JSSP team was also affected.

## **6 PRODUCTIVITY**

- 6.1 Productivity is an integral component of the Oxfordshire Deal and sits alongside both the housing and infrastructure streams. It is central to delivering economic growth by supporting growth in critical economic sectors, supporting innovation clusters and attracting investment. We anticipate that this will realise significant long term economic benefits to Oxfordshire and the UK.
- 6.2 The headline commitment under the Productivity stream invited Oxfordshire to be one of three ‘Trailblazer’ areas to take forward the ambitions set out by Government in its Industrial Strategy

White Paper. This was to be in the form of a *Local Industrial Strategy (LIS)*, and involve close working with Whitehall departments in the development of the Strategy

- 6.3 The development of the LIS is being overseen by a steering group comprising senior officers from OxLEP, local authorities, Universities, business representatives and Government, reporting into both the OxLEP Board and Growth Board. The Housing and Growth Deal committed Oxfordshire and Government to have agreed the LIS by March 2019, and is a key deliverable for year one of the Deal.
- 6.4 It is important to note that no funding has been allocated to the Productivity Stream under the current Deal agreement. The intention in Year One is to work with Departments and identify areas where the objectives of the stream can be developed and, where possible, to progress key priorities under the LIS process.
- 6.5 In addition to the development of the LIS, the Productivity Stream also included proposals to explore early land remediation at Harwell to bring forward critical employment land supply in Science Vale. There are also commitments to work with OxLEP and partners to identify interventions and solutions to support our world class science clusters and businesses with scale up potential through emerging sector deals, development of a dedicated investor programme for trade and investment, an enhanced Growth Hub and developing a more responsive skills system.

#### Quarter 2 Progress

- 6.6 Following a review meeting in the summer with the Government's Cities and Local Growth Unit, officials proposed that the focus for all elements of the productivity stream moving forward need to be built around the emerging LIS, thus utilising planned and future working sessions with departments to prepare the ground for landing the propositions developed by the LIS
- 6.7 At its July meeting, the Growth Board received an update presentation setting out the progress which had been made in developing the LIS. Since July's Growth Board, significant work has been undertaken in reviewing the economic performance of the Oxfordshire economy, the challenges which businesses face- including specific sectors where we have market potential to grow and the critical skills which the local workforce need to develop in order to secure the jobs opportunities created.

#### Next Steps

- 6.8 During November and early December further work and engagement will be undertaken with partners and Government officials to continue to develop the strategy.
- 6.9 A draft document will be considered by the OxLEP Board in mid-December for submission as a working draft to Whitehall as the basis of further discussion and agreement during early 2019. It is the intention to reach agreement with Government on the final LIS by March 2019, in line with the commitments of the Housing & Growth Deal.

- 6.10 An update report will be shared with the Growth Board in January and we anticipate submitting the final document to both the OxLEP Board and Growth Board for formal endorsement in March 2019.

## **7 DEAL GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE**

- 7.1 As part of the Deal, Oxfordshire was granted £5 million of capacity funding to assist with the delivery of the Deal. The allocation of the fund is £2.5 million to prepare the Oxfordshire JSSP, £1.5 million of capacity funding to progress the Deal and £1 million to support scheme feasibility to ensure that the step change in housing delivery that the Deal requires is properly resourced.
- 7.2 The majority of planned spend under the capacity fund is on additional staff resources to support delivery of the programmes. During September and October, a recruitment process has taken place and a number of appointments made to the JSSP team, the Programme Management Office and the Core Growth Deal Delivery Team.

## **8 CONCLUSION**

- 8.1 This report outlines progress against the Deal year one milestones at end of Q2 2018/19.
- 8.2 Good progress is being made towards meeting our commitments under the Deal. The focus for the core deal team and in each of the partner authorities in Q3 and Q4 of 2018/19 needs to be on activity required to accelerate the delivery of the year one programmes and to develop confidence in the delivery of commitments in future years.
- 8.3 The report asks the Board to note this progress with the Deal and the achievement against the milestones committed to.

<b>Project name</b>	<b>Project description</b>	<b>Estimated Growth Deal Spend</b>	<b>Full cost of scheme</b>
Wantage Eastern Link road	From Mably Way (A338) to access junction on A417 just west of Grove Park Drive (drawing to be supplied – Feasibility through to construction	£2,000,000	£15,143,771
Shrivenham New School	Cover shortfall in funding for new school on Highworth Road, Shrivenham	£2,500,000	£8,500,000
Didcot Garden Town Project: Central Didcot Transport Corridor improvements	Didcot - From the new Science Bridge on the A4130 west of Sir Frank Williams Way to Jubilee Way Roundabout at Broadway – Feasibility through to construction	£2,000,000	£60,000,000
A44 corridor improvements from Langford Lane to Pear Tree roundabout (Woodstock Road Corridor)	Yarnton. From the junction with Langford Lane to Pear Tree roundabout – Feasibility through to construction	£20,100,000	£22,100,000
Access to Witney at Shores Green	A40/Shores Green junction at east Witney – Feasibility through to construction	£2,100,000	£5,600,000
<i>SE Corridors Study Component - Barns Road corridor</i>	From Blackbird Leys Road (junction with Cuddesdon Way) to the Barns Road/B4495 junction - Feasibility	£1,300,000	£10,300,000
<i>SE Corridors Study Component - A34 corridor</i>	A34 between Lodge Hill & Hinksey Hill - Feasibility	incl in £1.3m above	£25,100,000
<i>SE Corridors Study Component - Eastern Bypass corridor</i>	Eastern Bypass: Kennington Roundabout to Cowley Interchange - Feasibility	incl in £1.3m above	£38,100,000
<i>SE Corridors Study Component - Cowley Road/Garsington Road/Watlington Road corridor</i>	B480 between Magdalen Road (off Cowley Road) and the B480/Grenoble Road junction - Feasibility	incl in £1.3m above	£39,700,000
<i>SE Corridors Study Component - A4074 corridor</i>	A4074 starting approx. south of its junction with Grenoble Road to Heyford Hill - Feasibility	incl in £1.3m above	£18,800,000
<i>SE Corridors Study Component - B4495 corridor</i>	B4495 starting at its junction with The Slade/Horspath Driftway to its junction with Abingdon Road – Feasibility	incl in £1.3m above	£22,000,000

<b>Project name</b>	<b>Project description</b>	<b>Estimated Growth Deal Spend</b>	<b>Full cost of scheme</b>
<i>SE Corridors Study Component - Abingdon Road corridor</i>	Hinksey - Feasibility	incl in £1.3m above	£13,700,000
<i>SE Corridors Study Component - Iffley Road corridor</i>	A4158 corridor between the Eastern Bypass and The Plain roundabout - Feasibility	incl in £1.3m above	£19,700,000
Banbury Road improvement (Banbury Road Corridor)	Oxford. From the northern end of St Giles up to the Kidlington roundabout – Feasibility through to construction	£9,700,000	£9,700,000
Woodstock Road improvements (Woodstock Road Corridor)	Oxford. From the northern end of St Giles to Wolvercote roundabout – Feasibility through to construction	£9,100,000	£9,100,000
Ploughley Road / A41 Bicester - signalisation of junction	East of Bicester – feasibility through to construction	£2,777,048	£6,700,000
Thame to Haddenham cycle route	Roundabout junction at A418 / B4011/ Aylesbury Road / Tythrop Way to Haddenham railway station on land adjacent to the east of public highway (Aylesbury Road / Thame Road) – Feasibility through to construction	£8,000,000	£10,000,000
Jubilee Way Roundabout	Jubilee Way Roundabout at junction with Hitchcock Way, Broadway and Jubilee Way (Didcot) – Feasibility through to construction	£6,500,000	£6,500,000
A422 Hennef Way, Banbury - Relief to severe congestion	Northern edge of Banbury – Feasibility through to construction	£18,522,514	£20,000,000
Scheme Advancement	Various projects and locations – Feasibility through to construction	£37,700,876	£91,021,308