

## 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.

## 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 October/November 18 – as part of the project launch</b>