

**Spatial Planning & Infrastructure Partnership (SPIP)  
Full Partnership Meeting  
8 December 2009**

**MINUTES**

<b>Attendee:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
Cllr Ian Hudspeth	Oxfordshire County Council
Cllr Ann Ducker	South Oxfordshire District Council
Cllr Barry Norton	West Oxfordshire District Council
Cllr Bob Price	Oxford City Council
Cllr Tony de Vere	Vale of White Horse District Council
Cllr Barry Wood	Cherwell District Council
Cllr Angela Lawrence	Vale of White Horse DC (OHP lead)
Anna Robinson	South Oxfordshire District Council
Mary Harpley	Cherwell District Council
Andrew Tucker	West Oxfordshire District Council
Mel Barrett	Oxford City Council
John Hoad	Cherwell District Council
Huw Jones	Oxfordshire County Council
Catherine Mountford	Oxfordshire Primary Care Trust
Charlotte Frizzell	Natural England
Chris Farthing	Government Office for the South East
David Edwards	Homes & Communities Agency
David Ashworth	Homes & Communities Agency
David Doughty	Oxfordshire Economic Partnership
Paul Robinson	Highways Agency
Jodee Katalanos	Homes & Communities Agency
Lindsay Tift	Homes & Communities Agency
Mark Jaggard	Oxford City Council
Rosemary Redmond	Environment Agency

**1. Welcome & Introductions**

Apologies were received from Warren Ralls (SEEDA), Catriona Riddell (SE Partnership Board) and Mark Dillon (Oxfordshire PCT).

The Chairman welcomed all to the first full Partnership meeting and to Cherwell District Council offices. All the participants in the meeting introduced themselves.

**2. Full Partnership Inception**

The Chairman explained that this was the first full Partnership meeting following a Local Authority Leaders only inception meeting in August 2009. It had been agreed at that meeting that initial SPIP work would concentrate on responding to the Homes & Communities Agency (HCA) invitation to undertake pilot work on their new 'Single Conversation' process. This had meant that a

considerable amount of behind-the-scenes work had been necessary before the Partnership could meet to address this issue.

- **SPIP Terms of Reference**

The Partnership Terms of Reference had been presented and agreed at the August inception meeting, subject to some minor amendments which had been delegated to the Chairman. Mary Harpley tabled the finalised terms of reference and explained the minor changes which had been made to address the points raised by Local Authority Leaders at the inception meeting.

**AGREED:**

The Terms of Reference document was approved (*attached to the Minutes*).

- **Work Programme and forward plan for meetings**

This had been re-circulated with the agenda but was in need of update.

**AGREED:**

It was agreed that an update would be undertaken following the meeting. This would allow account to be taken of discussion of items on the meeting agenda. In particular, the HCA Single Conversation process had to be considered and there would be a requirement for meetings to discuss that item.

- **Staff support**

The current position was noted. Oxford City Council is providing technical support to the Partnership (Mark Jaggard). Cherwell District Council is providing administrative support for the Partnership. This arrangement depends on both Councils offering the support from their own resources. Tentative plans are in place for a move to dedicated administrative and technical support through the appointment of a Partnership Co-ordinating Officer. This would be dependent on financial commitment of LLA Reward Grant which would not be available until mid 2010.

**AGREED:**

It was agreed that staffing support would be the subject of a further detailed report (including financial proposals) to a forthcoming meeting.

### **3. Local Transport Plan (LTP) 3: 2011-2030 / Delivering a Sustainable Transport Strategy / High Speed (HS) 2 Railway**

John Disley and Daniel Round from OCC gave a presentation explaining the current position on Local Transport Plan 3 and related transport initiatives (especially the 'Delivering a Sustainable Transport Strategy' or DaSTS) project. ***The presentation is recorded in a revised PowerPoint presentation attached to the Minutes.***

**AGREED:**

It was agreed that further reports on the LTP 3 progress would be presented to future meetings of the Partnership. OCC committed to ensuring there would be an opportunity for the Partnership to comment and advise on the emerging Plan following the public consultation proposed in mid-2010.

**NOTE:**

A number of points of advice to the County Council were noted in the discussion on this item:

- Priorities in the LTP 3 and the HCA Single Conversation Local Investment Plan need to be linked effectively and this should be a subject for Partnership consideration once the LTP had completed its public consultation phase.
- The Local Transport Plan had close links to the Local Development Frameworks (LDFs) being prepared by the Local Planning Authorities in the County. It was considered important that the geographical presentation of schemes and funding streams should include a District level analysis which could be closely related to the LDFs. Concerns were expressed about the

'backlog' of transport schemes to meet existing demand, as opposed to new investment to address the issues of development.

- There needed to be a reconciliation of the timetabling and phasing of Local Transport Plan schemes with requests to safeguard land in LDFs. Where schemes were un-programmed it would be difficult to safeguard land.
- It was considered important that the DaSTS presentation/funding bid which was directed at A34 improvements and benefits to Science Vale UK should be put to the Regional Transport Board in conjunction with work being undertaken by the Science Vale UK Officer.
- Careful consideration needed to be given to the degree of reliance in the LTP on developer funding from major planning applications. This source of funding was still crucial to transportation initiatives, but was becoming increasingly uncertain.
- There was a need for funding realism. It may be necessary to concentrate on core funding or maintenance of the existing transport infrastructure, with new schemes and initiatives being increasingly dependent on special sources of funding or developer funding.
- An omission from the summary of rail schemes and initiatives was noted – this was the need to consider options for improvements to railway services to Didcot. This issue should also be dealt with in the DaSTS project.

John Disley tabled a paper detailing current rail infrastructure issues and developments (***re-circulated with these Minutes***). This paper was noted – there was some discussion on the need to keep abreast of High Speed 2 proposals and announcements, but it was reported that the expected early December announcement which would have enabled more detailed discussion had not yet been forthcoming.

**AGREED:**

It was agreed that this should be an agenda item for future meetings.

#### **4. HCA Single Conversation Local Investment Plan Priorities**

The Chairman summarised the current position (as detailed in the papers presented to the meeting). Some considerable work had been undertaken but there was still much to do to produce a Local Investment Plan acceptable to the HCA and all authorities.

Anna Robinson (acting for the joint Housing Partnership and SPIP Forum) reported back on the results of a successful meeting which had been called to widen understanding of the 'Single Conversation' process. ***PowerPoint slides summarising the points of feedback from the Forum will be circulated later.***

The Chairman noted the report and congratulated the Housing Partnership lead authority (Vale) on the organisation of the Forum.

It was noted that the consideration of the Single Conversation work at this meeting was the first opportunity for involvement of the wider Partnership (eg. Highways Agency, Environment Agency, Economic Partnership and other interested parties). These partners were asked to consider the papers circulated within their own organisations and offer feedback to the SPIP (via the technical support officer, Mark Jaggard) at the earliest opportunity.

**AGREED:**

It was agreed that:

- Work in progress as contained in Papers 1, 2 and 3 circulated was noted and endorsed.
- The high level priorities contained in Paper 5 circulated were accepted as the basis for future prioritisation in the Local Investment Plan, subject to further work on points of detail.

- Further detailed work on housing and infrastructure schemes other than priorities already listed was required. This should follow the example of the template produced by Vale as circulated with the agenda.
- Authority to agree the content of the emerging Local Investment Plan was delegated to the Chairman in consultation with the Local Authority Leaders. The aim would be to agree a well-developed draft which would then be considered and approved at a future Partnership meeting.
- Timetabling of meetings should be adjusted to accommodate further work on the Local Investment Plan. A 'waypoint' meeting would be required in late January. This would be an additional meeting. The already planned meeting in February/March should be in early March at the latest and needed to agree the final Local Investment Plan and Local Investment Agreement.

**NOTES:**

David Edwards (HCA) advised that there remains considerable uncertainty about the funding allocations which will be available for future investment. He thus considered that agreeing criteria for prioritisation of schemes was likely to be a key issue for the Partnership. This is a matter that Partnership technical officers would now have to consider.

David Edwards also advised that the Government and its agencies were still considering how to use the Single Conversation process to assist in 'joined up Government'. Links were now being made to the 'Total Place' initiative which tended to look at revenue funding streams but was capable of making links to the capital funding orientated work in the Single Conversation.

It was recognised that in order to maximise opportunities for local investment considerable further work on the detail of the Local Investment Plan was needed. This work would depend on resources available in the Partnership Councils. It was, however, also noted that it was important that the already agreed high level priorities should not be lost in this detailing.

**5. South East Strategy and Sub Regions**

Huw Jones presented a paper on proposed arrangements for the Partnership to respond to work on the new Regional Strategy for the South East.

**AGREED:**

The Partnership should inform the South East England Partnership Board (SEEPB) that the Oxfordshire authorities will work together to provide information and advice requested by the SEEPB for the preparation of the new Strategy for the South East. The SPIP Partnership would co-ordinate the provision of information and advice on behalf of the Oxfordshire authorities.

**6. LAA Housing Delivery Targets Review**

A paper had been prepared by the Oxfordshire Housing Partnership. This was to be submitted to Government Office for the South East as a basis for the re-negotiation of numerical targets for performance indicators for housing delivery and the affordable housing element of delivery.

**AGREED:**

The paper was endorsed by the Partnership, subject to the tabled amendments from Oxford City Council which updated their figures.

**7. Any Other Business:** None.