

**Spatial Planning & Infrastructure Partnership (SPIP)
Full Partnership Meeting
2 February 2010**

MINUTES

Attendee:	Organisation:
Cllr Barry Wood	Cherwell District Council
Mary Harpley	Cherwell District Council
John Hoad	Cherwell District Council
Martyn Swann	Cherwell District Council (Item 4 only)
Craig Forsyth	Cherwell District Council (Item 4 only)
Cllr Ian Hudspeth	Oxfordshire County Council
Huw Jones	Oxfordshire County Council
Ian Walker	Oxfordshire County Council
Louise Harrison	Oxfordshire County Council (Observer)
Cllr Barry Norton	West Oxfordshire District Council
Andrew Tucker	West Oxfordshire District Council
Mel Barrett	Oxford City Council
Cllr Ed Turner	Oxford City Council
Mark Jaggard	Oxford City Council
Lily Langlois	Oxford City Council
Cllr Tony de Vere	Vale of White Horse District Council
Cllr Angela Lawrence	Vale of White Horse DC (OHP lead)
Anna Robinson	Vale of White Horse District Council and South Oxfordshire District Council
Chris Woolf	Government Office for the South East (for Chris Farthing)
David Ashworth	Homes & Communities Agency
Bob Langton	Oxfordshire Economic Partnership
Paul Robinson	Highways Agency
Warren Ralls	SEEDA
Alison Bailey	SEEPB (for Catriona Riddell)

Apologies:

Cllr Ann Ducker (OCC), Catherine Mountford (PCT), David Doughty (OEP), Mark Dillon (Oxfordshire PCT), Rosemary Redmond (EA), Catriona Riddell (SEEPB)

1. Minutes of Meeting Held 8 December 2009

AGREED: The minutes of the meeting were agreed with a minor correction to the attendance list: it was noted that Anna Robinson should be listed as representing Vale of White Horse District Council as well as South Oxfordshire District Council.

2. Matters Arising

There were no matters arising. However, the Chairman noted that this meeting of the Partnership had been added to the meetings programme as a special additional meeting arranged to deal with the heavy workload on Single Conversation issues.

3. HCA Single Conversation Local Investment Plan

The Chairman referred to the covering report circulated which explained the various papers which were now available and indicated the areas where decisions were required. In particular it was noted that the material finally circulated was not as complete as had originally been intended. Appendix 7 – 20 Year County Council Infrastructure Plan – had not been included as planned. Instead, only an example of part of the Infrastructure Plan was included. It was noted that this was still an item of work in progress.

The Chairman asked for an update from HCA on the Single Conversation process and changes to the timetable. It was noted that HCA had recently issued new guidance on the Single Conversation entitled Further Information; Local Investment Agreements (circulated with these Minutes). David Ashworth (HCA) updated the Partnership on the HCA's revisions to the approach to the Single Conversation and the Local Investment Plan/Local Investment Agreement (LIP/LIA). He stressed that it had been agreed that more time was needed to complete work on LIPs and that the LIA process would now take place following completion of the LIP. It was likely to involve more work by HCA on assessing and selecting investment priorities. This would be a process related to emerging information on the budgets likely to be available to HCA over the next few years.

AGREED: It was agreed that:

- HCA (David Ashworth) would make a presentation to the next meeting of the SPIP Partnership on the revised approach to the Single Conversation. Members of the Partnership requested that this should cover arrangements for National Affordable Housing Programme funding and methods of payment to local authorities and partner organisations, the likely perspective on future funding streams other than the National Affordable Housing Programme, the options available to the partnership for completion of work on the LIA and a perspective on how the proposed funding arrangements would handle market engagement flexibility to respond to changing circumstances.
- The Chairman would write formally to HCA to ask for clarification on the relationship between pilot Single Conversation exercises and the new arrangements for the Single Conversation. In particular, the Partnership was anxious to clarify what benefits would accrue to Oxfordshire as a result of early participation in the Single Conversation pilot.

There was some discussion about the scope of the Single Conversation and the need to involve delivery organisations and agencies outside of HCA and local government. In particular the Highways Agency were concerned that they had not been sufficiently engaged in the process from the outset. Generally, the members of the Partnership felt that the intent of the Single Conversation was to include wider infrastructure projects and the funding streams of agencies involved in such provision. This was confirmed by HCA. However, it was recognised that there would be a need to focus first on local authority led proposals for housing and regeneration and planning decisions on them, and then in associated infrastructure issues and address questions about the funding streams available from other public sector agencies affected.

AGREED: It was agreed that the local authority officers working on the Single Conversation and the HCA team would make efforts to consult with other partners and agencies involved in local infrastructure investment. This would be done as part of completion of the LIP. It was noted that it was also important for the partners and agencies now participating in SPIP to offer any direct feedback from their consideration of papers now being put through Partnership meetings.

The meeting considered and discussed the various papers circulated.

- The County Council explained their emerging approach to their Infrastructure Plan (Appendix 7). It was suggested that the best way forward on this would be for elements of infrastructure closely related to specific housing and other development schemes should be included in notes to the various District Council programmes, and that this should feed through into the LIP Priority Projects List. In addition, there would be a list of strategic infrastructure projects which would be separately itemised and included in the previously planned Appendix 7. In turn this would also input to the final Priority Project List.
- The time remaining for completion of work on the LIP was now short. The Chairman would be using the delegated authority provided by the Partnership at its previous meeting to undertake a quick consultation with all local authority Leaders about the final content of the Priority Projects List (in the case of OCC this would be Cllr Hudspeth in his role as representative of OCC on the Partnership). This would be done by a combination of e-mail exchange and use of already programmed local authority Leader meetings.
- It was felt that the final decision on a prioritisation process and projects list should be deferred until there had been a full consideration of new HCA advice on a Single Conversation process. The proposed programme of a further meeting in early March should allow for this, but some further adjustment may be necessary.

The Partnership noted a number of concerns about how the prioritisation criteria would be applied and the results which would emerge in terms of a final list of LIP priority projects.

AGREED: It was agreed that the general thrust of work should be to produce a LIP which included an overall list of projects which would in effect be an 'inclusive' long list. It would then be necessary for HCA to assist in further appraisal of projects to determine a shorter list which would be capable of funding within likely budget constraints. The HCA would need to take a lead in this process. This seemed to accord with the new arrangements being suggested for the overall Single Conversation procedure and the LIA in particular.

The specific recommendations in the covering report were discussed:

AGREED: It was agreed that:

- The completed 20 Year Development Programmes for the Districts were endorsed (with a caveat that there was still time for further minor corrections and updates to be included).
- The suggested Criteria for Prioritisation of Projects were endorsed, subject to a delegation to the Chairman to undertake any final presentational changes and agreement that the list of numbered points under strategic fit should be presented as bullet points to indicate that they were not in priority order but of equal significance.
- The emerging priority projects list was noted and all partners agreed to check the list and provide their initial feedback by 13 February.
- Feedback from Partnership members on the content of the priority projects list will be used to inform discussions between local authority Leaders under the Chairman's delegated authority and this would in turn inform work to present a final draft of the LIP document and the priority projects list to the meeting on 1 March.

In discussing the issue of wider infrastructure requirements, the Chairman noted it would be useful for the Partnership to receive an information report on the future of Planning Agreements and the Government's new proposals for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

AGREED: It was agreed that a report on Planning Agreements and CIL would be prepared for a future meeting (if possible the 1 March meeting).

4. Oxfordshire Housing Partnership LLA 1 Reward Grant Project Delivery Plan – Young People's Self Build Project, Banbury

The report was introduced by John Hoad and Martyn Swann from CDC. It was noted that this was an Oxfordshire Housing Partnership project which had been successful in receiving LLA 1 Reward Grant funding. SPIP would be asked to act as the lead thematic partnership in pursuing this project in future.

AGREED: It was agreed that the project proposals and delivery plan/project initiation document be endorsed by the Partnership.

5. Work Programme and Meetings Forward Plan

The revised Work Programme and Forward Plan was noted. There were no additional suggested items for consideration. The Plan would be updated as a result of discussion at this meeting and a revised version circulated with the Minutes.

6. Any Other Business: None