

# Oxfordshire Growth Board

**Date:** Thursday 30 July 2015

**Time:** 2.00 pm

**Venue:** Council Chamber, Bodicote House, Bodicote,  
Banbury, OX15 4AA

## Membership

Councillor Matthew Barber  
Councillor Ian Hudspeth  
Councillor Bob Price

Councillor John Cotton  
Councillor Barry Norton  
Councillor Barry Wood

## AGENDA

1. **Apologies for Absence and Notification of Substitutes**

2. **Declarations of Interest**

Members are asked to declare any interest and the nature of that interest which they may have in any of the items under consideration at the meeting.

3. **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 6)

To confirm as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on 25 June 2015.

4. **Post SHMA Strategic Work Programme** (Pages 7 - 12)

Report of Growth Programme Board Manager

**Purpose of the Report**

To provide a synopsis of the Post-SHMA Strategic Work Programme (the Programme) along with a revised timetable, provided as an appendix to this report.

**Recommendations**

That the Growth Board:

- (i) Confirm that the emphasis on the Sovereignty of Local Plans in the key principles for the Post SHMA Strategic Work Programme remains appropriate.
- (ii) Endorse the detailed work programme and revised timetable.

- (iii) Request a more frequent pattern of Growth Board Meetings aligned with the Strategic Work Programme.
- (iv) Request that the Partners adopt a Coordination and Communication Protocol.

### **Dates of Future Meetings**

Thursday 24 September 2015, 2pm, Council Chamber, Cherwell DC Council Offices  
Thursday 19 November 2015, 2pm, Council Chamber, Cherwell DC Council Offices  
Tuesday 19 January 2015, 2pm, Council Chamber, Cherwell DC Council Offices  
Thursday 31 March 2015, 2pm, Council Chamber, Cherwell DC Council Offices  
Thursday 26 May 2015, 2pm, Council Chamber, Cherwell DC Council Offices

## **Information about this Meeting**

### **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence should be notified to

[Natasha.clark@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk](mailto:Natasha.clark@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk) or 01295 221589 prior to the start of the meeting.

### **Declarations of Interest**

Members are asked to declare interests at item 2 on the agenda or if arriving after the start of the meeting, at the start of the relevant agenda item.

### **Evacuation Procedure**

When the continuous alarm sounds you must evacuate the building by the nearest available fire exit. Members and visitors should proceed to the car park as directed by Democratic Services staff and await further instructions.

### **Access to Meetings**

If you have any special requirements (such as a large print version of these papers or special access facilities) please contact the officer named below, giving as much notice as possible before the meeting.

### **Mobile Phones**

Please ensure that any device is switched to silent operation or switched off.

### **Queries Regarding this Agenda**

Please contact Natasha Clark, Democratic and Elections  
[democracy@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk), 01295 221589

**Sue Smith**  
**Chief Executive, Cherwell District Council**

Published on Wednesday 22 July 2015

## Oxfordshire Growth Board

Thursday 25 June 2015, 14:00

Committee Room One, West Oxfordshire District Council Offices

### Present:

Councillor Matthew Barber, Leader of Vale of White Horse District Council  
Councillor John Cotton, Leader of South Oxfordshire District Council  
Councillor Ian Hudspeth, Leader of Oxfordshire County Council  
Councillor Bob Price, Leader of Oxford City Council  
Councillor Barry Norton - Chairman, and Leader of West Oxfordshire District Council  
Councillor Barry Wood, Leader of Cherwell District Council

### Non-voting Members:

Adrian Shooter, Chairman Oxfordshire LEP  
Linda King for Alistair Fitt, Universities Representative, Oxford Brookes  
Sally Coble for John Mansbridge, Environment Agency  
David Warburton, Homes and Communities Agency

### In attendance:

David Neudegg, West Oxfordshire District Council (representing Oxfordshire Chief Executives)  
Andrew Tucker, West Oxfordshire District Council  
Paul Staines, Growth Board Programme Manager  
Sue Scane, Oxfordshire County Council  
Bev Hindle, Oxfordshire County Council  
David Buckle, South Oxfordshire & Vale of White Horse District Councils  
Sue Smith, Cherwell District Council  
Calvin Bell, Cherwell District Council  
Anna Robinson, South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils  
David Edwards, Oxford City Council  
Nigel Tipple, Local Enterprise Partnership

### Apologies:

Alistair Fitt, Universities Representative, Oxford Brookes  
Andrew Harrison, Business Representative  
Adrian Lockwood, Business Representative, Oxfordshire Skills Board  
Jon Mansbridge, Environment Agency

### 1. Introductions and Welcome

Barry Norton welcomed Members, Officers and members of the public to the meeting. He advised that this would be his last meeting as Chairman, the Chairmanship rotating between the constituent authorities and passing to Cherwell District Council at the next meeting. Those present then introduced themselves.

Mr Norton advised that the Growth Board had been approached by the CPRE with a request to ask a question at the meeting. The current terms of reference did not allow for any form of public participation, such as asking questions at a meeting, but these Terms of Reference needed to be reviewed. In response to the CPRE's request, an undertaking had been given to provide a response on behalf of the Chairman of the Board.

Subsequently, a number of further questions had been received from individuals and groups and these had been circulated to Members. Draft responses would be circulated to Growth Board Members for comments in advance of formal written replies being given.

As previously indicated, the Joint Committee's Terms of Reference were due for review shortly and Mr Norton suggested that the matter of public participation at the meetings be considered by the Executive Officer Group as part of that work.

Finally, Mr Norton advised that he intended to take agenda item No. 3 (Summary of the Cherwell Local Plan Inspector's Report) prior to consideration of the Post SHMA Work Programme Update Report.

## **2. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for Absence were received from Andrew Harrison and Phil Shadbolt, Business Representatives; Sally Coble attended in place of John Mansbridge representing the Environment Agency and Linda King for Alistair Fitt, the Universities Representative.

## **3. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest in matters to be considered at the meeting.

## **4. Minutes of the Shadow Growth Board held on 14 November 2014**

The minutes of the meeting of the Shadow Health Board held on 14 November were received and agreed as a correct record. There were no matters arising.

## **5. Summary of the Cherwell Local Plan Inspector's Report**

Barry Wood introduced the report and advised that Cherwell would seek to adopt the Plan at its Full Council meeting on 20 July. A series of adjustments would be made to the submitted plan and tabled at the meeting. Mr Wood reminded the meeting that making Local Plans was critical to economic prosperity and Districts welcomed the obligation to do so. Whilst the development of a Local Plan was intensive in terms of time and resources, these challenges had to be met so that planning could regulate growth. The absence of a Local Plan would result in developer led planning. Cherwell would be happy to assist other districts in developing their plans and to share the lessons learned.

## **6. Post SHMA Strategic Work Programme**

David Neudegg introduced the report outlining the post SHMA Strategic Work Programme. He indicated that the Programme had been the subject of previous debate and the Board was now invited to confirm approval of the Programme and establish a partnership holding account to finance the Programme. He noted that the timetable had been produced some time ago and that, whilst some dates may have slipped, it summarised the work streams as set out in the appendix to the report.

With regard to the appointment of land use consultants to undertake a Green Belt Study, John Cotton indicated that the Vale was just about to publish its own Green Belt study and, whilst the authority would be willing to co-operate with the consultants, he raised concern over the manner in which various open spaces and developed land had been parcelled together, suggesting that if this had not already been resolved it could represent a weakness in the eventual report.

In response, Andrew Tucker confirmed that the concerns raised were in the process of being addressed by the consultants in liaison with the relevant authorities

Matthew Barber suggested that it was fundamental to the Programme that the availability of land for residential development in Oxford City and the level of unmet demand be identified. With this objective in mind he proposed the following motion:-

*Districts councils note the clear direction of the Cherwell Local Plan Inspector that Oxford City's unmet housing needs be 'fully and accurately defined'*

*The districts believe that fulfilment of the duty to cooperate would be further strengthened by Oxford City also committing to an early review of their Local Plan in common with all the other districts. The districts remain firmly committed to delivering the post SHMA Work Programme, including the critical friend process, as part of the duty to cooperate.*

In seconding the proposition, John Cotton indicated that a review of Oxford City's Local Plan would enable both the policy desires of the Council and the issue of capacity to be tested in a public forum through the Local Plan Inquiry process.

Ian Hudspeth emphasised the importance of continuing with the existing Programme and the need to reach a conclusion without delay. He expressed concern that other district's Local Plans ought not to be delayed recognising that, if Plans were not robust, there was a continued danger of speculative development on unallocated sites.

Barry Wood indicated that he had no objection to the Board making such a request as long as it did not deflect from the work identified in the post SHMA Work Programme

Bob Price, responding to the proposal acknowledged that this was a matter of on-going debate and reiterated the City's position was that their 2011 Local Plan was robust and that the city has sought to address as much of their unmet housing need as possible. He confirmed that the Oxford SHLAA was based in their view upon an exhaustive examination of sites and indicated that consultants employed by the City to review Oxford's SHLAA had concluded that a review of the Local Plan was unnecessary.

On being put to the vote the Motion **WAS CARRIED**

Turning to the revised timetable for the Post SHMA Work Programme, Barry Wood indicated that he did not consider that the Board was in a position to endorse the Programme as submitted given that it was not fully up to date. He proposed that consideration of the Programme be deferred to a special meeting of the Growth Board to be held as soon as possible in July to enable the Executive Group to produce a revised timetable, together with a synopsis of the work involved.

In expressing his support the proposal, Matthew Barber advised that, in moving towards Examination in Public in September, the Vale of White Horse had advice suggesting that the spatial options work should be more robust. Whilst the Vale would not wish to delay the post SHMA timetable, it was crucial to the joint process (and for districts to begin accommodating Oxford's unmet need) that Local Plans were found to be sound in order to avoid delay and potential future challenges.

With regard to the creation of a partnership holding account, John Cotton indicated that, having undertaken its own independent Green Belt Study, South Oxfordshire would not wish to see any funding it allocated to the account applied towards this

particular study. He also sought reassurance that the necessary procedures would be put in place to ensure that funds were properly spent and accounted for.

Matthew Barber emphasised the necessity to allocate funds to progress the work programme and Ian Hudspeth noted that the suggested contribution of £60,000 from each authority was to be viewed as a maximum.

Bob Price advised that expenditure would be subject to all the usual accountability arrangements employed by the lead authority. David Neudegg confirmed that a regular monitoring reports and budget updates would be submitted as part of this process.

The Board :-

**RESOLVED:**

- (a) That further consideration of the detailed Programme be deferred to a special meeting of the Growth Board to be held as soon as possible in July to enable the Executive Group to produce a revised timetable, together with a synopsis of the work involved.
- (b) That the establishment of a partnership holding account be authorised and each partner authority requested to transfer £60,000 to the account for the purposes of financing the Programme.

**7. Local Growth Fund Projects Update**

Nigel Tipple introduced the report which outlined progress on Local Growth Fund Projects. He explained that inclusion in the project list ought not to be taken to presuppose the allocation of Government funding as detailed discussions would not take place until after the budget, comprehensive spending review and autumn statement. Identifying and developing potential projects at an early stage in conjunction with the private sector allowed the LEP to take advantage of any future funding opportunities as and when they arose.

He explained that the 'Gold' and 'Silver' designations shown on the report related solely to the original expressions of interest for individual projects and not to any ranking within the project list. He also confirmed that the financial sums were indicative project totals only and inclusion within the list did not imply that all projects could be progressed at the same pace as a number were still the subject of on-going dialogue and not yet in a position to be brought forward.

By bringing an outline programme together, the LEP would be in a position to commence discussions with Ministers and Civil Servants after the summer recess. There were business plans underpinning each project and, by working with the private and voluntary sectors and aligning projects with strategic objectives, the LEP was able to access a wider range of funding streams.

Bob Price noted that total potential expenditure was huge and questioned how the projects could be prioritised in relation to the SEP. He also queried the extent of match funding committed by the proposers of individual projects, indicating that this was a significant factor in establishing priority.

Nigel Tipple acknowledged that potential costs were substantial and advised that private sector funding created significant leverage in accessing other funding streams. A 25% contribution towards a potential total expenditure of some £350M

to £400M was envisaged which raised issues with regard to state aid and support from the private sector.

The programme built upon the success of the City Deal and Growth Fund where projects were ranked according to their business plans and consistency with the SEP.

Further assessment of project activity was currently taking place and it would be necessary to prioritise areas and rank schemes within those priorities. Projects were grouped using a thematic approach but were not prioritised. It was necessary to identify those that were deliverable and in accord with Government priorities. Some projects would be developed further whilst others would be held in reserve as being desirable.

Bob Price suggested that the economic significance of the Harwell project was such that it should be considered as an exceptional project outside the Growth Fund. Nigel Tipple concurred but noted that projects would need to be tailored in order to resonate with the Government's current approach; a methodology that had proved successful in the past.

John Cotton acknowledged that, whilst projects could be packaged differently to meet Government priorities and maximise funding opportunities, this ought not to be to the detriment of established local priorities or the relative benefit to the local economy. Nigel Tipple concurred that there was little merit in pursuing funding as an objective in itself but noted that funding had been secured for projects of recognised strategic importance in the past by re-packaging schemes.

Barry Wood commended the work carried out and recognised the need to maintain a flexible approach, particularly in times of financial constraints. He noted that the governance of the Growth Fund fell to the LEP and that the report was submitted to the Growth Board for information.

Whilst acknowledging the need to maintain flexibility, Ian Hudspeth stressed the importance of taking a wider strategic view in preference to seeking to secure funding for local projects of limited merit. Whilst applications could be made in response to changing Government priorities, it was important to ensure that projects fell within agreed strategic objectives.

Adrian Shooter indicated that the medium and long term direction of the SEP was kept in mind by the LEP Board. The project plan enabled the LEP to be opportunistic when Government funding opportunities arose; for example when other areas were unable to progress funded schemes. Accordingly, whilst schemes might not always be progressed in the expected order, the general direction of travel would always be maintained.

**RESOLVED:** That the report and the current position be noted.

## **8. European Structural Investment Fund**

Nigel Tipple introduced a report seeking an in principle approval for funding for technical support for projects allocated funding from the European Structural investment Fund.

**RESOLVED:** That partner councils be requested to give in principle approval to make provision in their budgets for the three years to 2018/19 to fund technical support for the projects allocated funding from the European Structural investment

Fund, subject to a detailed assessment of the funding required and how the resources could be delivered by the Executive Officer Group.

**9. City Deal Finance Summary**

The Board received a report summarising the financial position of various City Deal Projects.

**RESOLVED:** That the report and the current position be noted.

**10. Response to Oxford City Council's Scrutiny Committee**

The Board received and considered a report advising Members of the recommendations made by Oxford City Council's Scrutiny Committee and suggesting a response.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted and the proposed response approved for submission to Oxford City.

**11. Date of Future Meetings**

It was noted that, in addition to the special meeting to be held in July, future meetings of the Growth Board would be held at Cherwell District Council's offices on 24 September and 19 November 2015 and 19 January, 31 March and 26 May 2016.

**12. Any Other Business**

Bev Hindle introduced John Henderson, regional Asset Manager for Oxfordshire County Council.

The meeting finished at 3:00 pm



Growth Board 30 July 2015  
Contact: Paul Staines; Growth Board Programme Manager  
E- mail Paul.Staines@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk  
T: 01295-221847

## **Post SHMA Strategic Work Programme**

### **Recommendations**

*That the Growth Board:*

- (i) Confirm that the emphasis on the Sovereignty of Local Plans in the key principles for the Post SHMA Strategic Work Programme remains appropriate.*
- (ii) Endorse the detailed work programme and revised timetable.*
- (iii) Request a more frequent pattern of Growth Board Meetings aligned with the Strategic Work Programme.*
- (iv) Request that the Partners adopt a Coordination and Communication Protocol.*

### **Purpose of the Report**

1. To provide a synopsis of the Post-SHMA Strategic Work Programme (the Programme) along with a revised timetable, provided as an appendix to this report.

### **Background**

2. Public bodies have a Duty to Co-operate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries. A key issue in Oxfordshire is the potential unmet housing need arising from Oxford City. The Programme has been developed to help the Oxfordshire Councils fulfil the duty on this issue.
3. The Growth Board considered a report on the Programme at its last meeting on 25 June 2015. It resolved that further consideration of the detailed Programme be deferred to a special meeting of the Growth Board to be held as soon as possible in July to enable the Executive Officer Group to produce a revised timetable, together with a synopsis of the work involved.

### **Key Principles**

4. The Growth Board in November 2014 approved the key principles which should underpin the Programme. The principles as endorsed are set out below:
  - The district Local Plans are sovereign and all work should feed into Local Plans for them to determine the spatial future of the districts;

- A recognition however that the work must be collaborative and joined up to provide a county wide spatial picture and strategy;
- A recognition therefore that joint work on future spatial options, transport infrastructure and green belt will be required to feed into Local Plans;
- Recognition that the City cannot fully meet its housing needs and there is a need to agree on the level of unmet need. However work on determining spatial options in Local Plans can commence alongside this;
- A wish that the timescale for completing the Review is 12 – 18 months and that this should not hold up Local Plan timescales.

## **Synopsis of Strategic Work Programme**

### Defining Oxford's Unmet Need

5. An important element of the Programme is to clarify the extent of Oxford's housing need that can be accommodated in Oxford City itself. The Critical Friend, engaged to help the programme, has been asked to review the documentation on this issue and recommend a way forward. A single figure or narrower range is being sought around which hopefully the relevant authorities can coalesce, at least as a working assumption, in order to inform the assessment of Strategic Options.

### Development of Strategic Options

6. A range of Strategic Options will be developed for meeting Oxford's unmet housing need. The intention is that the Strategic Options will identify potential areas of search for additional housing, above a threshold of 500 dwellings which will then be used to help inform the future distribution of this unmet need between the various local authority areas.

### Green Belt Study

7. A study into the Oxfordshire Green Belt is underway. This will assess the contribution that different parts of the Green Belt make to the purposes of the Green Belt according to the 5 statutory criteria. This study will, in combination with the Strategic Options Assessment, help to identify the potential, or not, for development, and the case for additional areas to be added to the Green Belt. Local Planning Authorities will consider any changes to Green Belt boundaries through Local Plan Reviews.

### Strategic Options Assessment

8. A common set of criteria will be used to assess the Strategic Options. The assessment process will look at each of the Strategic Options and provide a high level sustainability assessment. It will also identify any strategic constraints on the scale of growth in Oxfordshire.

It has always been recognised that this is an informal process which does not form part of the statutory planning system but one that is intended to demonstrate compliance with the Duty to Co-operate without compromising the principle of individual local plans sovereignty. The assessment process itself will involve a two stage process with transport modelling restricted to a shortlist of Strategic Options owing to the significant costs involved with this element of the work.

#### Infrastructure Delivery Planning

9. The County Council will prepare an Infrastructure Delivery Framework to set out the strategic infrastructure investments required to support growth. A draft framework will be prepared in parallel with the assessment of strategic options. This will allow the cumulative impact of growth to be properly considered alongside the identification of infrastructure priorities.

#### Housing Need Distribution

10. The outcomes of the Strategic Options Assessment will inform the distribution of Oxford's unmet need between the various district council areas. This will be set out in a Statement of Cooperation to be approved by the Board and which will feed into subsequent Local Plan Reviews. A package of background reports will be published documenting the process carried out and the technical evidence underpinning the Statement of Cooperation.

#### Local Plan Reviews

11. Local Planning Authorities will complete Local Plan Reviews, if required, to address the issue of Oxford's unmet housing need. This will involve detailed technical work at a sites level and will provide extensive opportunities for public and stakeholder engagement. Local Planning authorities will need to commission detailed evidence, and full Sustainability Appraisals to support their Local Plan Reviews. It will be for each Council to consider whether they adopt any of the Strategic Options assessed through the Strategic Work programme or whether they develop an alternative approach supported by their own evidence prepared in conjunction with local plan reviews.

### **Revised Timetable**

12. Officers, through the Growth Board Executive Officer Group, have prepared a revised timetable and detailed work programme to reflect the current position. This is attached in Appendix 1.
13. The revised timetable shows that the partnership will not be in a position to reach a short list of strategic options until January 2016. It is now anticipated that the Statement of Cooperation will be published in May 2016 alongside a draft Infrastructure Delivery Framework and the background reports.

## **Issues**

### Local Plan Sovereignty and Robustness

14. The Strategic Work Programme exists to help Councils satisfy the Duty to Co-operate. It is not a formal planning process and its outputs will not be Statutory Planning Documents. It will help inform the future Local Plan Reviews of City and District Councils. The individual Local Plan Review processes will provide extensive opportunities for public and stakeholder engagement, and will formally test the outcomes of the Programme.
15. A more formal approach could be adopted for the Strategic Work Programme but this would, to some extent, constrain future Local Plan Reviews and undermine the sovereignty of Local Plans. The Growth Board could consider this aspect.

### Governance

16. It is important that key stages of the Strategic Work Programme are reported to the Growth Board for agreement. Additional Growth Board meetings can be arranged to facilitate this. It is anticipated, for example, that the conclusions of the Critical Friend on the figure for Oxford's unmet need can be reported to the Growth Board in September.

### Coordination and Communication

17. In order for the programme to be successfully completed it will require commitment and co-operation from the partners. A number of coordination mechanisms have been established. For example the Executive Officers Group and a Project Team. But the development of a Coordination and Communication Protocol could be useful given the complex nature of the issues being considered.

## **Conclusions**

18. The Programme and timetable demonstrates the progress made to date but also recognises the slippage. Officers believe that the revised timetable is realistic, albeit challenging but acknowledge that it will not be achieved without the full continued commitment of all partners to the programme and ask the Growth Board to reaffirm that full commitment.

Post SHMA Strategic Work programme July 2015

No.	Programme Element	Lead Council(s)	Resources	Tasks	Outputs	Original Completion Date	Revised completion date as at 21st July	Notes
1	Programme Set Up	WODC	Growth Board Programme Manager/ In-house staff	Prepare Detailed Project Plan, agree project leads, identify resources, and define steering and reporting arrangements	Detailed Project Plan for approval at February Growth Board	ongoing	ongoing	
			Growth Board Programme Manager/ In-house staff	Recruit/Identify Strategic Planner to support the Growth Board Programme Manager	Fixed term/ seconded Strategic Planner	February 2015	May 2015	Agreed to be part of the tender for a critical friend.
			Growth Board Programme Manager/ In-house staff	Engage external expert Critical Friend to independently validate and comment on the programme at key stages	Critical Friend appointed	February 2015	May 2015	Appointed Mid May.
			Growth Board Programme Manager/ In-house staff	Develop communications strategy and Growth Board website	Communication Strategy and Website Information	February 2015	February 2015	Comms strategy completed. Agreed at GB that a WGB web site will not be developed, instead relying upon partners web sites.
			Growth Board Programme Manager/ In-house staff	Develop coordination and communication protocol	agreed coordination and communication protocol	May 2015	August 2015	Draft circulated, awaiting comments from partners.
2	Define Oxford's Unmet Need	OCityC	In-house staff/ Consultants	Detailed response from VOWH, SO and CDC on Oxford SHLAA (Cundall Review)	Cundall Report	November 2014	November 2014	Completed.
			Critical Friend	Critical Friend reviews Oxfords SHLAA and responses from rural districts and recommends an unmet need figure for Oxford based upon existing policy, with policy change options to be considered as a Strategic Option(s) and tested	Critical Friend Review Paper	February 2015	August 2015	Meetings held with City and Districts. Report under preparation.
3	Strategic Options development to inform housing distribution	WODC	Growth Board Programme Manager/ In-house staff	Define scope of Strategic Options (i.e. size thresholds and essential criteria) and prepare standard information template (SHLAA compatible)	Scoping Paper and Standard Information Template	January 2015	March 2015	Scoping paper agreed on 23rd March.
		All Councils	In-house staff	Individual Districts generate aggregated Strategic Options	Strategic Options for all districts	March 2015	August 2015	Strategic options yet to be provided for South and Vale.
		All Councils	Critical Friend, Growth Board Programme Manager/ In-house staff/ Consultants	Check and Challenge workshop on Strategic Options list to ensure that all reasonable options have been included	Final Strategic Options list	March 2015	September 2015	This date is will depend upon completion of strategic options templates for all districts.
4	High Level Sustainability and Strategic Options Assessment	OCountyC	In-house staff	Finalise brief and procure consultants for Sustainability Assessment	Develop Project Brief and appoint consultants	February 2015	August 2015	The tender for the consultants was issued in early June however appointment requires clarification of scale and scope of project and strategic options templates for all districts.
		OCountyC	In-house staff/ Consultants	Study the relative contribution of areas of land to the purposes of the Oxford Green Belt in order to identify the potential, or not, for development, and the case for additional areas to be added to the Green Belt.	Draft Report on Green Belt Study	June 2015	August 2015	Revised project programme proposes a draft report by 14th August 2015.
		OCountyC	In-house staff/ Consultants	Establish spatial and sustainability assessment criteria and baseline	Agreed assessment criteria and baseline	June 2015	September 2015	This work cannot commence until the task entitled Strategic Options development to inform housing distribution has been completed.
				Identify any strategic environmental constraints	Report on Strategic Environmental Constraints	June 2015	December 2015	
				Identify any strategic infrastructure constraints	Report on Strategic Infrastructure Constraints	June 2015	December 2015	
				Identify any strategic water constraints	Report on Strategic Water Constraints	June 2015	December 2015	
				Assess Strategic Options for consistency with Strategic Economic Plan	SEP Consistency Paper	June 2015	December 2015	
Infrastructure assessment of Strategic Options, including transport	Infrastructure analysis of Strategic Options	June 2016	December 2015					

				Assess landscape and heritage impact of Strategic Options	Landscape and heritage analysis of Strategic Options	June 2017	December 2015	This follows the tasks above		
				High level viability assessment of Strategic Options	Report on viability assessment of Strategic Options	July 2015	January 2016			
				Evaluate Strategic Options and Prepare Draft Sustainability Assessment Report	Draft Sustainability Assessment Report	July 2016	January 2016			
				All Councils	Critical Friend, Growth Board Programme Manager/	Check and Challenge workshop on emerging evaluation of Strategic Options	Revised Draft Sustainability Assessment Report and Revised Draft Report on Green Belt Study		July 2017	January 2016
				OCountyC	Critical Friend	Critical Friend review of evaluation of Strategic Options to ensure that this is justified and appropriate	Final Sustainability Assessment Report and Final Green Belt Study Report		August 2015	February 2016
5	Infrastructure Delivery Plan	OCountyC	In-house staff/ Consultants	Collate existing IDPs and evidence	develop a background comprehensive evidence base	March 2015	September 2015	Background work underway		
				Define scope of infrastructure assessment work and transport assessment/ modelling	Detailed Project Brief	March 2015	September 2015			
				Assessment of funding and delivery of Infrastructure options, including Government (e.g. LGF Round 3), land value capture, etc.	Funding options assessment	June 2015	January 2016	These tasks require the Sustainability and Strategic Options Assessment to arrive at a short list of options to consider taking forward for infrastructure implications		
				Develop infrastructure options to support delivery of Strategic Options and other district growth proposals	Draft options	July 2015	February 2016			
				First Draft Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Draft Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan	July 2015	February 2016			
		All Councils	Critical Friend, Growth Board Programme Manager/ In-house staff/ Consultants	Check and Challenge workshop on emerging infrastructure plans and priorities	Revised Draft Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan	July 2015	February 2016			
		OCountyC	Critical Friend	Critical Friend review of Draft Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan to ensure that this is justified and appropriate	Revised Draft Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan	August 2015	March 2016			
				In-house staff/ Consultants	Assess Local Plan Growth Proposals as they emerge	OCountyC comments on Local Plans/ Development proposals	tbc	tbc	follows statement of cooperation	
					Finalise Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Final Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan	tbc	tbc		
		6	Complete final reports for Growth Board	All Councils		Recommendations from Critical Friend on housing distribution between districts and implications for 5 year housing land supply	Report to Growth Board	July 2015	February 2016	
Critical Friend, Growth Board Programme Manager/ Strategic Planner/ In-house staff	Check and Challenge workshop on Critical Friend's emerging recommendations				Revised Report to Growth Board	August 2015	March 2016			
Growth Board Programme Manager/ Strategic Planner/ In-house staff	Growth Board consider recommendations and decide housing distribution between districts				Agreed position on housing distribution	September 2015	March 2016	Target of Growth Board EOG on 17/3 and Growth Board on 31/3		
Growth Board Programme Manager/ Strategic Planner/ In-house staff	Publish statement of cooperation setting out agreed distribution				Revised Statement of Cooperation	September 2015	April 2016			
7	Strategic Habitat Regulations Assessment	TBC	In-house staff	Prepare brief and procure consultants	Project Brief	October 2015	February 2016			
			Consultants	Screening of Recommended Strategic Options	HRA Screening of Strategic Options Report	November 2015	March 2016			
				Appropriate Assessment (if required)	Appropriate Assessment	tbc	June 2016	This task will commence alongside Local Plan reviews		
	Water Cycle Strategy	Vale/South	In-house staff	Prepare brief and procure consultants	Project Brief	October 2015	tbc	This project will commence alongside Local Plan reviews		
			Consultants	Prepare Water Cycle Strategy	Water Cycle Strategy	tbc	tbc			