

**OxLEP Board Meeting
10th December 2019
5:00 – 7:45pm**

**VENUE
John Paull II Centre, Bicester**

MINUTES

Board Directors Present:	Jeremy Long (Chair), Adrian Lockwood (AL – Deputy Chair), Alistair Fitt (AF), Cllr Ian Hudspeth (IH), Nigel Tipple(NT), Penny Rinta-Suksi (PRS), Cllr James Mills (JM), Phil Southall (PSo), Miranda Markham (MM), Peter Nolan (PN), Angus Horner (AH), Cllr Susan Brown (SB), Di Batchelor (DB), Cllr Barry Wood (BW), Patrick Grant (PG), Cllr Sue Roberts (SR), Jayne Norris (JN), Wendy Hart (WH)	
Board Directors Apologies:	Cllr Emily Smith (ES) Bindu Varkey (BV)	
Minutes:	Sadie Patamia (SP)	
In attendance:	Ahmed Goga (AG), Josh Fedder (JF), Richard Byard (RB), Sebastian Johnson (SJ), Rob Panting (RP), Sarah Watson (SW) Sue Cooper (SC), Lorna Baxter (LB), Lyn Davies (LD), Simon Pringle (SP) and Jody Tableporter (JT)	
Item		Action/Responsible
Item 1 - Welcome, Apologies and Declarations of Interest		
Apologies were accepted from Emily Smith (ES) New Board members Wendy Hart and Jayne Norris introduced themselves at the end of the meeting.		
Item 2 – Minutes		
Minutes		
To approve		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of AGM (10/09/19) • Minutes of Board Meeting 20 (10/09/19) 		Approved Approved, with the note that Item 4.5 was approved not noted
To note		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finance and Audit Committee (20/8/19)¹ • Nominations and Personnel Committee (12/6/19)¹ 		Noted Noted
Items 4 & 5 are confidential items and are exempt information -Under Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended		
Public Invited to Join the Meeting		
Board Meeting Part Two – Items for Decision/Information		
Item 6 - Questions from the public arising from the Agenda (Max 3 mins per question – notified in advance in writing)		
There were no questions received from the public.		
Item 7 - Programme Sub Group Chair Report		
PRS presented the paper.		

<p>She advised that there were currently 15 projects with minor issues or delays and that these were subject to regular review and had been presented previously to the Board. As before, completed projects were highlighted in blue and noted in the paper.</p> <p>SR asked for clarification regarding progress with the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme. PRS confirmed it had been subject to a capital swap as approved at the last Board meeting and that we continued to monitor progress as this remained a priority. NT further explained the context of the Capital swap and the flexibility this provided given the complexity of the project and its interdependence with the Hinksey Bridge replacement/improvement programme.</p> <p>AF asked if there were any Amber projects, as currently assessed which may go red in the short term. PRS replied there were none we were aware of at this stage. We continued to monitor progress but that we could not rule out changes outside our control.</p> <p>Recommendations from Programme Sub Group</p> <p>That the Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes the report. 	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Item 8 - Chief Executive's Report (NT)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex 1 Communications Update • APR Guidance 2019/20 	
<p>NT presented the report. He drew the Boards attention to the forthcoming Annual Performance Review scheduled for the 13th February. Whilst we have continued to make good progress and that broadly speaking the process was similar to last year's review, the information required, and preparation should not be underestimated particularly given the very tight turnaround time for initial submissions of the 16th December.</p> <p>JL noted the importance of the process, not just as a performance monitoring exercise, but its relationship with demonstrating good governance, transparency and performance. All factors which will influence future funding allocations.</p> <p>AH asked if there was an opportunity in the process to point out to Government that performance could be improved if there was more certainty about core funding. NT agreed with the points being made and advised that we had raised the same points in each of the last 3 reviews.</p> <p>NT further reminded the Board of the positive progress we had made over the last 6 years and particularly in meeting the revised APR Guidance over the last 24 months where increased scrutiny and challenge had been evident.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>That the Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes the report and activity supported to date, • Communications Activity Tracker at Annex 1 	<p>Noted</p>

Papers annotated with an * are supported by a Board Committee or Sub-Group recommendation.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APR Guidance at Annex 2 And Approves <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delegation of the APR submission to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Chair/ Deputy Chair and Chair of the Programme Sub-group 	Approved
Item 9 - 3rd Thames Bridge Meeting Update (IH) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update paper¹ 	
<p>IH stated that the proposals associated with the 3rd Thames Bridge had been around for some time. He stated that the project was been driven by Local Authorities in Berkshire, particularly Reading, and was a project supported strongly by Thames Valley LEP. He reflected on the proposed alignment and its impact on the South Oxfordshire side.</p> <p>He noted that both SODC and OCC have been involved in discussions for some time and whilst no firm proposals have been prepared, both Authorities wish to ensure that should it progress in some way, then it should be focused upon supporting sustainable modes of transport, not predominantly car-based traffic movement.</p> <p>IH asked whether our collective position had changed from previous discussions, which was to note the proposal and to recognise its impact but to reserve our position until such time as both SODC and Oxfordshire County Council promote this as a priority in their statutory plans, both Planning and Highways. He noted that “partners” had been asked to contribute £25k towards the costs of further development work and that the County had now agreed to do so. IH enquired as to whether the LEP would support the scheme and consequently put money into it.</p> <p>NT noted that neither SODC or County had prioritised investment in this project through either their local plans or the Oxfordshire infrastructure strategy, therefore it was not identified in our programmes or prioritised for support. Furthermore, we had made that position clear on several occasions, noting that any proposal coming forward would be subject to the same rigorous assessment process through both Programme sub-Group and Board before we could consider support.</p> <p>SR stated that SODC did not support the project as proposed and that it would generate too much local traffic, impacting on the south Oxfordshire communities. Should the project progress, then it should focus upon public transport access primarily not commuter movements.</p> <p>AL noted the potential benefit of the proposed bridge for residents, though he recognised the project was not currently included in our programmes or prioritised.</p> <p>JL reiterated that we had not prioritised this project or agreed to provide any funding for development costs. However, it was noted that continued oversight would be helpful to understand the progress being made and impact on Oxfordshire of the proposals.</p>	
Item 10 Oxfordshire LIS – Delivery Programme and Investment Prospectus Development (AG) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation by Steer Economics 	
<p>AG presented the paper. He confirmed that the LIS had been well received and that Steer Consulting had now been commissioned to support the development of</p>	

Papers annotated with an * are supported by a Board Committee or Sub-Group recommendation.

Business Cases to form a future programme bid into government or to respond to future funding rounds such as UKSPF should that be progressed. He then introduced JT and SP who gave a presentation to the Board setting out how they would work with partners to develop the respective business cases.

They emphasised the importance of Oxfordshire being seen as a place where problems come to be solved, where innovation is encouraged and where ambition is translated into sustainable delivery.

JL noted that the ambition of the LIS was clearly articulated but that we must strive to turn that ambition into deliverable solutions, the “what” we want to do into “how” we intend to deliver this with partners.

SB stated that sustainability and inclusivity were very important when considering economic growth and its impact on the prosperity of communities. She felt that promoting a Single Oxfordshire Voice at this time would be challenging, but there was no reason why we could not seek to harmonise our approach. Furthermore, SB noted that whilst we are not seeking to adopt a “one size fits all” approach, there was real value in a single shared vision.

BW supported the need for sustainable and inclusive development across the County. He reflected on the perception that for some, growth is bad, but that is not the key message underpinning the Oxfordshire LIS. He noted the need to be careful to ensure the intent and output from the LIS is understood and championed by partners.

The Investment prospectus and/or delivery plan needs to identify and articulate the propositions, why we should invest in them and who we might want to be targeted to secure further investment from. The importance of ensuring the ambition of the Local Plans is appropriately reflected in the prospectus, ensuring we strike a balance between communities, business and the environment.

SR stated that Oxfordshire is predominantly a rural county and questioned why farming specifically is not mentioned in the LIS. She suggested that that growth as defined should not be GVA growth, it should rather focus on the prosperity of existing residents, and a zero-carbon future.

AH sought clarity as to the role of the company in promoting the LIS ambition and in ensuring that the tremendous assets which existing are used to improve the quality of life for our residents at the same time as looking to global markets; the positive impact on the prosperity of residents. That said, the scale of ambition will require us to continue to prioritise, to manage expectation and deliver tangible outcomes.

PRS asked whether we should just be focusing purely on the prosperity of Oxfordshire residents when our impact has a much greater reach. The point being that the strategy was looking at the potential of our future generations and existing residents, leaving the environment and its economy in a better position than we inherited.

DB expressed the view that the document could be seen to be focused just on an exclusive set of technologies or outcomes, perhaps reflecting the rich diversity of our communities not just our high technology potential.

<p>BW commended the work the LEPs across the Arc were leading and the fact that we were able to influence and shape that approach.</p> <p>JL reflected upon the challenge of Chairing the OX-Cam Leadership group and that BW and Bev Hindle were doing a good job. He stated that although OxLEP remained focused on delivering for Oxfordshire residents and businesses, we were committed to supporting joint working for mutual benefit.</p> <p>AF noted the alignment of this work with the Arc Universities Group and that this aligned well with the respective LIS documents, they were focused on driving the potential of the HE sector.</p>	
<p>Item 12</p>	
<p>The meeting closed at 19.45.</p>	

DRAFT