

Econ + Land use Planning

- Missing some context - this project is well underway already. In 5 yrs Ox LEP already created 16k homes. Managing growth while trying to plan strategically. There is a cross-leaders group in existence

Key Workstreams:

- Productivity not mentioned.
- Place making
- Connectivity (not just traditional infrastructure)
- What does the arc do for Oxfordshire?
 - aggregating potential
- Arc based on 2 pieces of linear infrastructure → ^{linear} solutions
- Should be asking what infrastructure is needed to drive growth.
- Other pieces missing
 - Natural resources (how will agriculture work? Water? ^{Conservation})
 - How much infrastructure will be green infrastructure. →
 - NNL (no net loss) a formal gov. target. Is this possible with this level of development?
 - Place-based decision making.

- Don't bother with agricultural land - planning around it leads to inefficiency.
- Need to review greenbelt rules.
- Not clear who benefits. Will main users of Cam-Ox roads be from within the arc?
- Inequality highlighted as important - definitely a major issue in both Comb+Ox.

* Next step - go through all relevant central govt. policy to understand how they all fit + relevance to the arc.

Ques: Democratic legitimacy?
- Imposed, socialised, politically socialised.

Where does the arc fit in the Industrial Strategy?

- Ties together areas of IS that need wider cooperation
- Is there anywhere that ties together these separate visions of how the arc can add value? Disparate understanding

Water - water required for the plan is not there.

Already under huge pressure

Govt. promoting national approach to manage this.

These actors need to be included in the arc discussions.

Existing plans based on LA plans. Difficult to take additional growth into account.

Main strategy in SE is to reduce water use, not increase supply. Such approaches need to be integrated into arc planning.

Transport - objective to reduce car use. Growth plan should be constrained by this. Sequencing key

- last mile key - major infrastructure doesn't address this.
- Is there a need for a new form of regional planning?
 - 'Yes', but politically infeasible.
 - Can existing structures be used to achieve this?

Final points:

Roughly aligned with 3 workstreams of Cross Corridor Leaders Group

- ① Don't do infrastructure-led growth
 - 1 Productivity
 - 2 Connectivity
 - 3 Sense of place
- ② Need for new form of regional spatial planning (ideally building on existing structures e.g. Cross Corridor Leaders Group)
- ③ Environmental piece is missing! To what extent can/should it be carbon neutral / No Net Loss / Net Env. Gain.
Build from an environmental base e.g. water has to be integrated from start.

1. AGREEING MODE SHIFT
IN ADVANCE + RIGOROUSLY
PLANNING FOR IT
2. WORKING WITH WHAT WE'VE
GOT + PUTTING IN PLACE
HIERARCHY OF PROVISION AROUND IT
3. TRANSPORT AS A SERVICE
(cf. NHS)
4. 4-TRACK RAIL TO START WITH
& DEVELOP AROUND NODES
BUT INVESTMENT MODEL
BROKEN - MAY NEED TO
BUILD UP TO IT!

TRANSPORT

HOUSING + INFRASTRUCTURE NEW MODELS

LEADERSHIP - CASE STUDIES SHOW THIS HAS DELIVERED BUT NOT ALWAYS. NEED FOCUSED HOUSING DELIVERY UNITS WITH PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP; IDEALLY LINKED WITH PLAN-MAKING - MORE RESOURCES NEEDED. NEED TO INCLUDE PARTNERSHIPS BEYOND LPA BOUNDARIES AS WELL AS FUNCTIONAL ECONOMIC AREAS

QUALITY - CLEAR PRINCIPLES REQUIRED TO DELIVER LANDSCAPE-LED PLANNING, ECO-SYSTEMS/NATURAL CAPITAL " NET ZERO CARBON PLANNING "

INNOVATION NEW FINANCIAL MODELS TO LEVERAGE LAND VALUE CAPTURE CLARITY ON INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING + COSTS; MOST OF ALL TO DELIVER DIVERSITY OF SUPPLY (+ AFFORDABILITY) WHERE WE CURRENTLY EXPERIENCE MARKET FAILURE

- RE-INCENTIVISE
COMMERCIAL MODEL
 - TREASURY TOOLS
 - BARONETCIES

• LONG-TERM REGIONAL GOVT

- COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN
VISION/PLANNING + DELIVERY

SOCIAL