

Strategic Economic Plan – revised following public consultation

Comments and decisions made by local authorities and the OxLEP and Growth Boards

LA/Board	Comments and decision	Response
OxLEP Board – 5 September 2016	<p>There was an extensive discussion regarding the response from businesses and their engagement. It was agreed and accepted that there is a challenge for the Board as a whole to get more businesses engaged and to raise the profile of the SEP.</p> <p>It was suggested that it is important to ensure engagement at subgroup level also as businesses are more likely to get involved when it is in their particular sector.</p>	<p>It is worth reflecting on the reach and engagement with business representative organisations (over 4000 businesses consulted) including stakeholder engagement as distinct from the number of written submissions received. We continue to work with representative groups and engagement through Board sub-groups. We will articulate this in the Delivery section of the SEP.</p>
Oxford City Council Scrutiny Committee – 5 September 2016	<p>The Scrutiny Committee AGREED the following recommendations to the City Executive Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report sets a clear goal on page 19 to deliver sustainable growth in line with the Brundtland Commission definition. The SWOT analysis (page 29) identifies the risk that, as it stands, this will not be achieved with regard to climate change targets – a key indicator of sustainable development. Nowhere are the conclusions of this aspect of the SWOT analysis addressed. Where is the detail of how climate change targets are to be met? 	<p>We thank Oxford City Council for their considered response</p> <p>We refer to climate change five times throughout the SEP. The SEP is a strategic document and not a delivery plan and therefore does not focus on detail. However, we are in the process of establishing an Environmental and Sustainability sub-group where climate change and how we mitigate its effects locally will be explored in detail.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report and framework should make it clear that whilst the formal response from the business community was low this does not mean that views were not given and captured as part of this exercise. Businesses engaged through workshops and other informal channels with representatives of OxLEP. The poor connectivity of buses across the City is identified as a threat but not closed off. This position has been made worse by the reduction in subsidised bus services. The SEP should include actions and solutions in this area including better use of trips around the ring road and additional stops along established routes. 	<p>It is worth reflecting on the reach and engagement with business representative organisations (over 4000 businesses consulted) including stakeholder engagement as distinct from the number of written submissions received. We continue to work with representative groups and engagement through Board sub-groups. We will articulate this in the Delivery section of the SEP.</p> <p>This is too detailed for the SEP. This level of detail is included in the Transport Strategy</p>
<p>Oxford City Council Executive Board – 15 September 2016</p>	<p>Resolved to AGREE to formally endorse the draft SEP, subject to the feedback in the report and any additional member comments being relayed to OxLEP for consideration.</p> <p>Comments made at this meeting on the SEP were as follows:</p> <p>The comment made at Scrutiny Committee (see above) about the sustainability issues was supported.</p> <p>It was felt that the SEP did not put enough emphasis on the gaps in key skills and jobs and the need for more affordable housing in Oxford.</p>	<p>These issues are highlighted in the SEP but we will make sure they are referred to in the Executive Summary and Introduction where they are currently missing.</p>

	The impacts of Brexit need to be clearly described. OxLEP needs to remind the government that the scientific and educational communities and tourism are extremely vulnerable to Brexit.	The impacts of Brexit are unknown and will remain so for months and years. We will be inserting a Risk Register for the SEP and the impacts of Brexit will be a Risk to be considered. We will be responding robustly to the national Industrial Strategy where we will champion the Oxfordshire economy and its key sectors.
Oxfordshire County Council – 20 September 2016	<p>RESOLVED to endorse the revised SEP.</p> <p>Cabinet recognised that the challenge was to create appropriate jobs and they hoped to see more done to support apprenticeships. Cabinet recognised that there had been a great deal of inward investment from the original plan with projects being completed on the ground. Councillor Nimmo-Smith, Cabinet Member for Environment in moving the recommendation emphasised that rural areas were part of the LEP and highlighted the numerous small businesses supporting Science Vale.</p>	<p>We thank Oxfordshire County Council for their considered response.</p> <p>Oxfordshire Apprenticeships continues its work in schools throughout Oxfordshire.</p> <p>The emphasis is on the Knowledge Spine as that is where most of the growth is and will be taking place. However, the SEP will better articulate the role of the markets towns and rural areas in sustainable economic growth.</p>
Oxfordshire Growth Board – 26 September	The SEP was Noted	Noted
Cherwell DC – 3 October 2016	<p>RESOLVED that the refreshed Strategic Economic Plan be endorsed in principle for the following reasons:</p> <p>The SEP is an important strategy affecting the District. It will influence decisions made on infrastructure funding and local authorities are required to give it due consideration in preparing their Local Plans.</p>	We thank Cherwell District Council for their considered response.

	<p>The refresh of the SEP is timely and has provided an opportunity to more closely align the SEP with the economic needs of Cherwell as set out in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan. A key issue is to secure the continuing level of economic activity we are seeing in Cherwell with major new investors at allocated employment sites alongside the planned housing growth at Banbury, Bicester and Upper Heyford.</p> <p>The refreshed SEP has an important role to play in supporting the delivery of the economic objectives identified in the Cherwell Local Plan, to help fund the necessary infrastructure identified in the Cherwell Infrastructure Delivery Plan and maintain support the partnership provision of business support measures that already exists between OxLEP and the Cherwell District Council.</p>	
<p>South Oxfordshire DC Cabinet – 6 October 2016</p>	<p>It was RECOMMENDED to Council to endorse the decision of Cabinet to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome some of the changes made to the SEP which seek to make it ‘shorter and clearer’ and acknowledges that this has largely been achieved; • Support the broad thrust of the SEP in terms of the stated vision, identified SWOTs and proposed actions, and; • Believe the SEP would be more robust if it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More fully addressed the issues highlighted in the report (see below). - More clearly linked actions to identified issues, and confirmed where responsibility lies for implementing these various actions • Note that the Leader will take account of points raised at Council in responding to the consultation. <p>SODC Cabinet agreed that the revised draft of the SEP be subject to Council debate before the Leader submitted his formal response to the consultation.</p> <p>Report excerpts:</p>	<p>We thank South Oxfordshire District Council for their considered response.</p> <p>Overall the responses received indicate that we need to more clearly articulate what the SEP is for and how it should be used by businesses, communities and organisations to help meet their social, economic and environmental objectives.</p>

	<p><i>SODC consider that the SEP would have been stronger if:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>More detail had been provided to indicate how the strategy intends to build on strengths, address weaknesses, exploit opportunities and responds to threats,</i> • <i>The proposed actions were more directly linked to the identified SWOTs</i> • <i>A clear indication was provided of where the main responsibility lies for implementing those proposed actions, and</i> • <i>The spatial dimension was articulated in more detail to provide a more county-wide perspective, rather than the current Oxford-centric perspective</i> <p><i>During the course of the SEP consultation process, South and Vale officers raised a number of issues relating to the draft version of the SEP document. Some of these have been addressed completely, some partially and some have been ignored. Additionally a number of further issues were highlighted during the discussion at Joint Scrutiny Committee. As a result, the proposed final version of the SEP does not address the following issues:</i></p>	<p>We will revisit each of the programme sections to ensure that the Priorities and Actions flow from the SWOT. The SEP is however a strategic document and not a delivery plan and therefore does not focus on detail resulting in a 'shorter and clearer' document which SODC have clearly welcomed. Detail is included in the subordinate investment plans and strategies.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>This information will be included in the SEP Monitoring and Impact Framework. As above, the SEP remains a strategic document shaping and positioning intervention.</p> <p>We will include other strategic spatial dimensions where it is appropriate to do so, i.e. the work on regenerating Berinsfield and WODCs work on the regeneration of Carterton.</p> <p>All comments received during the consultation were considered carefully. None were 'ignored'. As with any consultation on a complex document, not all comments received can be accommodated or are appropriate to the exercise.</p>
--	---	--

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The need to produce a less Oxford-centric document and to see greater recognition of, and detail concerning, the R&D hubs of Culham, Harwell, Howbery</i> <i>2. There are three identified hubs in Oxfordshire, Bicester, Oxford and Science Vale, however equal weight has not been given to these and the SEP fails to recognise that if employment growth were to be spread more around the county then the pressures on the roads, on Oxford itself and the green belt, would be greatly reduced</i> <i>3. More emphasis should be placed on the potential contribution Oxfordshire's Enterprise Zones and Garden Towns can make to future economic growth</i> <i>4. There is still little reference to how the LEP is going to improve the conversion of R&D into private sector business growth</i> 	<p>We do not agree that the SEP is Oxford-centric. Harwell is mentioned 16 times throughout the document, Milton Park 6 times, Culham 13 times. Detailed investment plans and strategies sit below the SEP and contain project and programme specific references. These include the CCHTIP, SEEIP, ESIF, Innovation Strategy and Skills Strategy. We will make sure to mention Howbery Park in the Economic Assets section.</p> <p>This is a local planning matter addressed by the Growth Board and individual Local Plans. The SEP is not a land use planning tool, nor does it shape planning allocation/decisions.</p> <p>EZs are mentioned 4 times and Garden Towns 2. We will look at consolidating the text and perhaps include an Enterprise Zone as a case study.</p> <p>The detail is in the Innovation Strategy already consulted upon and will be launched prior to Christmas. Again, we have the innovation "hooks" in the plan and the specific strategies will support project delivery. It is also worth reflecting on the Business/Innovation support available through Oxfordshire Business Support already.</p>
--	--	--

	<p><i>5. In considering Oxfordshire's strengths the document should also look at sectors that are doing less well and indicate which companies are leaving the county and why</i></p> <p><i>6. The Oxfordshire economy is dominated by companies of under 20 employees. This is more pronounced than other high tech economies. However, there is no aspiration to try and redress the balance by nurturing the growth of high potential companies and high value sectors</i></p> <p><i>7. There is only passing reference to self-employment, which is one of Oxfordshire's fastest growing employment forms. Trends towards self-employment and home working needs to be analysed and an assessment made of the types of support required</i></p> <p><i>8. There is little reference to the high proportion of public sector jobs in Oxfordshire or any consideration of how this imbalance can be redressed</i></p>	<p>Again this is work being undertaken at an operational level by LA/University and LEP staff as part of our joint business support work. That is one of reasons for the Creative Cultural Heritage Tourism Investment Plan and Strategic Environmental Economic Investment Plan work streams.</p> <p>We do not agree – Cambridge is similar in its business make-up. Oxfordshire Business Support targets high growth businesses for support and along with the skills strategy supports business growth, cross sector and high growth /scale-up support. We have embryonic discussions with the Scale up Institute and Said Business school about support for Growth.</p> <p>We already support a wide range of business and start up activity. Self-employment is an important aspect of the economy and the support available through Oxfordshire Business Support, Regional and National Offers is available to all.</p> <p>This point is not valid. Oxfordshire has a large public sector due to its role as an international centre for excellence in higher education and health – an essential element of our local economy. However, jobs growth in the economy, currently tracking at over 7000 jobs per annum</p>
--	--	---

	<p>9. <i>It would be useful if more detail were provided on forecast jobs growth in the core economic growth areas of the districts, such as in Science Vale for example, and the issues and constraints faced by businesses in these particular areas</i></p> <p>10. <i>There is insufficient reference to the importance of suitable business accommodation and available land for housing. The lack of suitable business space and accommodation for key workers is often sighted by companies as a reason for choosing alternative locations elsewhere. The SEP should include actions to support the needs of growth companies</i></p> <p>11. <i>The SEP could better outline actions for encouraging the adoption of energy efficient approaches and other means of improving productivity. Our</i></p>	<p>predominantly private and cross sector. Again OBS and the national programmes are available to support this activity.</p> <p>The SEP responds to the forecast growth, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, associated economic assessment and local plan allocation process. As before we are working through the Growth Board and Executive Officer group to better understand predicted growth and impact. Forecasting of job growth will form part of the work on the Oxfordshire Strategic Infrastructure Strategy.</p> <p>We have already identified this matter in the Innovation Strategy. Again the SEP is not intended to be a delivery strategy but does set the framework within which the mapping and grow on space work is already taking place. There is also a need for the local plan development to recognise and allocate land to support this ambition. We have been very successful already in bidding for challenge fund investment to support incubation/grow on space across the county.</p> <p>The SEP sets the strategic context and delivery will be articulated in the delivery plans such as</p>
--	--	---

	<p><i>broadband roll-out for example is already well behind the performance required by business, yet this issue is given little prominence and objectives for this crucial area are weak</i></p> <p><i>12. The SEP is too narrowly focussed, failing to take into account the impact of major developments close to but outside Oxfordshire, i.e. Haddenham and Princes Risborough</i></p> <p><i>13. The map detailing Oxfordshire's growth corridors (Fig. 10) was unhelpful since it covered most of the county apart from Thame and Chinnor</i></p> <p><i>14. The continuing problems of broadband connectivity in districts has not been addressed, and this is a potentially severe impediment to small business growth and an increased level of homeworking</i></p> <p><i>15. The response rate from the business sector to the document has been</i></p>	<p>Innovation, Creative Cultural Heritage Tourism Investment Plan, Strategic Environmental Economic Investment Plan etc. The Better Broadband for Oxfordshire programme continues to roll out superfast broadband in rural areas. We can and will continue to flag the importance of this investment and need to invest in the network to create future resilience.</p> <p>The SEP focuses upon Oxfordshire and supports the local plan ambitions. As such it has not identified locations specifically outside the county. However, we do work through partnerships with other LEPs to address cross boundary issues such as infrastructure including England's Economic Heartland Alliance, Greater Thames Valley and Motorsport Valley.</p> <p>This is a county council map. We will revisit all maps and illustrations in the SEP to ensure they are all up to date.</p> <p>See response to point 11</p> <p>It is worth reflecting on the reach and</p>
--	---	---

	<p><i>extremely disappointing and, although separate additional consultation events were held involving businesses, the overall level of business participation is disappointing</i></p> <p>16. <i>A risk register should be included as an appendix to the SEP</i></p> <p>17. <i>Future educational infrastructure requirement should have been addressed in more detail; especially in connection with how this infrastructure can support the job market and future skills agenda</i></p> <p>18. <i>The Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy is not due to be produced until the spring of 20-17, whereas members of our scrutiny committee questioned whether a robust SEP could be produced without a critical underpinning strategy</i></p> <p>19. <i>The SEP should include proposals for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Converting R&D to technology readiness and manufacturing</i> 	<p>engagement with business representative organisations (over 4000 businesses consulted) including stakeholder engagement as distinct from the number of written submissions received. We continue to work with representative groups and engagement through Board sub-groups. We will articulate this in the Delivery section of the final SEP.</p> <p>We agree and we will include a Risk Register.</p> <p>Whilst the SEP makes clear the need for and approach needed to support growth, it is not the document within which we develop the specific response. This is addressed both in the Skills Strategy refresh and also the emerging Infrastructure Strategy being led through the growth board and feeds into the Local Growth Fund challenge fund bids both capital and revenue.</p> <p>The SEP sets the strategic direction and supports the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Local Plan ambitions, the strategy will inform future iterations of the plan and will along with the suite of the investment plans and strategies feed into the SEP going forward.</p> <p>These are valid points but not for the SEP to address in any detail, we have a strong suite of</p>
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Altering the balance between micro-businesses and medium/large enterprises</i> - <i>Undertaking a review of funds and support for high growth businesses, in order to harness scarce resources as effectively as possible</i> - <i>Developing an Oxfordshire-wide strategy for schools and further education to better support the local economy</i> - <i>Integrating skills and business development programmes to improve the coherence of the Oxfordshire offer to business</i> 	<p>investment plans and strategies which address some of the issues raised and others such as the alignment of skills and business support very much part of the work we are currently undertaking across the LEP family. The Innovation Strategy and work we are doing on Business Growth/Scale-up through Oxfordshire Business Support will support many of the issues raised here. The SEP again is not an implementation plan - it is a strategy within which we develop investment plans and strategies that respond to Oxfordshire's need.</p>
<p>Vale of the White Horse DC – 7 October 2016</p>	<p>As for SODC above.</p>	
<p>South Oxfordshire DC Full Council – 13 October 2016</p>	<p>The following points were raised during the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The map detailing Oxfordshire's growth corridors (Figure 10) was unhelpful since it covered most of the county apart from Thame and Chinnor. • The plan is housing led with aspirational employment figures. • Development would impact on the countryside and threaten the green spaces between the villages and larger towns particularly around Didcot. • The plan should focus more on supporting self-employment. • The continuing problems of broadband connectivity had not been addressed. • The increase in house building without a commitment to renewable energy/zero emissions will increase carbon emissions and prove 	<p>We have addressed these points above.</p>

	<p>unsustainable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A risk register should be included as an appendix to the SEP. • Oxford City Council continued to allocate land for employment whilst failing to provide housing which compounds the current housing shortage and transport problems. • Affordable housing/social housing – there was a lack of suitable accommodation for key workers and those on lower incomes. • Infrastructure – the document should address the infrastructure problems (particularly transport connectivity). <p>A number of councillors remained sceptical that the SEP had a plan to address weaknesses and respond to threats and was not sufficiently strategic or visionary. It remained inward looking and provided an Oxford-centric perspective rather than addressing county-wide issues.</p> <p>RESOLVED: to endorse the decision of Cabinet to:</p> <p>(i) welcome some of the changes made to the Oxfordshire Strategic Economic Plan which seek to make it “shorter and clearer”, and acknowledge that this has largely been achieved;</p> <p>(ii) support the broad thrust of the Oxfordshire Strategic Economic Plan document in terms of the stated vision, identified strengths weaknesses, opportunities and threats, and proposed actions; and</p> <p>(iii) believe the document would be more robust if it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more fully addressed the issues highlighted in the body of the Cabinet report, and • more clearly linked actions to identified issues, and confirmed where responsibility lies for implementing these various actions, <p>and to note that the Leader will take account of points raised at Council in responding to the consultation.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>West Oxfordshire DC – 19 October 2016</p>	<p>The Cabinet ENDORSED the revised SEP in principle subject to OxLEP further revising the SEP in order to address the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to identify Carterton as a priority area for economic regeneration and environmental enhancement; and • The potential of the strategic development areas which will help meet Oxford's unmet housing need to act as innovation districts for business growth, the West Oxfordshire Garden Village proposal is considered to have significant potential in this regard to deliver a significant campus style science/business park linked by extensive green infrastructure framework to a new high quality living environment. 	<p>We thank West Oxfordshire District Council for their considered response.</p> <p>We will include a reference to WODCs plans for Carterton.</p> <p>We will include a reference to the Eynsham Garden Village proposal and its potential to meet Oxford's unmet housing needs.</p>
<p>SODC/Vale Joint Scrutiny Committee - 31 October 2016</p>	<p>Questions from Members and the public to Nigel Tipple (OxLEP CEO) and Dawn Pettis (OxLEP Strategy Manager)</p> <p>Should they not take account of development in the parts of Buckinghamshire adjacent to Oxfordshire in terms of housing and employment?</p>	<p>This is a planning matter for the local authorities to approach through the preparation of Local Plans. We already work across wider geographic areas such as our role as a partner in the England's Economic Heartland (EEH) Strategic Transport Forum which seeks to realise the full potential for economic growth of this area that covers Oxfordshire, Northamptonshire, Buckinghamshire, Milton Keynes, Bedford, Central Bedfordshire, Luton, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and involves the local authorities</p>

	<p>Since there will be little further transport improvement for getting into Oxford once the Marylebone line opens, should there not be a limit on extra jobs in Oxford City in line with housing availability?</p> <p>Everyone pretty much agrees there are two main constraints to economic growth in Oxfordshire. The shortage of decent housing that working people can afford to buy or rent limits companies' ability to recruit and puts them off locating here. The congestion on our roads has brought them to over-capacity, which both deters companies from relocating here and harms existing businesses by making it hard for goods and staff to get to where they need to be. What is there in your plans that address each of these major constraints?</p>	<p>and LEP's. See http://www.englandseconomicheartland.com</p> <p>We are also an active member of the Greater Thames Valley (GTV7) collaboration which covers Buckinghamshire, Berkshire, Enterprise M3, Coast2Capital, Solent, South East LEP, and Hertfordshire. We also collaborate across the SE Midlands and Leicestershire/Coventry through the Motorsport Valley Partnership.</p> <p>This is a matter for all of us including the local planning authorities. OxLEP continues to seek Local Growth Funding for transport improvements across Oxfordshire. Our track record to date demonstrates that we have, and continue to be, successful in securing funding for infrastructure which to date exceeds £400m across all funds, excluding Garden Towns and Enterprise Zones.</p> <p>The SEP recognises the two key constraints to economic growth – lack of housing that is affordable and congestion on our roads. As mentioned above we continue to seek funding for transport improvements. We also encourage new technologies that could transform the way we travel in the long term, i.e. driverless cars, and support programmes such as the Science Transit Strategy, and the Smart Oxford Strategy. In our</p>
--	--	---

	<p>What are your thoughts about the low response rate to your refresh consultation, particularly with businesses (I understand only 2 responded)? How do you interpret this? How does it suggest to you what might be better done differently?</p> <p>It's good practice to have SMART goals: objectives that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timely. How do you monitor and publish your performance against your goals? Where can the public see how you've done compared to how you aimed to do? How will you (and we) know whether you've been successful?</p> <p>Our councils have given you feedback about how we think the SEP could be</p>	<p>Local Growth Fund 3 submission we outlined plans for accelerating housing delivery, to be delivered through the Growth Board. Graven Hill is a prime example of a local project that seeks to address housing need.</p> <p>We recognise the need for, and do, engage widely with business. We have established and new sub-groups which report to the OxLEP Board, including business support, inward investment, transport, Visitor Economy, Environment. Businesses are engaged in these sub-groups, are active and work with the Business Representative Organisations networks to extend the reach to over 4,500 businesses. We continue to raise awareness of our work via Oxfordshire Business Support briefings, intermediary activity and events such as Venturefest, Oxfordshire Business Awards, Cherwell Business Awards and the West Oxfordshire Business Awards.</p> <p>We are preparing and publishing a SEP Monitoring and Impact Framework which forms part of our overall government and board reporting. This will be integrated into our quarterly operating plan in early 2017 and outcomes reported in our annual report.</p> <p>See above</p>
--	---	--

	<p>improved. What is OxLEP's response to the most recent feedback you had from South and Vale councils?</p> <p>How does the various strategy development documents (OxLEP SEP, Oxford City Deal, Oxford growth deal) that have been written over the past few years actually affect the development of individual plots in the region. I have noticed that recent planning applications to sites in and around North Hinksey make no reference to any of these apparently important documents and arguably the developments that have been signed off pay little regard to them. Taking the Oxford city deal as an example, the knowledge spine that is referenced in the document extends from Bicester in the north to Didcot in the south including Oxford and follows the A34. One would imagine that North Hinksey sitting right in the middle of the development zone should be heavily influenced by it</p> <p>If the developer, planning officers and planning authority are not obliged to consider applications with these documents in mind, why do we spend the sums of money we do on them - Is it worth having OxLEP at all?</p> <p>How does OxLEP plan to deliver the ambitions laid out in the refreshed SEP? Whilst I am sure they can raise the money to deliver the goals, I wonder whether we have the capacity to deliver across the county. For example, the SEP seems to suggest</p>	<p>The SEP is not a statutory planning document. It, and its underlying investment plans and strategies, are tools for partners to use in seeking funding for projects and programmes. For example, the Local Growth Fund 3 submission is based on the ambitions set out in the SEP, whilst the Skills Strategy sets out in detail our work on ensuring local employers have access to the right skills.</p> <p>It would depend on the size of the development. We are currently working with the local planning authorities to include a policy in Local Plans that will require a developer to prepare or pay for a Community Employment Plan (CEP) on housing sites of 1,000 or more new homes, or on employment sites of more than 4,000sqm. This is to ensure that local residents are provided with training, apprenticeship and job opportunities related to the development. For example, we have a CEP in place for the Westgate Centre currently under construction.</p> <p>Each local authority has, or is, preparing Local Plans that will identify sites for the number of new homes required as set out in the Strategic</p>
--	---	--

	<p>that our housing deliveries over the next few years need to be 5000 units a year yet the SEP also seems to suggest that we have not delivered more than about 2500 homes at any point of the past 5 years. A 10% increase I could believe but doubling the delivery rate would seem an insurmountable challenge.</p> <p>How does OxLEP engage with local communities? There are a huge range of talents in communities waiting to be tapped and should be very influential in these strategic documents. I see little evidence of change resulting from community involvement. How does OxLEP engage with communities? I am the Chairman of the working group looking at employment and the economy as part of the North Hinksey Neighbourhood Plan but I have no contact with OxLEP. We in North Hinksey are keen to engage with OxLEP if there is some value in doing so - can we arrange a meeting?</p>	<p>Housing Market Assessment. Delivery will depend on global and national economic circumstances. As stated above and outlined more thoroughly in the SEP, there are local solutions being considered to increase housing delivery in the county.</p> <p>During the SEP consultation in April/May we engaged with all parish and town councils in Oxfordshire, of which there are more than 300. 12 responded to the consultation in writing. Staff from our Oxfordshire Apprenticeship service regularly visits schools across the county. We aim to further raise awareness of our work through the sub-groups mentioned above and through our work on Community Employment Plans and via Oxfordshire Business Support.</p> <p>We would be happy to engage in the Neighbourhood Plan process and will continue to feed into the process through and with the Growth Board.</p> <p>We will be preparing a short summary of the SEP which we will distribute to all parish and town councils.</p>
--	---	---

