

<p>PRESENT: Gillian Argyle, Clive Booth, Chris Church, Gillian Coates, Richard Dodd, Ian Green (Chairman), Liz Grosvenor, Sarah Hendriks Tony Joyce (AMJ), Penelope Lenon, Margaret Maden, Vernon Porter, Peter Thompson. By invitation: Hilary Bradley</p>		
1.	On the eve of the 3 rd national lockdown, the Chairman wished everyone a happy and healthy 2021 as the Society embarks on an ambitious programme.	
2.	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Louise Thomas	
3.	MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING The minutes of the meeting on Tuesday 1 December were AGREED to be a correct record and signed by the Chairman.	
4.	MATTERS ARISING	Action by
4.1	<p>Membership Recruitment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LG reported that at end-December we had 450 memberships, representing 777 <u>individuals</u>. As of 4 January, 419 subscriptions had been received - 106 by Direct Debit were in the pipeline, 73 people had changed their Standing Orders correctly and 9 people had paid both a SO and a DD having forgotten to cancel the former. This amounts to 188 correct payments. 231 had been paid at the incorrect rate and the members would need to be contacted. She proposed to do this in small batches over lockdown; the Treasurer was very much hoping to avoid having to handle 231 cheques. She further observed that a number of subscribers had changed from joint to single membership. IG encouraged LG to ask for help with this laborious task. RD noted that the budget assumes only 75% of the maximum possible subscription income will be received, so there is headroom. • Existing <u>corporate</u> members would continue to pay the old rate. We aim to increase such membership over 2021 and new corporates would pay the new rate. • Nothing to report on <u>sponsorship</u> or from <u>the colleges</u>. 	<p>ALL</p> <p>LG</p>

5.	PROGRESS REPORT	
5.1	<p>IG drew particular attention to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Futures Group’s response to the Oxfordshire Growth Board’s Strategic Vision, whose methodology lacked sense and left little scope for constructive criticism. Bev Hindle’s promotion to the directorship of the Arc was a loss to the OGB; we should get to know his newly-appointed successor as soon as possible. • A meeting with the Oxford Design Review Panel had also been unimpressive. Significant weaknesses need to be addressed, notably the monitoring of impact. <p>VP suggested that we should seek to interest the press in our concerns about the shortcomings of both the ODRP and the OGB’s Strategic Vision. IG would discuss this further with PL, possibly linking it with the pre-publicity for the March seminars (see 6.1 below).</p>	<p>Futures Group</p> <p>IG/PL</p>
5.2	<p>HB and the Communications Group were to be congratulated on the shop window display which looks very professional. It was also welcome news that Roger Grosvenor had taken on the role of photo archivist.</p>	
5.3	<p>Encouraging progress had been made at a meeting with Ian Hudspeth and Yvonne Constance on the future of Broad Street without carparking. We are working closely with the Preservation Trust, where Debbie Dance is cautious about doing too much too quickly: we need to avoid public opposition such as that encountered by the bus gates proposal. IG also will be liaising with Hayley Beer-Gamage of Experience Oxfordshire, as well as with Mary Clarkson and Tom Bridgman of the City Council who continue to work on the City Centre Vision. The plans will also have to fit with the <i>Connecting Oxford</i> proposals.</p> <p>We now need to generate ideas for future use of the space: HB had already proposed a flower festival; GC proposed a walled garden area with seating. VP suggested that some of the Keith Holly legacy might be used to help generate ideas.</p>	
5.4	<p>MM was concerned at the absence of strategic information on student numbers in the Planning Group’s note about Oxford Brookes’s proposed redevelopment of its Clive Booth residential accommodation and the conversation with David Prout reported by the Transport Group. AMJ observed that various planning applications were coming through piecemeal. Prospective growth in numbers and kinds of student (graduates tending to need greater space than undergraduates) was an issue OCS should be tracking, and MM would gladly look into it further if the data were available. GC suggested looking at the development plans published by both universities.</p> <p>IG noted that David Prout had said both that increases in OU’s numbers would be driven by available accommodation, but also that OU’s priority to maintain its position as a world class university would override OCS’s</p>	

	<p>concerns. Further, OU is the county's largest employer, and its development is of broad significance.</p> <p>CB would raise the issue in a meeting with OBU later that day, but noted that the university already has 600 fewer students than it had 5 years ago. CC asked that he also seek information about plans for the Harcourt Hill site, which OBU is planning to vacate.</p>	CB
6	EXECUTIVE BUSINESS	
6.1	<p>Draft Budget 2021</p> <p>Although the budget envisages breakeven over the year, RD cautioned that it contains a number of highly speculative elements, including the <u>income</u> forecast where there is considerable uncertainty about individual subscription renewals. He had further not appreciated that existing corporate subscriptions would remain unchanged.</p> <p>On <u>expenditure</u>, he envisaged no change in the cost of the newsletter, but the publications budget had risen to include posters for the major webinar events. Visits and walks were expected to break even, but the Programme Group were seeking £3,900, a greater total than previously, to cover 15 speakers' fees plus 7 possible venue hires in the latter part of the year: RD had not had time to explore this fully. The budget for special projects was also speculative, as is the estimate for spending on shop window displays. He expected the Keith Holly legacy to be spent within the year.</p> <p>IG stressed the importance of linking the budget to the Society's statement of aims and values, and to strengthening our work on liaison and cooperation with other organisations in particular, The <u>Vice Presidents' Group</u> has met three times to work on this, and has generated several ideas; work continues on the practicalities. None of the possible initiatives has major cash implications, but they will make significant demands on our human resources. One starting point is to consider how OCS might support the city's work on inclusivity, where the Oxford Strategic Partnership has published a well-researched paper which makes a number of recommendations.</p> <p>IG also drew attention to the planned <u>2 x half-day online seminars</u> aiming to draw together thinking on planning, transport, housing and climate change. No decision has been taken about whether to charge participants (and if so, how much); some speakers may require payment. He also hoped it would be possible to resurrect the planned <u>tourism debate</u>, which might be a ticketed event.</p> <p>GC undertook to explore the Programme Group's bid in more detail, and to discuss synchronising talks with the seminars and debate.</p> <p><u>OxClean</u> is not included because Natasha Robinson has been too busy to submit a bid. It is unclear what will be permissible this year: the usual Spring Clean looks unlikely to happen. The Committee welcomed the idea of a big clean-up once vaccination makes a return to normal life possible. Although supplies of litter-pickers and hi-vis jackets are thought to be adequate, it was AGREED the budget should include £500 contingency funds.</p> <p>It was further AGREED that, although the Executive and the Groups have adapted well to online meetings, some face-to-face meetings should</p>	GC

	<p>resume when possible, and the budget should allow for <u>room hire</u> where necessary.</p> <p>IG thanked RD for all his work. RD will present a final budget at the next meeting, along with the 2020 accounts.</p>	RD
6.2	<p>Trustee and active member recruitment</p> <p>There are currently 3 trustee vacancies, and we also need more volunteers to help with proposed projects. In particular, MM felt that the Vice Presidents' project in East Oxford would need a proper project manager.</p> <p>IG wondered whether there should be a designated trustee to lead on each of the Society's four main aims, possibly also with a Vice President in support. The Futures, Planning and Transport Groups are quite successful where <u>influencing</u> is concerned, and the Communications Group works well on <u>informing</u>, but we are less successful on <u>liaison/cooperation</u> with other organisations, and weak on <u>learning</u> from other cities and countries.</p> <p>AMJ described the Museum of Oxford's trustees' successful recruitment of two much younger people (one an intern), who had brought interesting new perspectives. In response to a suggestion from GC, SH said she would be willing to work as part of a group seeking to increase links with younger people.</p> <p>IG undertook to contact Sarah Fernandez at the Oxford Hub whose remit is to bring together volunteers and organisations, and who run a trainee scheme for trustees.</p> <p>Oxford's twinning links might usefully be exploited to strengthen our leaning from other cities. CC recalled the event that had been cancelled in the spring and suggested contacting the City Council about reviving it.</p>	
7.	OTHER BUSINESS	
7.1	HB will shortly be seeking contributions for both the <i>2020 Annual Review</i> and the next edition of <i>Visions</i> .	Groups
7.2	We need to strengthen our relationships with the local press in order to maximise interest in our forthcoming events and projects. Normally this would be done socially, perhaps over lunch, but a Zoom meeting might offer a possible substitute. PL to explore further.	PL
8.	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>It was AGREED that the next meeting of the Committee will be held online on Tuesday 2 February 2021 at 10am to enable SH to join from Australia.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked members for their attendance and declared the Meeting CLOSED at 11.25 am.</p>	