



Headington neighbourhood plan

FORUM ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Report of the Forum Meeting held in the Green Room, Headington Hill Hall
on Wednesday 2 October 2015 at 7.00pm

Email – info@HeadingtonPlan.org.uk Web - HeadingtonPlan.org.uk/
Facebook – [HeadingtonPlan](https://www.facebook.com/HeadingtonPlan) Twitter - [@HeadingtonPlan](https://twitter.com/HeadingtonPlan)

Steering Group present (SG) 9

Mike Ratcliffe (Chair) MR, Patrick Coulter PC (Vice Chair), Liz Grosvenor LG (Secretary), Veronica Hurst VH, Fiona McKenzie FM, John Nealon JN (Press & Communications), Nicholas Rollin NR, Cllr Roz Smith RS, Ruth Wilkinson RW

Forum members present: 9

Heather Armitage, Andrew Colleran, Cicely Havely, Jill James, Peter McCarter Jennifer Pegg, Glynis Philips, Christopher Taylor, Charles Young

Interested parties present: 12

D. Albiston, Sue Brownill, Bernard & Jenny Dagnall, Cllr. Alex Hollingsworth, Simon Hunt, Paul Rogers, Hilary Rollin, H Sheahan, Howard Stanbury, Colin & Hazel Taylor

Apologies:

Adam Symons (Project Manager), Richard Bradley, Jan Clark, Paul Goffin, Mary Hope James Kelly, Dee Sinclair, Stella Welford, Ian Wilson

Total: 30

1.	Introduction and Apologies	Action
	MR introduced himself, welcomed participants to the AGM, and apologies were read.	

	<p>Aims of the meeting</p> <p>To carry out the official business of an AGM, and to prepare the Forum for the final draft which will be circulated next week. The Forum members will be given two weeks to respond with their comments.</p> <p>We will amend the draft accordingly, and ask the meeting for delegated authority to continue without further reference unless there are significant changes which would require further consultation.</p> <p>Each of the Policy Working Group (PWG) chairs will explain the changes made to their original proposals following the consultations at The Hub, and elsewhere, over the summer, and changes made as a consequence of the Planning Consultant's advice.</p> <p>Finally we will explain the next steps that we are statutorily required to follow.</p>	
3.	<p>Minutes of last meetings</p> <p>The minutes of the last AGM/Forum meeting (1 October 2014) and the Minutes of the last Forum Meeting (27 April 2015) were agreed.</p>	
	<p>The AGM</p>	
4.	<p>Election of Steering Committee</p> <p>Officers and Members were proposed, seconded, and duly elected as follows, P Coulter presiding over the election of the Chair:</p> <p>Mike Ratcliffe (Chair) proposed by NR and seconded by VH Patrick Coulter (Vice Chair) proposed by VH and seconded by NR John Nealon (Press/Communications Officer) proposed by RW and seconded by VH Fiona McKenzie (Treasurer) proposed by PC and seconded by NR Liz Grosvenor (Secretary) proposed by PC and seconded by VH</p> <p>And members of the committee proposed and seconded <i>en masse</i></p> <p>Veronica Hurst Nicholas Rollin Roz Smith Ruth Wilkinson Ian Wilson</p>	
5.	<p>Report of the Treasurer</p> <p>Copies of the Income & Expenditure were circulated and explained, pointing out the two main sources of income from the Department for Communications & Local Government £7,716 and Headington Action, who were thanked for their generous contribution of £6,163.</p> <p>On the expenditure side it was explained that the appointment of a Project Manager (Adam Symons) was a vital element in the production of the Plan and he was thanked for driving the whole scheme.</p> <p>Brookes University were warmly thanked for providing room-hire totally free of charge, such that the bulk of our room hire expenditure was for The Hub for our 6 consecutive Saturday consultations in the summer.</p> <p>With total expenditure amounting to £8,568, we ended up with a surplus to date of ££5,311, some of which has been/will be allocated before the end of our financial year.</p> <p>The Accounts were approved by the meeting.</p>	

The Forum Meeting	
<p>The Chair explained that The Draft Plan was not yet complete as acceptance was required by this Forum to the changes made as a result of recent consultations.</p> <p>The bulk of the comments came from our Hub presence, but we received comments from the institutions, and some online through our website.</p> <p>The appointment of a professional Planning Consultant enabled us to present the draft plan in a format and with wording that would be acceptable to the City Council. All comments will be positive, not negative (for example, “we will retain trees” rather than “we will not cut down trees”). The NP needs to be in general conformity with the Strategic elements of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The City Council are being consulted along the way, and after our submission to them it will go out to another statutory consultation before being re-submitted.</p> <p>The referendum questions will be made very clear and without ambiguity.</p> <p>We seek delegated authority for any further changes unless there are substantial changes required to necessitate another meeting.</p>	
<p>The chairs of the PWGs then explained some of their alterations which will be seen in the draft being sent out shortly.</p>	
<p>1. Amenities & Green Spaces</p> <p>PC thanked the members of his group for all their hard work, and outlined some of their work. He mentioned that the Character Assessments (CA) had been a vital element in their deliberations, with green spaces the most important topic brought up in the consultations, and that the City had designated us as an Urban Village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals regarding the green space requirement on developments of 10 houses or more are being increased from 10% to 15%. • The group do not agree that a developer can build on green space if alternative green space can be provided somewhere else – somewhere else is losing out. • The CAs valued the Headington views, but this is not in the Local Plan, so it will be mentioned. • Nature conservancy areas require more protection. • The group do not consider that development which removes publicly accessible green space in Headington can be classed as sustainable development. <p>Some comments (and responses) from the floor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 20,000 workers in Headington, and 13,000 adults live here (including about 5,000 who both live and work here). While the interests of the two groups often overlap, they sometimes conflict: for example many of those who work here would like to, but cannot, live here, while those who commute would like cycle lanes and bus routes that may not be to the liking of residents. • One of the largest conflicts is that of green spaces and housing – how do we balance the loss of green spaces and housing? • Workers not living in Headington are disenfranchised from the Plan – we have no control over this as voters need to be on the electoral roll. • The recent “Access to Headington” consultation by the County Council advocated the removal of verges and trees to facilitate traffic access – we have responded to this. 	
<p>2. Housing</p> <p>JN explained that the 16 Housing Policies of the City Council do address green spaces,</p>	

<p>and also density and the balance of housing. These policies have to be adhered to. The consultation brought up the problems of lack of housing, and the cost. Mark Fransham's recent statistics from the City Council show that the cost of renting in shared houses is second highest in the whole country after London. There were concerns about Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) but these are not always students – they can equally be young professionals. (An HMO is a dwelling where 3 or more unrelated people live).</p> <p>There was concern about the lack of key worker housing. Since 2008 all developments have to be 50% affordable (there is a proviso for 40% in some cases), and a development cannot be for 100% key workers.</p> <p>There is a tension between Transport and Housing. London Road and Old Road are the main access roads into work and they experience the worst congestion and pollution. Ideally, 25% to 35% of housing in Headington should be 3 bedroom houses, and any such house replaced by a new development of flats has to be replaced somewhere else. The average size of houses in Headington is, in fact, relatively large.</p> <p>Comments (and responses) from the floor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More flats should be built for elderly people downsizing. There is a current consultation on the aged population and this will be looked at. • Sheltered housing was not included in the policies as there is nothing in the City Housing policies about this. • There is little room for manoeuvre on housing as the City policies are very comprehensive. • The balance of housing, as counted by the Council, covers the whole of Oxford. Whilst this cannot be challenged, perhaps we could suggest a zonal policy as Headington differs in kind from many parts of Oxford. Our area will also be skewed by the new Barton Park development. • The hospitals are treated as special sites – they can build for their own use but the 50% still applies. 	<p>JN</p>
<p>3. Business & Retail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NR explained that they want to encourage the setting up of a Business Association. • A 3rd major policy deals with the requirement to enhance and co-ordinate the frontages of the central shopping properties. <p>During the meeting a questionnaire was circulated ranking some new ideas including the balance of shops.</p> <p>The city are looking at a proposal to demand that 65% of the shops should be true retail. Some Community policies are being considered.</p>	<p>NR/FM</p>
<p>4. Character & Identity</p> <p>Cicely Havelly gave a presentation on behalf of the Policy Working group on Character and Identity. The key points were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since the beginning of the exercise there have been a number of changes in the areas. • Some consultations asked that small decorative features should be added, but it was felt that to do this for all areas would make the document unwieldy. • As there were many shared concerns, an Executive Summary was added • In all areas there are some good elements, but also some bad – for example, it is good to have world-leading hospitals here, but bad because of the traffic it generates 	

<p>and the detrimental effect on local residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shops are good but traffic and parking to get to them is bad. • There were adverse comments about garden maintenance in HMOs, and the paving over of front gardens to facilitate parking which also affects drainage • A new proposal is to reinforce the identity of Headington – we are checking with the council as to where this could fit into the plan. • In any other part of the country Headington would be seen as a very attractive place, but within Oxford we are competing with the grandeur and open spaces of the University. <p>It was pointed out that as the plan has reached a significant stage it can be quoted in planning applications.</p>	<p>CA group</p>
<p>5. Education</p> <p>MR reiterated the desire to have any new schooling for local children i.e. not international language schools. It would have been nice to comment on the enhancement of educational attainment but this falls outside the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan,</p> <p>Comment from the floor: There is pressure on nursery places. There is a synergy between Green Spaces and Education where, in the spirit of goodwill, independent schools allow state schools to use their facilities, but this is not something that can go into the plan. It could be a community project.</p>	
<p>6. Transport</p> <p>Charles Young gave a presentation on behalf of the Policy Working group on Transport. The key points were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal to remove London buses from Headington has been shelved following opposition at the consultation stage. • A proposal to specify that no more parking provision should be made until the ratio of annual average weekday traffic to the “congestion reference flow” is reduced to 85% on all through routes. Currently this is 102% on Old Road and 92% on London Road • The proposal to allow space for car club cars in multiple housing developments has been supplemented with evidence showing the number of private cars removed by each shared car. Estimates range from 5 to 13. • Connectedness of pathways where practicable to link pedestrian and cycle ways will be suggested. • There are no changes to the travel plan proposals. • The proposal requiring provision of cycle racks in new developments has been made more flexible. • During our deliberations the Access to Headington consultation emerged. We responded along the lines that such a consultation should be generated from the locality rather than from the City. • We are encouraging the institutions to look at minibus provision to get their staff to work. • There is a need to consult with the Bus Companies regarding the under-use on some services – the flouting of regulations regarding the use of Churchill Drive was cited. 	<p>CY</p>

7.	<p>General queries</p> <p>Q. Where is the hydrology and flooding going to be addressed?</p> <p>A. There will be an overall planning section which will cover this, likewise for air quality.</p>	
	<p>The meeting agreed that we could have delegated authority to continue without further reference unless there are significant changes which would require further consultation **</p> <p>The next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft plan will be circulated to all Forum members (175), and Interested Parties (128) by email, and post where we do not have an email address. • The deadline for responses will be 2 weeks later – the actual date will be specified. • If the comments received require further consultation and approval then this will be arranged ** • The plan will go to the City for consultation. • The plan will come back to us for statutory local consultation. • Depending on the timetable of the City Council the referendum may not take place until Autumn 2016. • There will be ongoing consultations with the City. • New ideas can still be introduced. • Schools and Oxford Brookes will be contacted for further consultation 	
8.	The meeting ended at 9.05pm	

Liz Grosvenor 3.10.2015

The Constitution is available on the HNF website <http://headingtonplan.org.uk/index.php/forum/constitution/>

The Character Assessments can be found at <http://headingtonplan.org.uk/index.php/plan/policy-groups/identity/character-assessments/>