



Headington neighbourhood plan

FORUM MEETING

Report of the Forum Meeting held at Oxford Brookes University, JHB
202 on Monday 27 April 2015 at 7.30pm

Email – info@HeadingtonPlan.org.uk Web - HeadingtonPlan.org.uk/

Facebook – [HeadingtonPlan](https://www.facebook.com/HeadingtonPlan) Twitter - [@HeadingtonPlan](https://twitter.com/HeadingtonPlan)

Steering Committee present (SC) 8

Mike Ratcliffe (Chair) MR, Adam Symons (Project Manager), Patrick Coulter (Vice Chair) PC, Liz Grosvenor (Secretary), Fiona McKenzie FM, John Nealon JN, Cllr Roz Smith, Cllr Ruth Wilkinson,

Forum members present: 14

Heather Armitage, Richard Bradley RB, Chris Furness, Robin Gill, Mary Hope, Jill James, James Kelly, Tony Joyce, David Knight, Lesley Mallinder, Tony Turton, Marie Vickers, Judy Webb, Charles Young CY

Interested parties present: 10

Michael Crofton Briggs, Mary Gill, Anne Harrap, Ross Hitchcock, Hannah Jones, Sylvia Lymbery, Paul Rogers, Howard Stanbury, Cllr Dee Sinclair, Terry Wood,

Total: 32

Apologies: 16

Sheila Allcock, Rosemary Belton, Sue Bennett, Jan Clark, Paul Cross, Roy Darke, Chris Glover, Paul Goffin, Simon Hunt, , Hilary Rollin, Nicholas Rollin, Glynis Phillips, Derek Sherwood, Andrea Siret, Stella Welford, Veronica Hurst

1.	Confirmation of membership and Apologies	Action
	MR introduced himself, and welcomed participants to the Forum. He explained that the purpose of the meeting was to encourage discussion about the draft policies produced so far before it ultimately goes out to a Headington-wide consultation. The plan will be “owned” by the Forum but worked up by the Policy Working Groups (PWG)	
2.	The Minutes of the last meeting held on 10 February - were confirmed.	
3.	Matters Arising – none	

<p>4.</p>	<p>Workshop Review of the First Draft Plan Policies</p> <p>MR explained that the Plan was derived from many documents produced by the City Council with the items pertaining to Headington extracted for further scrutiny.</p> <p>Six PWGs were formed: Transport, Business, Amenities & Green Spaces, Education, Housing, and Character & Identity (CANDI).</p> <p>There are plans to develop Community Cohesion and Planning into further groups.</p> <p>The Draft Plan consists of a set of policies relating to planning issues – these are coded P The second set of policies, not pertaining to land use/spatial planning are community policies – these are coded C.</p> <p>There will be a further classification (not in this draft plan yet) which will be projects – these will be seen as “wish lists”.</p> <p>Loosely speaking, there are c. 18,000 Headington Residents, c. 18,000 people who work here, and c. 18,000 students, and these will all be consulted on the Plan in due course.</p> <p>The meeting then divided into 6 PWG tables for discussion of the draft plan, and attendees were encouraged to move around the tables to sample all the subjects.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Feedback on workshop discussions</p> <p>Each PWG chair gave a summary of what had been discussed at the tables.</p> <p>Education MR</p> <p>In addition to the policy already outlined, the subject of transport to schools, and housing families near schools will be addressed. The Plan will not specify the types of educational establishments we would welcome, but the stress will be on providing education for people who live here. More policies will be built around these issues.</p> <p>CANDI RB</p> <p>20 areas have been assessed and the results are on the website at http://headingtonplan.org.uk/index.php/plan/policy-groups/identity/. Policies and projects will be derived from these assessments to include the listing of important assets, development sites, important views to be preserved, and possibly height of buildings.</p> <p>Housing JN</p> <p>The Policies were evolved within the parameters of the copious existing housing policies of the City Council. Plans are underway to contact the Hospital Trusts regarding the provision of key-worker housing. Identifying empty and potential sites is all very well, but what can the Neighbourhood Forum or the Council do to encourage them to be used for housing?</p> <p>Amenities & Green Spaces PC</p> <p>The Policies that emerged were very popular but how do you implement them and translate them into reality. The community ideas would need to be funded and delivered. How do we go about this?</p> <p>Business FM</p> <p>The business policies were derived from focus groups with the local retail businesses. It was suggested that this should be broadened to include employment issues and the role of</p>	

	<p>institutions in future employment. Local businesses were keen to encourage the Farmers' Market.</p> <p>Transport CY</p> <p>Some of the planning policies were deemed to be too sweeping and should have been specified within certain parameters. The TRC5 item on buses was found to be unpopular.</p>	
6.	<p>Summing up and next steps</p> <p>The feedback from the workshop will be incorporated into the next stage of the draft plan. The attendees were encouraged to look at the CANDI assessments now on the website, as they each refer to elements in the other PWGs.</p> <p>Further comments from the floor included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing was mentioned about design or site allocations (this will be addressed by the new planning section) • Speculative buying-up of sites for development (eg Latimer Road) needs to be mentioned. This should include the Old Telephone Exchange and the area around the back of the charity shops and estate agents, accessed from Windmill Road. • The subject of empty rooms in HMOs being let out for short term lets was mentioned – apparently the City Council are monitoring this, together with “beds in sheds”. • Height of buildings was not addressed – <i>it was mentioned under CANDI above.</i> • We need to warn that we should avoid a plan which would have the effect of excluding those who could not now afford to live here. 	
	<p>The meeting ended at 9.30pm</p>	

Liz Grosvenor 28 April 2015