



# Headington neighbourhood plan

Minutes of the **Steering Committee** Meeting held at  
scottfraser, Lime Walk  
on Tuesday 8 March 2016 at 7.30 pm

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

<p><b>Steering Committee present:</b> Patrick Coulter PC (Vice Chair) Liz Grosvenor LG (Admin. Support) Fiona Mckenzie FM (Treasurer) John Nealon JN (Press/Communications Officer) Cllr Ruth Wilkinson RW Ian Wilson IW</p>	<p><b>Apologies:</b> Mike Ratcliffe MR (Chair) Nicholas Rollin NR Cllr Roz Smith RS Adam Symons AS (Project Manager)</p>	
<p><b>Policy Working Groups - existing</b> <b>Business and Retail – FM &amp; NR</b> <b>Amenities &amp; Green Spaces – PC</b> <b>Education – MR</b> <b>Housing – JN</b> <b>Transport – Charles Young</b> <b>Character &amp; Identity – vacant</b></p>	<p><b>Possible new groups</b>  <b>Planning Applications</b> <b>Community Engagement</b></p>	
<p><b>1.</b></p>	<p><b>Apologies –</b> As above.</p>	<p><b>Action</b></p>
<p><b>2.</b></p>	<p><b>Minutes</b> from last steering committee meeting of 18 January were approved and are now on the website. Matters arising: 3. We are minded to keep the planning and community projects together rather than splitting them as suggested by the Council, but will check with the City that this is acceptable.  All subsequent amendments as minuted have been addressed and incorporated into the plan.</p>	<p><b>LG/JN</b>  <b>PC</b></p>
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Consultation Responses</b> We received responses from: Oxford City Council Oxfordshire County Council Historic England Environment Agency</p>	

Natural England  
Thames Water  
Highways Agency

Of these *Oxfordshire County Council* made the following observations:

**1. Draft Plan:**

*Policy AMP1: Protecting and Enhancing Sports, Leisure and Community Facilities*

**OCC Response:**

In contrast, the draft NP policy requires alternative facilities to be provided within the NP area. That may not be possible or practicable where existing facilities are located near the boundary of the NP area. The policy should be amended to reflect the Core Strategy policy text in this regard.

**Our response:**

We have in all cases kept within our area.

**2. Draft Plan**

*Policy AMCI: Enhancing Accessibility to Sports, Leisure and Community Facilities*

**OCC Response:**

It would be helpful if the words "where appropriate" could be added at the end of the policy, to ensure that where issues of, for example, child protection arise with school playing fields, there is the ability to restrict or prevent public access where appropriate to do so.

**Our response:**

We don't think that this adds anything helpful

**3. Draft Plan**

*BRC1: Changes to Car Parking Charges*

**OCC Response:**

If this proposal was to be implemented then the highway authority would want to be reassured that it did not lead to any additional peak period traffic on the surrounding network, particularly at the busy London Road/Windmill Road/Old High Street signal junction. This could be achieved by limiting free parking to off-peak periods only.

In addition, the need for parking charges to be set at a level that discourages or prevents commuter or long stay use needs to be emphasised.

**Our response:**

We will add that this applies to off-peak times only.  
(Parking charge levels are not within our remit).

**4. Draft Plan**

*CIC1: Reinforce the Identity of Headington*

**OCC Response:**

One of the examples given in the NP is 'signage style' and whether there should a distinctive style for Headington signs. **Road signs** are specifically

AS

<p>mentioned. It is not clear if this relates to street nameplates or traffic signs (e.g. signs for road side orders, speed limits, directions etc.), so for the avoidance of doubt, a policy to introduce alternative styles for traffic signs in the NP area would not be supported.</p> <p>Not only would this be costly it is also unlikely to be approved by the Department for Transport who are responsible for traffic sign standards and regulations.</p> <p><b>Our response:</b> Our intention was to mean <b>street name</b> signs.</p> <p><b>5. Draft Plan:</b> <i>Policy EDPI: New Education Provision</i> <b>OCC Response:</b> As drafted, this policy does not refer to permitted development rights for change of use to educational establishments. It would be helpful if the policy could be amended to refer to the extant <b>permitted development rights</b> in classes S, T and U of the 2015 General Permitted Development Order which permits the change of use of agricultural, B1 (business), C1 (hotel), C2 (residential institution), C2A (secure residential institution) and D2 (assembly &amp; leisure) uses to use as a state-funded school or a registered nursery, and back again (class U) in the case of all but the first of the uses mentioned.</p> <p><b>Our response:</b> We will emphasise the point about permitted development rights.</p> <p><b>6. Draft Plan</b> <i>Policies HGCI3</i> <b>OCC Response:</b> may be better expressed as aspirations rather than policies as they are not land use based.</p> <p><b>Our response:</b> All community policies with the heading <b>C</b> are aspirational <b>community</b> policies.</p> <p><b>7. Draft Plan</b> <i>Policy HGPI: Affordable Homes for Key Workers from Large Housing Sites Proposals for residential developments on Large Housing Sites (See definition of Large Sites – Oxford City Housing Policy HP3) in which up to 50% of the affordable housing element is available to key worker dwellings (See definition of key worker – Sites and Housing Plan 20112026, §A2.30) will be supported.</i></p> <p><b>OCC Response:</b> The government has proposed to change national planning policy so the definition of affordable housing is expanded to include wider options which support home ownership. If implemented it could make it more difficult for policy HGPI to be effective as it is likely to reduce the provision of affordable rental homes.</p> <p>We believe it would be helpful if the NP reinforced the need for sustainable drainage techniques as follows:</p>	<p>AS</p> <p>AS</p>
--	---------------------

<p>· All new buildings should be drained using sustainable techniques, (soak-aways, swales, online storage with reduced outfall to green field run off rates)</p> <p>· All new extensions to properties should also be drained by sustainable techniques to reduce flooding</p> <p><b>Our response:</b> We will add “already included within the Local Plan”</p> <p><b>8. Draft Plan</b> <i>TRP1: Parking Provision at major employment sites</i> <i>Proposals for <b>additional</b> car parking spaces at <b>major</b> employment sites in Headington will only be supported if they can demonstrate strong evidence that Headington’s road network has adequate unused capacity at peak times.</i></p> <p><b>OCC Response:</b> The Oxford Transport Strategy is clear on the need to manage car parking so the principle of this policy is supported. We do however believe that this policy could be more robust by applying it to all developments and not just those that might require additional car parking. The highway authority would also expect the developer to demonstrate that the implications of the parking provision are acceptable and whether any mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Our response:</b> We will query this with Martin Kraftl (Principal Infrastructure Planner) as to whether the query refers to <b>additional</b> or <b>major</b>. We will also clarify as to whether this parking applies to staff or customers. – i.e. which group are we wanting to restrict.</p> <p><b>9. Draft Plan</b> <i>TRP4: Travel Plans</i> <i>1. All new business developments and all new multiunit developments must develop and periodically update travel plans showing how employees and/or residents may minimise car usage.</i> <i>2. All single-unit development should state, in the design and access statement, whether car-free alternatives have been considered and, if parking provision is to be made, why the car-free alternative has been rejected.</i></p> <p><b>OCC Response:</b> While we are encouraged by this policy, we would query whether it is always necessary for all new business developments and all new multiunit developments to develop and update travel plans, depending on the size and nature of the development. The county council requires travel plans from developments which exceed the thresholds set out in ‘Transport for New Developments: Transport Assessments and Travel Plans’. The promotion of car free developments is a positive measure however, supporting measures such as CPZs may be required in some cases.</p> <p><b>Our response:</b> We wish to keep this policy as stated.</p> <p><b>10. Draft Plan</b></p>	<p>AS</p> <p>AS CY</p>
---	----------------------------

<p><i>TRP6: Promotion of Cycling and Walking</i></p> <p><i>1. Proposals for new developments comprising more than 3 dwellings should include secure bicycle storage for two bicycles per household.</i></p> <p><i>2. In shared accommodation and employment developments, the quantity should be based on the travel plan, with an allowance for a doubling of the mode share of cycling.</i></p> <p><b>OCC Response</b></p> <p>All new dwellings should provide bicycle storage. Policy HP15 of the Sites and Housing Plan adopted by the city council sets standards for cycle parking which should be followed. However, the proposed policy requires less secure cycle spaces than the Sites and Housing Plan.</p> <p>There is also no mention of the provision of secure cycle parking for visitors to public areas and commercial developments which should provide secure and covered cycle parking for both visitors and staff. Policy HP15 of the Sites and Housing Plan sets out cycle parking standards for commercial developments.</p> <p>The Plan states that '<i>Policy TRP6 aims to ensure that any new development above a certain minimum size plays its part in this objective</i>', however there is a lack of clarity over the minimum size of developments that this policy should apply to.</p> <p><i>Other comments:</i></p> <p>We would like to see the NP outline that any new developments should not obstruct the delivery of the Oxford Transport Strategy, with reference to rapid transit, walking and cycling improvements in particular.</p> <p>A policy could be included within the NP on residential developments in the northeast of the area focussing on access to the new primary school due to open in Barton Park.</p> <p>There is no indication of whether the NP would support the expansion of Thornhill Park &amp; Ride or the development and implementation of CPZs in the area.</p> <p>The NP could also clarify whether the status of Cuckoo Lane and Pullens Lane as pedestrian and cycle routes would remain the same and comment on the possibility of recognised connections across Warneford Meadow.</p> <p><b>Our response:</b></p> <p>We will re-examine Policy HP15 of the Sites and Housing Plan, and address the inclusion of the OTS comment.</p> <p>Barton Park and Thornhill are outside our HNP area, but we will look at Cuckoo Lane, Pullens Lane, and Warneford Meadow.</p> <p><b>11. Draft Plan</b></p> <p><i>TRC1: Promoting Safety and Active Transport</i></p> <p><i>A set of projects to promote safety and active transport in Headington (examples below) will be identified and implemented after wider consultation to determine residents' wishes and priorities.</i></p> <p><b>OCC Response:</b></p> <p>We understand that the list might be illustrative but we do have concerns with some of the items on the list. Furthermore, nearly all the examples lie within the county's control to approve and implement, and they are not land use based, so we wonder whether it is therefore appropriate for them to be</p>	<p>CY</p> <p>CY</p> <p>CY</p>
---	-------------------------------

	<p>specified within the NP anyway, or better to be expressed as aspirations rather than policy.</p> <p><b>Our Response:</b>  All community policies with the heading <b>C</b> are aspirational <b>community</b> policies.  We will expand the explanation on Page 16 No. 12 to make clear the difference between a <b>planning</b> policy and a <b>community</b> policy.  *****  All the suggestions made by <i>Historic England</i> have been incorporated into the Plan, but see note 4. Below.</p> <p><b>4. Draft Plan</b>  We will add a covering note when the draft is submitted to address the subject of an “appraisal of sustainability” which was requested by <i>Historic England</i>.  A new matrix has been added on Page 13 which evaluates the Plan Objectives within each policy.  Delivering the Vision Page 15 remains as originally drafted.</p>	<p><b>AS</b></p> <p><b>AS</b></p>
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>Next Steps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We will make contact with some graphic designers to help us present the final plan with photos to give it a professional readable look which may rely on its layout and typeface.</li> <li>We hope to be able to submit the draft plan by the end of March. Our plan is currently scheduled to go before the City Executive Board on 19 May under the Lead Officer David Edwards.</li> <li>In order to publicise the upcoming referendum (hopefully in September) we will need to advertise widely. Some suggestions include:  A stall on the Farmers’ Market with leaflets to take away  Posters – to be sent to schools, shops, doctor’s surgeries, Residents’ Associations, Waitrose, Co-op, Brookes (via the Student Union)  Brookes staff newsletter. <i>Headington Forward</i> personnel, Library, Freshers Fair (expensive)</li> </ul> <p>We will start to design a poster for this purpose and would hope to start the advertising process in April. JN and RW have agreed to organise the publicity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We will keep the Form in touch with all developments and may have a Forum meeting just before the referendum</li> </ul>	<p>LG</p> <p>RW</p> <p>AS JN/RW</p> <p>LG</p>
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>We have not included any reference to Access to Headington. All PWGs are being asked to look at A2H and see where it impinges on their policies. PWG responses will be compiled into a NPlan response to the Access to Headington consultation.</p>	<p>LG</p> <p>MR</p>
<b>6.</b>	<p><b>Schedule of meetings</b></p> <p>A Doodle poll has been generated for the next meeting in April.</p>	
<b>7.</b>	<p><b>Close of meeting</b></p> <p>9.25 pm.</p>	

LG 9.3.16