



# Headington neighbourhood plan

Minutes of the **Steering Committee** Meeting held at  
scottfraser, Lime Walk  
on Monday 11 November 2015 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 (Secretary) Fiona Mckenzie FM (Treasurer) John Nealon JN (Press/Communications Officer) Mike Ratcliffe MR (Chair) Cllr Roz Smith RS Guest: Charles Young (PWG Chair – Transport)</p>	<p><b>Apologies:</b> Adam Symons AS (Project Manager) Veronica Hurst VH Nicholas Rollin NR Cllr Ruth Wilkinson RW Ian Wilson IW</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 – VH</b></p>	<p><b>Possible new groups</b>  <b>Planning Applications</b> <b>Community Engagement</b></p>	
<p>1.</p>	<p><b>Apologies</b> As above</p>	<p><b>Action</b></p>
<p>2.</p>	<p><b>Minutes</b> from last steering committee meeting were approved.</p>	<p><b>LG/JN</b></p>
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>Review of the Draft Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments made by the Forum members at the last Forum Meeting have been incorporated into the subsequent comments.</li> <li>• Comments submitted since then by Forum members have been distributed to the PWG chairs to be addressed by their groups and have been brought to this meeting for discussion and implementation.</li> </ul>	

<p><b>RESPONSES BY POLICY WORKING GROUP CHAIRS TO FORUM COMMENTS ON DRAFT PLAN 10/11/2015</b></p> <p><b>GREEN SPACES AND AMENITIES</b></p> <p><i>University of Oxford</i></p> <p><b>GSP 2.</b> The University objects in principle to this policy on the grounds that it is not in accordance with the Core Strategy.</p> <p><b>Response</b> <b>We consider that we have conformed with the Core Strategy.</b></p> <p><b>GSP3.</b> The University suggests that this policy is too restrictive and would stifle development. It questions the definition of “exceptional circumstances”. The University considers that it is inappropriate to seek to protect prosaic species on the grounds that they are rare on a particular site.</p> <p><b>Response</b> <b>It is agreed that reference to exceptional circumstances may be unduly restrictive. We will Delete “save in exceptional circumstances”, and only then where” and replace by “save where it can be demonstrated that [the benefits etc etc]”</b></p> <p><b>The supporting text in the draft Plan justifies the protection of prosaic species as in accordance with both the objectives of the Green Strategy which seeks “the protection of important and prosaic species on all sites and the NPPF Guidance which seeks gains in biodiversity. Prosiac species which are rare in a particular area make an important contribution to the biodiversity of that area.</b></p> <p><b>GSP4</b> The University considers that the policy is too restrictive as there may be sound safety and management reasons for the removal of mature trees in certain situations. It suggests that the policy is over restrictive and lacks a good evidence basis.</p> <p><b>Response</b> <b>It is agreed that the policy be amended to include safety and management reasons to read “for ecological reasons <u>or for reasons of public safety or good practice</u>”.</b></p> <p><b>The evidence in support of this policy is set out in the Plan supporting text and footnote 6 which links to research on the 4:1 replacement ratio.</b></p>	<p>PC/AS</p> <p>PC/AS</p>
--	---------------------------

<p><b>Heather Armitage</b> Suggests we need policies on Sustainable Drainage Systems, Hydrogeology, Air Quality, Building Height.</p> <p><b>Response</b> <b>The Neighbourhood Plan does not have to cover areas which are adequately dealt with by other agencies, for example the Environment Agency. We have suggested a project on Air Quality (below).</b></p> <p><b>For SuDS the following policy is suggested:</b> <b>“Developments which include sustainable drainage systems shall provide detailed plans for the continuing inspection and maintenance of the drainage system throughout the lifetime of the development.”</b> <b>[We feel that the more suitable place for this comment is within the Character &amp; Identity Assessment.]</b></p> <p><b>Ruth Wilkinson</b> <b>GSP1</b> (I) ...in an identified area(s) of need... Should identifying areas of need be a community policy? Alternatively, give the method by which this can be identified, or an appendix listing these areas needing green space</p> <p><b>GSP4</b> The definition of "appropriate varieties" of trees to be planted - would that be delegated to the City Council's Tree Planning Officer Kevin Caldicott? Might be worth asking him for advice as to best species in different types of area?</p> <p><b>Response</b> <b>Both suggestions would be included in the implementation plans for these policies which would be prepared later and not included in the Plan itself. We favour leaving this as it is as the nature of areas change over time.</b></p> <p><b>Air Quality</b> Suggests a project to work with the City Council to reduce the NO2 and particulates levels in Headington to WHO standards and review location of diffusion tubes with the City Council each year.</p> <p><b>Response</b> <b>To be included as a community policy within the Transport Group to reduce air pollution, NO2 and particulates.</b></p> <p><b>Terry Newsome</b> The plan does not include specific measurable targets that can be implemented and monitored through extended periods of time</p> <p><b>Response</b> <b>We are not required by the Plan regulations to have targets.</b></p>	<p>AS/PC</p> <p>CY/AS</p>
--	---------------------------

	<p><b>Dermot</b> Seeks a statement that exterior lighting should be eco friendly and appropriate.</p> <p><b>Response</b> <b>We will check with the City regulators.</b></p> <p><b>EDUCATION</b> In the light of comments from Brookes and the University, The aim of the Education Group is to allow the expansion or addition of new facilities within the general context of local education provision. Changes will be allowed, but the policy only encourages provision aimed at education for which at least some part is intended for local children.</p> <p>EDUCATION (ED) PLANNING (P) POLICIES EDP1: New Education Provision Proposals for change of use of non-residential premises to educational premises (D1 Nonresidential institutions) for early-years or 5-19 education provision, for those who live or work in the HNPA, will be supported, subject to other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p><b>Our response is to add the sentence below in bold.</b> This policy encourages provision of education for local children through welcoming changes to expand or add new provision to educational facilities within the HNPA. That's not to say that international schools, residential schools or education for those over 18 should not be offered, <b>or their premises expanded or changed in use in other ways</b> just that this policy is silent on them.</p> <p><b>TRANSPORT</b> <b>Ruth Wilkinson:</b> Might be worth citing upward trend in Cycling in Headington over the last 5 years. Response: I don't know of data later than the last census in 2011. The census data shown on the NF website show a relatively small increase in those cycling to work (from 15% in 2001 to 16% in 2011). My own calculations from census data showed a slightly larger increase, but I am not sure if this is material.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> <b>THE LAST AVAILABLE FIGURES FOR 2011 ARE NOW OUT-OF-DATE. There has not been a significant upward trend since then.</b></p> <p><b>Don Norwood:</b> (a) If only we didn't all start work at 9 am. (b) stricter policing of laws re red lights and cycling on pavement. <b>Response: these are not matters that the NP has it in its power to control.</b></p>	<p>AS</p> <p>MR/AS</p>
--	---	------------------------

	<p><b>Dernot:</b> (a) more cycle spaces (b) stronger discouragement of school run</p> <p><b>Response: a) More cycle spaces will be added to the Transport Section as an extra box under TRC 1, currently on page 31.</b> <b>b) Not in the NPs power to control</b></p> <p><b>Colin Taylor</b> (a) Encourage cycle-only routes. (b) guideline on ratio of parking spaces to employees;</p> <p><b>Response:</b> <b>(b) TRP 1 (heavily criticised by major employers) goes in this direction. A general guideline would not work because of the wide difference in the need for access to workplaces by non-employees (eg at hospitals, shops, showrooms).</b> <b>Oxford University. The objection to TRP1 is one which I feel should be a matter for the planning inspector. It does not seem unreasonable to take account of the current level of congestion when deciding whether to encourage further commuting by car.</b> <b>The paragraph “All single-unit developments etc....” will be incorporated into the TRP4 Travel Plan Policy.</b> <b>The final part (“over the like of the development) of TRP6 Promotion of Cycle and Walking will be deleted.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Proposed amendments to the Character Assessments</b> This is ongoing and will be finalised shortly.</li> <li>• <b>Additional policies and visioning narrative as proposed by the vice chair.</b> It was decided that this should sit under Item 9 “Headington Plan Vision and Objectives”.</li> </ul>	<p>CY/AS</p> <p>CY/AS</p> <p>AS</p> <p>RS/PC</p>
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Project Manager’s Report and next steps.</b> We feel that we should employ a professional designer to look at the Plan before final submission.</p> <p>It was agreed that a matrix would be included showing for each policy which of the aims (1, 2, 3) which that policy will deliver. PC will circulate a draft to the PWG Chairs for their completion. The matrix will be included just after the aims".</p> <p>It was agreed to include the proposed policy on the successor body at the end of the policies.</p> <p><b>Policy C1 Successor Body</b></p> <p><b><i>The Neighbourhood Forum will plan and implement arrangements to</i></b></p>	<p>AS/PC</p> <p>PC</p> <p>AS</p>

	<p><b><i>create a successor body to oversee the implementation of the plan throughout the plan period.</i></b></p> <p>The vision and aims of the Plan are will be achieved through a range of policies and projects. To secure the effective implementation of policies and projects following the referendum will require that a successor body to the Forum is put in place at that stage. Such a body would monitor the implementation of the planning policies. It would also initiate and manage the implementation of the community policies and projects by working with the local authorities and other stakeholders and the Headington community. As the Plan is a living document there will be the need to regularly consult local people on implementation issues such as the development of new projects. There are a range of options for the form of the successor body, for example a charitable body such as a community trust, or a statutory body such as a community council similar to a parish council. "</p> <p>It was agreed to set up a working group to research and progress the development of a successor body"</p> <p><b>The Steering Committee agreed that there being no substantive changes there was not a requirement to go out to further consultation with the Forum.</b></p> <p><b>What next?</b></p> <p>As there is some considerable time before this Plan can go to referendum (possibly September 2016) it was decided that the PWGs would look at some of the community projects they have suggested. AS will be asked to create a working template action plan for them which will consider budgets, actions, timescales etc. and enable them to look at their aims, the stakeholders and the dependencies involved. There will probably be merit in setting up some research groups to take this forward.</p> <p>We will possibly schedule in a Forum Meeting with PWGs for late January/early February with adequate advertising to engage everyone in these projects.</p>	
5.	<b>AOB</b> <b>None</b>	
6.	<b>Schedule of meetings</b> Possible Forum/PWG meeting in January/February to be held centrally.	
7.	<b>Close of meeting</b> 9.05 pm.	

Liz Grosvenor 12 Nov 2015