

Minutes of the **Steering Committee & PWG** Meeting held at JHB 128 on Monday 27 July 2015 at 7.30 pm

Email – HeadingtonPlan@gmail.com Web - HeadingtonPlan.org.uk/ Facebook – HeadingtonPlan Twitter - @HeadingtonPlan

Stee	ring Committee present:	Apologies:			
	n Symons AS (Project Manager)	John Nealon JN (Press/Communications			
	ck Coulter PC (Vice Chair)	Officer)			
	Grosvenor LG (Secretary)	Cllr Roz Smith RS			
	nica Hurst VH	Ian Wilson IW			
Fiona	a Mckenzie FM (Treasurer)				
	Ratcliffe MR (Chair)	Cc Charlie Fisher & Charles Young			
	olas Rollin NR				
Cllr F	Ruth Wilkinson RW				
Cha	rlie Fisher (Housing)				
Policy Working Groups - existing		Possible new groups			
Busi	ness and Retail – FM & NR				
Amenities & Green Spaces – PC		Planning Applications			
Education – MR		Community Engagement			
Hous	Housing – JN				
Tran	Transport – Charles Young				
Cha	Character & Identity – VH				
1.	Objective	Action			
	To determine next steps following the 6 week consultation on the draft at				
	The Hub.				

	Project Manager's Report	
2.		
	 There has been a disappointing response online to the consultation. We will add in the comments from the Headington & Marston Forum (blog) 	RW/AS
	 The responses from The Hub have been copied out and are being distributed to the relevant PWGs. 	LG
	 The Principal Planner will look at the comments and the subsequent changes to the draft plan. 	AS
	 From our Locality funding we have employed a professional planner to make the plan consistent and to deal with potential Strategic Environmental Assessments. 	
	 The city planner has some issues on elements of the Green Spaces, CANDI and Housing items and some re-wording will be necessary. 	
	 We have had a number of institutional responses – the one from Brookes' comments on the consultations taking place when the students are not around. Brookes suggested a further consultation round but we consider that Brookes' staff and students have had sufficient opportunity to comment on our policies and so we decided not to conduct further consultation with Brookes at this stage. 	
	We are awaiting a response from OUHT. The residual and the least the great facilities a facilities and the response from the second seco	MR
	 There is a need to look at the contradictions in the plan and respond to the Access to Headington County Council consultation 	MR
	 During August the PWGs will need to meet to take on board all the comments and amend their parts of the plan accordingly. 	PWG
	 The amended draft will go on the web at least a week before the Forum/AGM meeting being scheduled for end of September to give forum members a chance to digest. 	JN
	 If any fundamentally different issues crop up we may need a further period of open consultation. 	
	 There is a need to advertise widely the process we have been following, from the original Issues and options leaflet to the processes employed in producing the draft plan, particularly that we have taken on board the comments made at The Hub consultations, and do some press releases and add to the H & M Forum. All the comments on the CANDI assessments need to be incorporated into the relevant PWGs. These have been analysed and distributed accordingly see MR email 29/7 at 9.50. 	MR
	Check List for PWGs	
4.	By the end of August it will be necessary for all PWGs to take on board all the comments from the consultations and produce an amended plan where necessary.	PWG
	 Take on board the comments from the planning manager regarding the wording of the plan so far - see AS email headed Draft Plan Consultation Responses and Proposed Changes and sent 24/7 at 8.31 	
	Reflect all the consultations comments from the Hub being	

	 distributed by hand this week. Reflect the comments from the institutions – see AS email 24/7 8.31 See email from Richard Bradley forwarded by LG 29/7 at 10.27 See email from RW re Cllr Alex Hollingsworth (28/7 at 7.39) – for Housing Group only. Incorporate the comments in the CANDI assessments – distributed by MR 29/7. 	LG
5.	Access to Headington This consultation by the County Council is about addressing access issues to places of employment in Headington. It talks about improvements to public transport with bus priorities and improved pedestrian and cycle links But it includes widening of roads by removing grass verges, removing trees and also removing residents' parking (particularly in Windmill Road). There are conflicts here regarding verges and trees, and there is no solution suggested as to where cars can be parked. The Transport Group have had a meeting with Stuart Wilson (Transport Planning officer at the County) to discuss initial thoughts, but have found that proper strategic assessments have not been carried out yet – eg cycle routes. We need to respond to this consultation before the referendum and will comment that various parts of their plan conflict with our emerging plan. We will comment on the benefits and conflicts on a case by case basis –	MR/AS
6.	MR is drafting a response which is being considered by SC so that it can be submitted by the deadline of 7 August. It agrees with the balance of alternative modes of transport, but is concerned about the pinch points of commuter traffic and the effects on residents, employers and hospital patients and insufficiently addresses some pedestrian issues We will point out that our emerging policies on the public realm will prevail in some of the areas of the County plan, and that we will respond when there are detailed engineering proposals to back up the proposals. Schedule of meetings PWG meetings during August to address the points in 4. above (Meeting of Headington Forward 2 September) Forum/AGM meeting in Baptist Church tba	LG
_	Close of meeting	
7.	9.15 pm.	

Liz Grosvenor 29 July 2015