



**PRESENT:** Posy Parrinder (PP), Richard Andrews (RA), Eleanor Chance (EC), Sue Chapman (SC), Marie Mills (MM), Charles Mathew, County Cllr (CM), Peter Emery, District Cllr (PE), Dennis Stukenbroeker (DS), Angie Titchen (AT) (note-taker)

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:** Jon Bright (JB), Nina Turner (NT), Steve Parrinder (SP)

**2. DECLARATIONS OF ANY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:**

MM declared a conflict of interest when the imminent A40 proposal to the Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) Cabinet was discussed under item 5 because her house backs onto the A40 at the western end of the village. It was considered appropriate for her to contribute to the discussion because the A40 proposal affects the whole village.

**3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** Charles Mathew and Peter Emery were invited to participate.

**4. MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF 15 March & 19 April 2016**

Both minutes were approved as accurate records. SP wanted his question to the OCC transport team at the April meeting to be included. His question was whether the Eynsham Park & Ride site had been chosen because it is OCC land. Bev Hindle had responded saying that this was the case because it makes it easier.

**5. MATTERS ARISING**

Nothing from the March 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.

From April 19<sup>th</sup> minutes- PP informed the meeting that the (as yet unfunded) **long-term development A40 proposals** being submitted to the OCC Cabinet in a few days time were now online. The proposals are:

- Dualling between Witney and the Eynsham Park and Ride (P&R) (to north-west of Eynsham) with a new bus lane, westward-bound, from Duke's Cut to Eynsham P&R (in addition to the new eastward-bound bus lane that is going to take place in the current road improvements). There will be new wide cycle ways on each side along the length of the whole road from Witney to Oxford.
- The train, tram and guided busway proposals were to be shelved.
- Cost £54 million.

Janice Bamsey, West Oxfordshire District Council (WODC), is planning a **whole day stakeholder meeting** to discuss the implications of the new A40 proposals for Eynsham and our Neighbourhood Plan and the WODC Local Plan. WODC are paying for and organising the meeting. Key stakeholders include WODC planners, OCC, developers, Eynsham Parish Council and Eynsham Futures Steering Group (EFSG). Possible dates are 7, 13, 15 or 21 June. It was agreed that EFSG should send three representatives including RA, PP and one other. Nina Turner and Jon Bright were proposed (PP to ask them if they are willing and able). AT offered to be a standby representative, but can only make June 8<sup>th</sup>. CM and PE would like to attend. **NB date set is 27<sup>th</sup> June.**

Another matter arising from the April meeting is the big issue about the WODC 5 year land supply being sufficient for our Neighbourhood Plan to be accepted. PE informed us that the situation is said to be 'fluid'.

**6. CORRESPONDENCE**

Calvin Lamont, Polar's public consultation event on 12 May, Sandy Hellig, Kate Naylor (emails forwarded to all EFSG members). These were all noted. In particular, it was reported that Kate Naylor, resident in Station Road was concerned about flooding in Station Road if the Gladman appeal to build 49 houses on the field west of Station Road was upheld. The Steering Group noted that the Inspector has just rejected the Gladman appeal. Correspondence recently received from the LoveCareFarm organisation regarding a community farm idea – AT to investigate.

**7. MEETINGS**

**David Bell, consultant from LDA design**

PP reported that David Bell was very pleasant and helpful and that he was not pitching for our business as he is too busy. He talked about what we could and couldn't achieve. He stressed that the important things are meeting the basic conditions, e.g., a 5 year land supply, and having Community Infrastructure Levy proposals in the plan and ranked. He said that the plan will set the tone of the development. RA acknowledged that these issues are

important and that we were already aware of and/or acting on them. David Bell advised that we should improve our consultation with the schools, e.g., we could run one of the cake stalls at 3pm on a Friday at the primary school for purposes of consciousness-raising, sharing views and how things could be achieved. No action regarding the schools was discussed at this point.

#### **Annual parish meeting**

There was a poor attendance at the meeting (only 20 people – there are usually twice the number) and only 3 people had looked in advance at papers posted on-line. PP thought that it might have been because it was the same night as the Rotary meeting that she had been invited to attend to talk about the Neighbourhood Plan. She thought that many of those present were people who were likely to be attendees at the parish meeting.

#### **Eynsham Rotary**

Attended by 20+ people. PP outlined the Neighbourhood Plan draft policies and progress to which there was generally a positive response. One person wrote on a post-it note, 'Splitting the village on each side of the A40 is a bad idea'.

There were a couple of people from Long Hanborough who asked if we are talking to their Parish Council. PP said 'no' to them and then asked this meeting, 'Is this necessary?'. It was agreed that it was, but at a later stage when (a) we invite all the Parish Councils on our boundaries to comment on our draft plan (as our plan will affect all of them in different ways) and

(b) when WODC establish the numbers of further housing in the 2 sub-areas in which Eynsham, Cassington, Long Hanborough, Stanton Harcourt and Standlake fall. It was established that all our neighbouring Parish Councils know that we are developing a plan and we agreed that Gordon Beach should be asked to approach them and ask if they would be prepared to read our draft plan (when we have it ready) and look now online at what we have done already (RA).

#### **8. COMMUNITY DAY 18 JUNE**

DS was the only person present at the meeting who will be at the Eynsham Parish Council (EPC) stall at the Community Day. PP to put out an email asking for volunteers. We agreed that the Neighbourhood Plan Policies, Site Options and Village Improvement posters should be on display on the walls behind the EPC stall. RA will laminate A3 versions of the latest posters. EPC to ask the Community Day organiser for the stall to be on the side of the folding doors (for ease of sticking up the posters).

#### **9. USE OF CONSULTANTS/APPLICATION FOR FUNDING FROM LOCALITY**

Discussion ranged from what we might need from a consultant (£9k government grant available from Locality if we bid for it) to whether we actually need consultant input as RA is doing such a fantastic job on the policies and other parts of the plan.

When RA was asked what help he needed, he said that photos of the village from different viewpoints would be helpful to show what long distance views of the village are like, so that the plan could show how proposed development might affect/block those views. Especially helpful would be views from the west towards the village from the fields between the Chilbridge Bridleway and the footpath to the old railway line. Also useful for built and landscape design purposes would be the new developments of Merton Close (as an example of uniform design of houses with a village feel design) and Hazeldene (as an example of a mixture of design styles). SC, EC and PE agreed to take a variety of shots.

If we need to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment on our site allocation(s) money will be needed. RA hopes that WODC will pay as part of Local Plan Strategic Housing & Economic Land Availability Assessment.

There was also discussion about the walking distance radius from the village centre. MM asked if there was any research about the best maximum travelling distance to a settlement centre in terms of retaining/creating community. RA reported that he has been working with our village centre (around the village square and central shops) having a 300 metre diameter. New developments are planned to be 800-1200 metres maximum from the centre- i.e. within walking distance.

When asked whether using a consultant would be helpful, RA responded that ideally he would like an outline plan of the site options, as exemplified in Louise Thomas' (Urban Design Consultant) presentation at the April meeting, but that that work would well exceed £8-9k. Alternatively, he thought that we could do with some help to produce the final documentation.

He suggested that NT with her design expertise might be able to help with images/layout etc. As a second option, RA thought it might be good to ask Rob Dance, one Community First Oxfordshire's consultants, to pull the report together.

It was agreed that application for the Locality grant should be deferred until we know more and maybe be used to pay someone to present our document in a final, polished version.

#### **10. PUBLIC MEETING 14 APRIL- Report. Actions**

AT reported on the success of the workshop style public meeting with 97+ participants (see Eynsham Futures Online and Facebook pages for photos, short reports and a small video). There was a lot of very positive feedback to us about the way we are developing the plan and one person's view of 'I felt heard' by the Eynsham Futures team seemed to sum it up.

Sally Hunt and AT have undertaken a thematic analysis of the posters produced by the groups and found a lot of duplication of ideas and views with previous evidence gathered from the community. She considered that this repetition further strengthens the evidence because it has been gathered from different people (as well as some of the same) and at different points of time over 13 months. New ideas were also found in the posters and are currently being incorporated into the policies and consultation analysis documents.

Another participant wrote on a post-it note that there was 'not enough time to absorb info. How about a one-week exhibition in the Bartholomew Room?'. The meeting thought this was an excellent idea and that the Policy, site options and village improvement posters, as well as photos could be used. **EC and SC** offered to lead on organising this event during the summer and will set up a rota for availability to answer questions and gather more views from those who attend the exhibition.

We also agreed to book the big village hall for the pre-submission of the policies public consultation in early September. Mondays and Wednesdays are best for availability of the hall. **AT** to circulate possible dates then book as soon as possible.

Huge thanks were offered to Sally, all the helpers on the night and to AT for organising the meeting and making the video.

#### **11. NP POLICIES, SITES FOR DEVELOPMENT and LOCAL GREEN SPACE**

RA is re-formulating the policies, to include the Public meeting evidence and the Local Green Space designation (list of spaces and map), in order to strengthen them. There was some general discussion about rural exception sites, recent dismissed appeal at Litchfield and the upcoming appeal at the Nursery site. It was noted that WODC is agreeing with us that Eynsham needs joined up development on the west of the village. EPC are submitting a written submission as the NP is close to its 1<sup>st</sup> draft and is impacted by the planning proposals at the Nursery.

#### **12. REPORTS OF GROUPS**

**Business-** AT reported that Sandy Hellig has commented very thoughtfully and usefully on the policies in the context of sustainable economy and retail. She has also agreed to have informal conversations about the policies with local businesses.

**Landscape & Design- Public Realm Options and their status within the NP-** This was not discussed. It will be included next month.

**Environment- Post-meeting information** – Ros Kent, RA and AT met recently and examined, in the context of the draft policies, the updated guidelines document, 'Low Carbon Neighbourhood Planning' (produced by the Centre for Sustainable Energy). We found supporting material, as well as some new ideas. Relevant material is currently being incorporated into the plan.

#### **13. AOB**

PE informed the meeting that he had met informally with Ian Hudspeth (Chair of OCC) today and they had discussed the A40 proposals that will be submitted to the OCC Cabinet shortly. In relation to possible development to the north of the A40 at Eynsham, PE floated his personal idea of a by-pass north of any new housing funded by the creation of a new Science Business Park north of it. PE said that Ian Hudspeth had expressed interest. It was too late for the group's reactions. **To be discussed at next meeting.**

Thanks were offered to Joan Stonham for her updating of the Eynsham Futures webpage which people felt had made the page much easier to find and use. Thanks also to AT and Rolando Medina for contributing to the Facebook page. AT encouraged other members of the Steering Group also to post photos, comments, ideas and keep the Facebook page alive.

#### **VOLUNTEER TO TAKE MINUTES AT NEXT MEETING ON 21 June 2016.**

PP to circulate email for a volunteer.