



**EYNESHAM FUTURES STEERING GROUP: MINUTES OF MEETING
7.30 PM, TUESDAY 18TH OCTOBER 2016, BARTHOLOMEW ROOM, EYNESHAM**

eynsham futures

PRESENT: Richard Andrews (RA), Eleanor Chance (EC), Sue Chapman (SC), Marie Mills (MM), Charles Mathew (CM), Jane Osborne (JO), Peter Emery (PE), Margaret Key (resident), Chris Potts (resident), Dennis Stukenbroeker (DS), Angie Titchen (AT) (note-taker)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Posy Parrinder (PP), Steve Parrinder, Jon Bright (JB), Nina Turner (NT), Paddy Coulter (PC), Gordon Beech (GB)

2. DECLARATIONS OF ANY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:

None

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Margaret Key and Chris Potts, Eynsham residents were invited to participate.

4. MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF 20 September 2016

As only SC and MM were present at the last meeting, they will be sent out again to Steering Group members for approval.

5. MATTERS ARISING

In relation to Agenda item 6c, there was discussion around whether Tilgarsley Garden Village would be genuinely for Oxford or if this is all a sham. The question arose about whether this development would really be part of the general UK housing pool and if so, why was there an insistence that the development had to be as near Oxford as the Green Belt would allow (which is why Eynsham was chosen). It was noted that house ownership only by people connected to Oxford, in some way, could not be 'policed'. A concern was raised that if necessary infrastructure was not forthcoming (citing the problem that Bicester Garden Town is having), then there could be a danger of ghettos forming. PE clarified the meaning of Garden Village designation and explained that even if the development failed to achieve Garden Village designation, standards regarding housing, design and infrastructure would be maintained by the National Policy & Planning Framework. It was also noted that these standards are not as rigorous as the Garden Village standards.

JO asked if Bartholomew would have the right to say 'no' to taking students from the Garden Village and explained that the school likes to be pro-active and offer community-based education with any new schools in our community including Free Schools. This would mean getting in there before anyone else.

6. CORRESPONDENCE: S. Hellig, Community First Oxfordshire, M Peterson, S Buss-Keating, L. Micklewright, R Johnson, S Raikes

Four of the correspondences were substantial written responses from residents to the Question & Answer discussions at the Public Meeting on October 5th 2016. Themes emerging from them include views that: Oxford should look to doing more/take full responsibility to meet its own unmet need and; there does not seem to be universal opposition to the Garden Village, more a concern about how it happens, ie, infrastructure including transport problems, impact of new retail. All points were noted and will be considered alongside responses from the Eynsham News insert and Public Meeting forms that residents are placing in the boxes in shops around the village. It was also noted that the feedback we are receiving now shows how much we need to inform residents better about the key background issues because many issues are so complex. **Action: RA to prepare a response to submission of views including a Frequently Asked Question sheet to enable residents to understand the full picture.**

A request from a Market Research organisation to interview a member of the Eynsham Futures Steering Group about the Group's experience of developing a Neighbourhood Plan was accepted. **Action: PP to respond.**

7. WODC LOCAL PLAN – published CABINET PAPERS & AGENDA 19TH OCTOBER WITH REVISIONS TO THE PLAN

The suggested amendments to WODC Local Plan 2031 have been put in the public domain as part of the Cabinet Papers for the meeting of 19 October.

STOP PRESS they are now going to full Council on 26th October and are available at

<http://cmis.westoxon.gov.uk/cmis/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/3111/Committee/8/SelectedTab/Documents/Default.aspx>

PE outlined the amendments that have been made (see particularly pages 235 – 242 that affect Eynsham).

The Plan was developed by external consultants who identified the area as capable of taking 2,200 houses of West Oxfordshire's share of Oxford's unmet housing need. WODC decided to develop it as a separate Garden Village to the north of Eynsham with the A40 as the boundary. Another 550 houses to go towards this share are to be sited on the West of Eynsham. These are to be placed alongside another 450 houses that make up Eynsham's part of the WODC allocation for West Oxfordshire.

PE asked what the Steering Group felt about an alternative to this allocation, ie, the possibility of all Oxford's unmet housing need being allocated to the North site, i.e., 2,750 houses with all necessary infrastructure, including an access road off the A40, two primary schools, secondary school provision and community, medical and retail services. Some members were positive about that suggestion, but it was recognised that speculative development on the West of Eynsham is so likely to take place in the very near future that we might be wise to keep our Western option as it is (ie, 600 houses that would bring infrastructure money). That led to discussion about: whether the western link road to the industrial estate would be necessary and; alternative sites to the current proposed site for the Garden Village, separated by a rural belt from existing villages, further west along the A40. It was considered that other places in West Oxfordshire where building could be begun quickly and where more housing was wanted by communities should be reconsidered to decrease the huge burden on Eynsham created by this Local Plan. It was also questioned whether Oxford City's preference for a site as near the city and its Green Belt boundary should take precedence over more universal ecological, environmental and social factors that will affect not only us, but future generations to come.

A response to the Local Plan and some requested actions for the WODC Cabinet by RA had been circulated in advance of the meeting. The response paper has the purpose of ensuring that our views could be heard by WODC before the Plan is submitted for consultation. After discussion, it was agreed that PE should use the response paper as well as our discussion at the imminent WODC Cabinet meeting where the Local Plan is to be discussed. He was asked to:

- Focus on the possibility of rolling Oxford's unmet housing needs into the North site only and keeping the West site in reserve.
- Ask questions about the skewedness of the evidence that had been presented to the external consultants that pointed to the North site being the only one in Oxford that was suitable
- Explore site options away from the Oxford City boundary and Green Belt.

8. PUBLIC MEETING, 5TH OCTOBER – Due to residents' decision to spend the Oct 5th meeting discussing the Garden Village Expression of Interest and defer discussion of the Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan to another time, we had decided with residents, at that time, that two separate extra meetings were necessary. We agreed the following arrangements:

Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan (ENP) - To carry out the consultation activities that we had planned for October 5th, we agreed to run a drop-in session over one evening and a day. This would give residents the time they requested to study the proposals carefully and have conversations before filling in the consultation forms from a more knowledgeable position. **Action: AT to liaise with Rachel Budd in booking the Village Hall.**

Garden Village – Decision made that this meeting should wait until after the WODC November decision about the Expression of Interest and that it should be called jointly by WODC and the Eynsham Parish Council. The people who made the decision about the site should be at that meeting to hear residents' views and answer their questions. **Action: RA to discuss with EPC.**

Library display – **Action: SC to organise display of a selection of the posters and policies in the Library as an enticement to come along to the ENP drop-in meeting for a closer look.**

9. BROOKES STUDENTS/BIODIVERSITY STUDIES - It was agreed that it would be helpful to invite these students to help us with the investigations we need on biodiversity at some of our proposed Local Green Spaces and development sites. We recognised that this work might continue beyond the life of our steering group. **Action: PP to continue conversations with Brookes.**

10. LOCAL GREEN SPACE – We agreed that the tabled Cotswold District Council Local Green Space Designation Toolkit should be fully assessed to see if it could help us with designation of Local Green Spaces in Eynsham. **Action: Posy to continue working on this evaluation.**

11. AOB - None

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING - 15 NOVEMBER 2016.

VOLUNTEER TO TAKE MINUTES AT NEXT MEETING - RA to circulate email for a volunteer.