



EYNSHAM PARISH COUNCIL

CLERK: SUE LEE, 19 BRADSHAW CLOSE, STEEPLE ASTON, BICESTER
Telephone: 01869 347652 email: sue@steeple.eclipse.co.uk web: www.eynsham.org.uk

Notes from the meeting with regard to East Eynsham development proposals held on Wednesday 14 May 2008 at 7pm in the Bartholomew Room.

Present – Mr G Smith – DPDS Consulting, Mr D Castle BH Oxon, Mr G Beach, Mrs L Gerrans, Mr D Rossiter, Dr F Wright and Mrs S Lee – Parish Clerk

The meeting had been arranged following the Parish Council's responses to the two sets of consultation with regard to proposals for the East Eynsham development site.

The Parish Council reaffirmed that they were unhappy with the level of consultation that had taken place so far and would advise WODC of this when a planning application was submitted on the site.

The meeting then looked at the 7 issues identified during the second consultation –

Flooding – the PC were advised that flood risk assessment had been submitted to the Environment Agency (EA) on the flood zones highlighted on the EA maps for the development and the EA did not have any concerns with regard to the development. This assessment was based on the flooding risk from the Thames – a 2nd assessment is currently being carried out on the flood risk from the Chilbrook. The PC advised that the main source of flooding on this land was from the north – Eynsham Mead Ditch – the consultant and developer agreed to look into this with the EA. The ditch was diverted when the by pass was built and is on the Evenlode flood plain. A risk assessment was being carried out on the Chilbrook due to local residents' concerns with regard to this watercourse.

Dr Wright asked the developers to check which floodplain maps they are using from EA to ensure they are post 1981 after the bypass was built. They advised that the floodplain maps on the EA website were indicative and if they identified any risk of flooding a risk assessment needed to be carried out.

Highways – the developers have taken on board the ideas suggested with regard to access to the site by road and a traffic survey is being carried out and is near conclusion – being carried out by OCC in partnership with developers team. Currently the favoured option is a right turning lane into the site off the by pass and free flow of traffic in both directions – the suggestion was again made for a roundabout, traffic lights or left turn only on exit to the Cassington Rd roundabout. None of these ideas have yet been discounted – awaiting final report.

Footpaths – the suggestion of a footpath across the playing fields was not part of the proposals but an indication that residents could cross the field to a bus stop etc – these plans will all be

incorporated in OCC public transport brief re developing public transport on site – currently approx £200,000 is being requested for this in Sect 106 monies. The developers stressed that it was vital that any money from a Section 106 agreement was spent on local works and was to the benefit of the local community.

The footpath along the bypass has been scrapped as too dangerous.

The developers are making provision for the possibility of footpaths in the future and are in discussion with WODC. Mr Rossiter stressed that the West Oxfordshire Local Plan stated that any development should give improvements to the cycling and pedestrian routes to the centre of the village and at present no improvement could be seen on any of the plans to meet this requirement. Dovehouse Close was cited as an example, where a new development had been added to the edge of the village and the pedestrian and cycle routes to the village were not fully integrated.

Residents in Bitterell had concerns re motorbikes using the public right of way – it was agreed a barrier could be erected to stop this happening but it was stressed that this would be OCC responsibility using Sect 106 monies as it would not be erected on the developers land.

Impact on local services

The section 106 agreement could allow for improvements to –

1. Public transport
2. Highways
3. Local provision of education – primary and secondary
4. Open space contribution
5. Play area refurbishment – as on PC wish list as no play area will be included on site due to proximity to Oxford Road area.
6. Astro turf – as on PC wish list
7. Public art
8. Issues with regard to the provision on health services had not been resolved and it was felt by the developers that this was a government issue for funding.
9. The possibility of funding for a cemetery was discussed but the developers were not over keen on this idea.

The PC advised that they felt out of the negotiations having handed their wish list over to WODC and OCC who all have their own needs for monies. They stressed that they would welcome the opportunity to discuss the village needs in more depth directly rather than through a third party. Mr Smith suggested that the planning brief be amended to show clearly what is planned with the Section 106 monies as the original brief was inherited - if the brief could be improved to provide a better development the developers would be happy to do this.

Density – the PC were advised that the density had been design driven rather than numbers driven. 34 houses per hectare – within current government guidelines – 110 houses.

Design - a local character study had been produced and a conservation appraisal was taking place in the village looking at the aspects in the village which could be incorporated in the design. The village is very varied with no distinct style and drawings are currently being put together of new ideas for design. There will be no 3 storey properties – some will be two storey with dormer windows in roof space. The designs will be plain and simple and there will be no Tudor frontages!

Conservation Area – Dr Wright again questioned the legality of building a development in the Conservation Area and advised he would be taking further advice from the Environmental Law Foundation. He cited RAF Bicester as an example where no building was permitted due to the conservation area. He advised that he felt the site should be removed from the conservation area first and then a planning application submitted – the meeting was concerned that this would allow any style of property as it would not have to enhance or preserve the appearance of the conservation area. It was agreed not to agree on this issue until further clarification of the law had been obtained.

The developers advised that the pond on the last set of consultation plans had now been removed and the stream would be piped under the road. The existing pipes under the by pass were silted up and would be cleared and new pipes added to aid drainage. The question of valves to prevent the flow of water in the wrong direction was raised.

The suggestion of raising the level of the properties using the subsoil from the foundations was advised to be risky as the land would take several years to settle and become permeable.

The village green will be extended on the next plans and will be adopted as public space and be handed over to WODC on completion of the development for upkeep.

Affordable Housing – 50% of properties will be affordable and they will be pepper potted over the development. There will be a tender process for Housing Associations to manage the affordable housing and all potential residents will have to be on WODC housing list and show evidence of need – the developers advised it was usual to have large proportion of first lettings go to local people on a cascade system. The last Housing Needs Survey in Eynsham was carried out approximately 5 years ago and indicated need for around 200 houses.

Orchard Close – as the nearest residents to the proposed development they have had meetings with the developers as their privacy will be affected the most. Initial thought of open space between houses was not favourable to residents and second plan is to put larger properties on their boundary and back garden to garden. This will be discussed with residents.

The developers advised they are working with Rob Parkinson, Martin Brookes and Mike Robinson at WODC re the urban design etc.

Timescale – next step to finalise all reports and details of design. A planning application will be submitted as soon as these details are finalised and a report from the EA is received on flood risk – the developers will discuss the Eynsham Mead Ditch with the EA.

Dr Wright asked how often the ground monitoring holes were inspected and was advised every few weeks.

The developers agreed that they were happy in principle to release more information to the PC with regard to the proposals when they were nearer being finalised if this was felt possible.

The PC thanked Mr Castle and Mr Smith for meeting them and the meeting ended at 8.10pm.