



# Watlington Parish Council

Parish Clerk: Kristina Tynan

---

## **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY 18<sup>th</sup> JULY AT 8PM IN THE PARISH OFFICE**

---

**Present:**

**Councillors:** Jeremy Bell (Chair), Ian Hill (Vice-Chairman), Terry Jackson, Robin Wilson, Tom Bindoff, Matt Reid

**In Attendance:** Peter Richardson, Gill Bindoff, David Cotterell

**Officer:** Rachel Gill

1. Apologies

None

2. Declarations of Interest

None

3. Minutes of the last meeting

Resolved that these minutes are a correct record of this meeting and that they be signed by the chairman.

4. Matters Arising

**Roadshows**

**GB** raised that Keith Jackson sent an email about the comparison to consultation 2 slide in the roadshow report questioning whether it is a like for like comparison. **IH** stated that the numbers are correct. There was further discussion over the difference between a formal consultation and informal feedback. **TJ** felt that the questions were worded differently. Consensus was to include it. **IH** had an action to arrange a meeting with John Curtis, no reply so far. In progress.

**Site 3**

**GB** raised what needs to be done about site 3, should it be available, unavailable or unknown? There was some discussion, as this site has no access and the owner/developer declined to come to a meeting. **Resolved: List site as available.**

**Exclusion limit for small sites**

**GB** raised whether to exclude sites with 5 or less houses or 10 or less houses. **IH** thought this was irrelevant as the only site affected already had planning in place. National guidelines are less than 5 but the development sites group had considered less than 10.

**Resolved : Stick with national guidelines and include sites with >5 houses.**

### **SODC Preferred Options Response**

NP and PC need to respond to this. IH suggested that this would be a Steering Group response and a separate Forum response. IH said that a document needed to be produced. GB reminded that group that everyone could respond individually. PR informed the group that there is a meeting in Chalgrove on Thursday and that the HCA has leafleted every house in the village.

**Resolved – NP representatives to attend the meeting on Thursday.**

**Action RG to print 2 more copies of the Preferred Options document.**

IH asked again for a volunteer to take the lead on writing the response document.

TB suggested that everyone read the document and write some comments and call an extra meeting to meet and discuss.

**Resolved : Meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> August 8pm in the Parish Office to draft response to SODC Preferred Options Document.**

### 5. **Traffic Modelling – Review of Specification Document**

The group reviewed the specification document prepared by DC. DC explained that originally there were 4 scenarios but there are now 6. He was concerned that the more options we looked at the more it would cost.

For traffic management the SODC contact had recommended keeping things as simple as possible and using options where there is a precedent in SODC. The three options recommended are:

1. Chicanes
2. Smart traffic lights
3. Pedestrian controlled crossings

Other possible work would be to look at pedestrian movements, reference to SODC AQMA and impact of new development at Chalgrove.

All the providers had said it was something they could do but some were cautious having had problems working with NPs before. DC said he has asked for an idea of the scale of costs, e.g. 5k,10k,15k and then adjust the brief as required.

We need to cover the traffic management and scenarios covered.

**GB** stated that the Locality application had 3 strands:

- Sustainability Assessment
- Materials to publicise the referendum
- Traffic Modelling

The most we can get is £9k.

**IH** said that we needed to do enough to make a decision on traffic management and whether an alternative route worked. The issue is how many components should we test.

**RW** asked what the potential maximum budget is? Would assessment of sites add a lot of cost? **GB** felt that the impact of sites assessment was something which should not add a lot of cost.

**DC** summarised the key points for discussion.

**GB** said can we get the providers to give basic guidance rather than detail, essentially can the traffic management measures work here?

**IH** said the main point were traffic management or alternative route, he felt traffic generated by housing was irrelevant.

**RW** expressed concern over availability of site 10. If site 10 is not included, this needs to be modelled. **IH** agreed that 'full' and 'partial' route options would need to be included.

**PR** commented that Pyrton NP are willing to contribute to modelling costs.

**JB** expressed his gratitude to DC for all his work preparing the document. He had 5 points to add:

1. What can we do for traffic in the town centre? AND/OR
2. What about an alternative route?
3. Through traffic has not increased since 2000, at a certain point people find an alternative route, would a new alternative route create more problems? If there is an adverse impact we need to know.
4. More houses will mean more traffic
5. If Willow Close is included then a traffic impact assessment will be needed.

**MR** expressed concern over increased traffic if the Chalgrove development goes ahead, especially if traffic wants to go South on the M40. OCC/SODC/HCA all need to model this but it will not happen in the next 2 months. **PR** said this could be raised at Thursday's meeting in Chalgrove.

**DC** asked the group if they agreed on the 3 elements to include on traffic management.

**JB** asked whether we could just ask what would work best. **DC** said it was best to be specific as otherwise the costs could spiral.

**TJ** asked whether the traffic lights would be in the centre of town or outside? **DC** said it could be either.

**MR** asked about whether there would be advice on road width? **GB** said guidance could be 6.3m.

**GB** asked the group if there was general agreement that an alternative route would not be for HGVs? Should it be 3.5t except for access? Eg school buses.

**DC** said that ANPR cameras were expected to be included. If this is the case a turnaround point would be needed.

**RW** reiterated the need to look/model either end of a route, e.g. what happens if 11+12 and 8+9 are developed but the route is not linked up. What are the positives and negatives of an alternative route. **IH** agreed this would be good evidence.

**MR** mentioned the influence of T-junctions in creating traffic problems and could this be modelled ?

There was a discussion over how traffic impact feeds into site selection.

**DC** raised whether we should include modelling with/without impact of Chalgrove?

SODC said to ignore it in terms of traffic assessment. **RW** said we have to bear in mind that we have a limited budget. **TB** raised whether we needed to consider extra traffic from Benson and Chinnor.

**JB** suggested that we ask for broad guidance or comments on these points.

**Action DC to edit document and circulate to the group. IH/JB to sign-off ready to email out on Thursday.**

Four providers identified. TPP and OCC be added once budget identified and spec modified if needed.

Action GB/TB to send DC description of further available data.

6. Review of Developer meeting Notes

**TB** pointed out that a paragraph was missing from the notes circulated.

**Action : RG to amend the document.**

**IH** had some corrections/comments and gave these to **TJ** for updating.

**Action RG** to chase response from Providence Land and then publish all documents on the website.

7. AOB

**IH** told the group that a formal complaint has been made and dealt with. He reminded the group to be careful when talking to the press.

**MR** stated that he had asked the Strategy group what response there would be to the Shadow NP group? **IH** stated that the PC approach was to ignore anonymous correspondence.

**PR** asked that the group review the selection of images he had circulated.

**Next Meetings:**

1<sup>st</sup> August 7:30 pm Parish Office. Steering Group

8<sup>th</sup> August 8pm Parish Office – SODC Preferred Options Response.

The meeting closed at 9:35pm.

---

1 Old School Place, Gorwell, Watlington, Oxon. OX49 5QH. Tel: 01491 613867.

Email: [wpc@watlington-oxon-pc.gov.uk](mailto:wpc@watlington-oxon-pc.gov.uk) Website: [www.watlington.org](http://www.watlington.org)