

Planning

GROVE AIRFIELD

DEVELOPMENT FORUM MINUTES

Wednesday 28th July 2021

MEETING DURATION: 10:00am – 11:20am

LOCATION: Virtual, Microsoft Teams

ATTENDEES (18)

VOWHDC

- **Paula Fox** – Development Manager (Large Sites)
- **Penny Silverwood** – Principal Planning Officer (Majors)
- **Sophie Milton** - Community Development Officer (Wantage & Grove)
- **Nathalie Power** – Assistant Planning Officer (*minutes*)

APPLICANT AND DEVELOPER TEAM (PERSIMMON)

- **Samuel Garland** - Planner
- **James Proyer** – Planning Manager
- **Wayne Jones** – Development Manager, Technical Matters

OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

- **Will Pedley** – Senior Transport Planner
- **Jason Sherwood** – Growth Manager (Highways)
- **Ryan Moore** – Senior Engineer, Road Agreements
- **Sarah Greenall** - Planning Obligations Officer

DEVELOPMENT FORUM MEMBERS

- **Cllr Jenny Hannaby**
- **Cllr Ron Batstone**
- **Julie Mabberley** - Wantage and Grove Campaign Group
- **Graham Mundy** – Clerk, Grove Parish Council
- **Frank Parnell** - Grove Parish Council
- **Hugh Rees** – Wantage Deanery (Oxford Diocese)
- **Gareth Smith** – HarBUG and Cycling UK Wantage

APOLOGIES (5)

- **Katherine Canavan** – Senior Planning Officer (Majors)
- **Ian Marshall** – Principal Transport Engineer
- **Reverend Chris Ashton** – Vale Benefice
- **Daniel Rolfe** – Grove Parish Council
- **June Stock** – Chair, Grove Parish Council

*This virtual meeting was recorded, with the permission of all attendees.
The following is a written summary of the topics discussed.*

Development Update & Discussion
Action Tasks

Page 02
Page 18

PERSIMMON DEVELOPMENT UPDATE		
TOPIC	INITIALS	COMMENTS MADE
WELLINGTON GATE	SG	<p><i>Please also refer to slides.</i></p> <p>Occupations (as of Monday 26th July) 320 total occupations; 233 private occupations 87 affordable occupations</p> <p>Persimmon Phase I (191 units) – Approved and substantially completed.</p> <p>Persimmon Phase 2 (119 units) - Approved and under construction.</p> <p>Persimmon Phase 3a (33 units) - Approved and under construction.</p> <p>Charles Church Phase I (55 units) – Approved and substantially completed.</p> <p>Charles Church Phase 2 (23 units) – Approved, and under construction.</p> <p>Persimmon Phase 3b (c. 169 units) A mixture of Charles Church and Persimmon dwellings. This parcel is the subject of a Reserved Matters application, submitted December 2020. A revised scheme was submitted on the 20th April 2021, and 21st June 2021. The application is currently in its final stages of determination.</p> <p>Persimmon Phase 4 / Charles Church 4 Application currently in preparation. Located north of Parcel 3b, and west of PP2. Site located within the ‘urban core’ character area.</p>
	JM	The application for the next phase (P3b) says that it will be determined under delegated authority. I thought all major applications had to go to Planning Committee?
	PS	Applications over 200 homes automatically go to Planning Committee. This application is not over 200 homes and there is no objection from the

		Parish Council so can be decided under delegated authority.
	GM	How many dwellings will be on PP4?
	SG	From 150 to 200, incorporating Charles Church and Persimmon properties. It is still in its draft stages, so I can't give you a precise figure.
SPORTS PITCHES AND FACILITIES (Development Obligation)	SG	<p>Replacement Sports Pitch Application Revised application for single replacement pitch and facilities (changing rooms, car parks and landscaping) submitted to the Vale on the 1st April. Additional information clarified the pitch surface drainage report and pitch maintenance. Application is in its final stages of determination.</p> <p>Additional New Sports Pitches Currently preparing reserved matters application for additional pitches. Pitches will comprise of a training pitch, junior pitch, senior pitch and smaller pitch. Due to be submitted later this year now.</p>
	JM	<i>Please see full comments below regarding</i> Delayed Delivery of Infrastructure [Page 6]
ROADS AND DRAINAGE (Development Obligation)	SG	Road & Drainage Infrastructure Application submitted for this in June 2021 and is currently in its consultation period. Incorporates some of the roads north of Parcel P3b and some off-site drainage infrastructure, such as the swale and attenuation basins.
SCHOOL PROVISION (Development Obligation)	SG	Primary School 1: Development Brief Development brief submitted in April (to discharge Condition 9 of Outline Consent). Awaiting a formal consultation response from OCC Education.
	HR	Have you got any indication on the timescale for this?
	SG	We have an agreed transfer date of June 2023. That is a formally agreed date. To reach that stage, we are required to have the development brief approved as an outline. A more detailed application would be submitted in due course for consultation.
	JM	<i>Please see full comments below regarding</i> Delayed Delivery of Infrastructure [Page 6]

LOCALLY EQUIPPED AREA OF PLAY (LEAP) (Development Obligation)	SG	LEAP & Open Space First play area located west of Phase 2 is under construction. Landscaping has been planted in and is being established at the moment.
	JM	<i>Please see full comments below regarding</i> Delayed Delivery of Infrastructure [Page 6]
TEMPORARY COMMUNITY FACILITY (Development Obligation)	SG	Deed of Variation (DOV) currently in Review Persimmon are finalising the Financial Contributions towards renting of meeting space to be rented. The revised DOV of the Section 106 is being reviewed by Persimmon's Solicitors.
	HR	Have you got any indication of timescale for this?
	SG	The DOV for the S106 is at an advanced stage now. We have received the final draft from the Legal representatives now, so we anticipate we'll be able to send that back in the next 5-10 working days.
	PS	Following discussions on the sports pitch application - there will need to be further amendments to some of the definitions in relation to the sports pitches within the documents, to correct errors within the S106 as is. It makes sense to do that as part of the DOV that is currently open. That will delay that DOV being formalised while we resolve those matters.
	PS	Graham Mundy has additionally put in a request for some contributions to go directly to the Parish, rather than through the District Council, given the Parish's agreement to take on facilities. I need to review the feedback from our solicitor and then I will come back to you Graham. The idea is to wrap this up all in one DOV. That might delay the issuing of it in relation to the Community commuted sum. However, that sum will still be secured.
LOCAL CENTRE (Development Obligation)	SG	Local Centre Development Brief Was due to be submitted prior to 250 occupations, and the land is required to be marketed by the 500 th occupation. Persimmon finalising the brief so that it may be circulated and consulted upon. This final design will be put on the website and circulated to members.

	HR	How long will it be until this is available for comment?
	SG	We are hoping this year. We are currently having discussions about how far to progress the brief, prior to formal submission. We are considering whether we produce a simpler scaled-back brief open for everyone to comment on and then following advice we scale it up to a full document. We're hopeful this year we'll be progressing that, to be online for comment.
S278 WORKS & ROADWORK SIGNAGE (Development Obligation)	SG	<p>Section 278 works along Denchworth Road, Cane Lane and Mably Way Roundabout are ongoing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Area 5 (section joining Cane Lane) is complete. Now awaiting a review of the recent Road Safety Audit. ▪ Area 6 (section from the old layby to Mably Way roundabout) has approx. 3-4 weeks remaining <p>Agreed with OCC that traffic management can be in place from the 16th August, with an estimated completion date for the end of October.</p>
	FP	Along the new road, or the realigned Denchworth road that's being constructed, it appears the footpath and cycleway stop halfway along.
	PS	The path switches sides as discussed in previous Forums.
	FP	Halfway along Denchworth road? I thought it was going to be alongside the recreation ground all the way along until where the road realigns – where the keep left signs are currently. So you have to cross over that road twice?
	PS	Persimmon or OCC may have a better update for you, but my understanding is that it crossed over.
	FP	Also, if you were walking along the footpath, from the entrance to the recreation ground by the skate park, to what is labelled Cane Lane (but shouldn't be) – it's all just earth. You have to cross over the road and cross back again.
	PS	I will get the latest 278 plans and attach them along with the minutes.


	FP	The new road sign says 'Cane Lane', but that was renamed 'Recreation Lane' some years ago to avoid confusion for sat navs going to the rugby club and sports facilities. Why does the sign still say Cane Lane?
	GM	There is a consultation going out to rename 'Cane Lane' to 'Recreation Lane', and that is a temporary sign that Persimmon put up to make sure that the sign stand was the correct size. It will be changed back to Recreation Lane.
	FP	The path along Newlands Drive between the zebra crossing by Savile Way and the first road into the new estate, the old hedgerow there is overgrowing the new footpath. Who is responsible for that? And can they cut it back? You get scratched by the brambles.
	RM	The works along Newlands Drive are not yet signed off and adopted so the maintenance of that would be down to Persimmon Homes.
	SG	I will relay that to my construction colleagues, thank you.
ON SITE CONCERNS RAISED WITH PERSIMMON	SG	<p>A couple of issues were raised with us;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Street signs (Boston Close) Temporary sign erected. New signs will be delivered in approximately two weeks. ▪ Swale Maintenance (Boston Close) Instruction has been sent to litter pick the swale weekly and works in scheduled in to have the swale landscaped. ▪ Newland Drive Cycle Lanes Acknowledge that the cycle lanes measure 1.2 metres when they should measure 1.5 metres. Persimmon are in discussion with the on-site ground workers.
	CIlr RB	Thank you for your response on Boston Close, I'll be watching that and responding to my constituents.
DELAYED DELIVERY OF INFRA-STRUCTURE	JM	According to the triggers, the first pitch was supposed to be delivered by 50 occupations. The next ones by 500 occupations. The first LEAP should have been in place at 150 occupations, the Primary School is meant to be delivered by 400 occupations, the first 5 hectares of strategic

	<p>open space by 500 occupations and the allotments by 500 occupations.</p> <p>We've got 320 occupations, and no agreed application on the sports pitches. At this rate we are not going to meet these targets. What is happening here? We are getting all of the houses and none of the infrastructure delivered on time.</p>
SG	<p>We understand the S106 requirements – the sports pitch was meant to be delivered at 50 occupations. The application has been in with VOWHDC for over a year, and it is required to go through a period of negotiation and consultation to make sure the facility and supporting facilities are to the correct standard and of a high quality for the community. We are in the final stages, and there is potential for the pitch to be available this year.</p>
JM	<p>This is not good enough.</p>
SG	<p>The construction of the LEAP is underway. We just need to make sure the landscaping is in place.</p>
JM	<p>I'm sorry Sam but this is not good enough. If the first pitch was due to be delivered by 50 occupations, then the application should have gone in at the very beginning of the development. 50 occupations came within the first 9 months.</p> <p>These applications are not going in early enough and you are not responding to comments fast enough. There has to be some compensation for the residents of this new development, who are not getting the infrastructure they were promised, when the original contracts were signed. You signed a contract you are supposed to meet it.</p>



	SG	<p>I understand, I wouldn't say there was any particular concern raised from residents in terms of the infrastructure not being delivered. It is difficult to deliver the infrastructure exactly on time, but we have been proactive in getting the applications in and progressing them with the Council. The main thing is that the facilities are delivered to a high standard, we are not trying to rush anything.</p> <p>The facilities for the pitch have been built, they are ready to be delivered upon the planning permission being granted. The LEAP is in its final stages, we are just establishing the landscaping at the moment.</p>
	JM	<p>Can I ask the Council if there are any enforcement conditions that could be put in place to ensure that we get the infrastructure on time?</p>
	PF	<p>We are working with Persimmon to get delivery as close to the occupations as we can. The developer team would have heard the frustration that these targets haven't been met this morning.</p>
	PS	<p>In terms of the first pitch - this has been discussed at numerous forums. Forum members will be well aware of the delay. At the time it was discussed that the need for the replacement pitch was linked to the loss of the training pitch on Denchworth Road. There was an agreement from the Developer that those works wouldn't continue until the application had been approved. Those works have been carried out, so we have lost the training area before the replacement pitch has been delivered.</p> <p>The pitch application has been complicated, linked to issues with the S106, pitch size, drainage issues. This has been hampered by the pitch being constructed before permission is granted. It has also been hampered by lack of pre-app from Persimmon. We are in the final stages with this pitch application, we are just awaiting feedback from the sports pitch consultant on the outstanding drainage concerns which can hopefully be resolved.</p>

	As an aside, I am disappointed that we are not going to get a pre-app for the second round of pitches either. The progress of this application would have been a lot smoother had these issues been resolved through a pre-app process.
JM	So the pitch is only 2 years late, and nobody cares. This is ridiculous.
PF	We hear the frustration Julie, but it isn't the case that we don't care. Obviously we will endeavour to move the situation forward, and hopefully the developer will have heard your feedback this morning and will want to work with us.
SG	In terms of the sports pitches, we are not ruling out a pre-app this stage. We will need to look at our occupation triggers and gain a better understanding of how long it will take to deliver the pitches on the ground, in terms of trying to meet that 500 occupation trigger as soon as possible. If that timescale would be achievable with pre-app included, then we would certainly be amenable to it. We are 320 occupations, 180 shy of the 500. It is our intention to get that infrastructure delivered by 500.
JM	Does that include the allotments and the strategic open space? You have said the LEAP is almost ready but looking at the pictures that is not the case – it should have been delivered after 150 occupations.
SG	That was an aerial image from a drone taken some months ago. Unfortunately, I do not have an up-to-date photo, but the landscaping is in place and is currently being established. The play area has progressed since that photo was taken.
JM	Shouldn't the allotments and strategic open space be laid out now so that everything can settle before it's handed over at 500?
SG	The landscaping elements will need a planning permission in place. As parcels progress there will be a degree of open space attributed to each parcel. Parcel P3b does have a southern section of the runway corridor. This is not 5 hectares, but the remaining pitches will equate to 3.74 hectares.


JM	The pitches are separate from the public open space.
SG	I will check this. I understand that the pitches are included in the open space to be transferred to the Parish Council.
JP	<p>We do understand the frustrations with the infrastructure delivery. Obviously, the playing pitch has had its own issues and hopefully we can learn from this – we wouldn't expect an application to be in for over a year, and that contributes towards delayed delivery. We will try to make sure that this doesn't happen this time around.</p> <p>In terms of the triggers for the allotments and second pitches we, Persimmon, will go away and look again at the timings of applications, determination dates and delivery, so we can be sure that the triggers can be met.</p>
HR	Could I ask about the scout and youth accommodation that was meant to come in at 250 occupations?
PS	I think that was a contribution Hugh, not delivery.
Cllr JHby	<p>I hope it is not the Officers of the Vale who have been lax on this. Can we raise our games a bit please. If you can't, could we have a reason why there is slippage? We know we've had covid, we know it's been difficult working under these standards, developers maybe not had the labour, but it would be good to have a reason.</p> <p>I understand as part of the County Stakeholder Group that there is slippage from primary school – let's get on, an ensure there is not further slippage. And then of course with the interference of the Department for Education with the delivery of the secondary school, there will be delivery about 2024.</p> <p>Do developers feel that there might be a slippage due to lack of materials/ labourers? Is it interfering with the continuation of build?</p>

	SG	Material deliveries is a nationwide problem, but there has not been any problem with the building and delivery of the housing. At present we are not anticipating any delays in terms of delivery of properties.
CYCLE INFRA-STRUCTURE	PF	Gareth Smith has submitted a separate document on cycling infrastructure, with 4 key discussion points, which Penny will take us through;
CYCLE PATHS AND PARKING CONFLICT ALONG LIBERATOR LANE	PS	<p>Cycle Paths & Parking Conflict along Liberator Lane</p> <p>This has been discussed at the last two forum meetings and is something that both Persimmon and OCC are aware of. In the last meeting, it was agreed that the developers would double the number of cycle path markings and paint a solid white line adjacent to it. From Gareth's photographs and my site visit, that hasn't yet happened.</p>
		 <p>Photographs: Gareth Smith</p>
	SG	It is difficult for me to comment on this. This is something that we will need to take away and pick up with construction manager Ben Hale. Apologies that this has not been completed yet, it is something we will look to do.
	GS	Thank you. In Didcot, along the Wantage Road, the developer has produced a leaflet given to the local residents explaining the utilisation of the cycle lanes. They were pleased how few people parked in the cycle lanes following this distribution. I could provide a copy of this leaflet if that is helpful, this document is positive in its approach.

	PS	This idea was discussed at the last forum and the travel plan coordinator Ben Maliphant said that it would be possible to include this information within the travel pack.
	SG	We also discussed having the websites updated. The websites haven't been updated yet, but I will ensure that that is progressed.
	WP	I think that is a really good idea. If it were possible, could you send me a digital copy of that leaflet, that would be really helpful. I can then forward that to our travel plans team and they can get in touch with Ben Maliphant if needs be. Gareth Smith to send Didcot leaflet to OCC
	JM	Do the travel plans only go out to new residents, or do they go out to existing residents? The existing residents are the ones already parking on the cycle paths.
	SM	Ben Maliphant has said that they were looking to do an additional newsletter, which would go out to all residents.
	PF	There is a requirement for all residents to receive a travel pack, but it does make sense for all residents to receive any updates.
	JM	It needs to be a separate document, rather than reissuing the same document with amendments – if you've already moved in, you'll be less likely to look at it.
	SG	Yes, an update like this would be best incorporated into a newsletter and online, I will discuss with Ben Maliphant.
NEW CYCLE LANES	PS	Issues with newly installed cycle infrastructure Gareth has raised that the new cycle path marked on the access road to the sports pitches is only 80cm wide, which is narrower than the minimum required.

	<p>RM</p> <p>We had a look at this yesterday, having a look at the drawings, that hasn't been implemented as per the drawing. 80cm is from the edge of the carriageway, whereas it should measure 1.2 metres.</p> <p>This was put in to allow cyclists to safely cycle along this section of road. This wasn't on the original planning approved scheme. This was just to provide a safer route for cyclists to use, rather than using the carriageway. Perhaps Wayne can take this way and discuss this with the contractors.</p>
	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;">   </div> <p>Photographs: <i>Gareth Smith</i></p>
	<p>GS</p> <p>That cycle path is utterly useless. You come up against all the bits of tree sticking out. It should be a minimum of 1.5 metres, and not up against the bushes like this.</p> <p>I'm also not sure why a road that goes to a car park needs a cycle lane on one side. It is redundant, I think it should be removed. I'm also not sure why it only runs along one side.</p>
	<p>RM</p> <p>It doesn't just serve a car park - it connects to the old section of Denchworth road where it linked on to Cane Lane. That's becoming a cyclist/ pedestrian shared zone, so there is that link to wider Grove. We'll have a discussion with Persimmon and if it's agreed that it should be removed, it will be.</p>

	<p>Cllr JHby Is 1.8m not the government standard cycle lane width. Why are we putting the minimum when we could be putting the maximum? Have we not got an active travel agenda?</p> <p>I made a request previously to Yvonne Constance that the spur road coming off of Cane lane did have a cycle track and was looked at with active travel in mind. Now we're saying what's there is useless anyway. Why was the road not constructed with a cycle lane in the first place?</p> <p>It's very frustrating when things are asked for and nothing happens. Can we listen to our campaign groups and get things done. There's nothing worse than going back to developers and asking for it to be done again when it should have been done properly in the first place.</p>
	<p>RM My role is to implement what's approved at the planning stage. We do try to ask for additional things during the technical approval process. However please bear in mind that 1.5 metres was the minimum width 3 years ago when we were looking at this scheme. There were no cycle lanes proposed along there initially. Persimmon, to be fair to them, provided additional cycle lanes and two zebra crossings along Newlands Drive, which were never part of the original approved scheme. We have definitely bettered the scheme.</p>
	<p>Cllr JHby Yes fine, well Persimmon probably realised that they needed to do that and we thank them for it. But if we're going to do things, can we please do it to County guidelines for active travel.</p>
	<p>PS As Ryan has highlighted, when this was approved three years ago, 1.5 metres was the standard.</p>
	<p>Cllr JHby I know it was the standard then, but you're building it now.</p>
	<p>PS Unfortunately, this is the way planning system works, we can't continually ask the developer to meet the current standards if they change once they've been granted outline permission.</p>
	<p>Cllr JHby This is the worry. It is so frustrating, but we have an active travel agenda now so let's hope we can find some agreement.</p>

	PF	We understand your point and your frustration. In terms of what we can enforce, it goes back to an approved permission. We hope to work with the developer where we can.
LEFT HAND TURN ON TO CANE LANE	PS	Gareth has also raised that the left-hand turn for the cycle infrastructure on Cane Lane is a tight angle for cyclists.
	RM	I have discussed this with the site inspector and the contractor. It looks like it has been built to the drawing but there do appear to be slight discrepancies. It is being investigated and if it is not correct, it will be changed. As a minimum, we are looking to move the bollard back a bit more, out of the way of the cyclists.
		 <p>Photograph: Gareth Smith</p>
	RM	It is a tight radius, but it has been designed like that to slow everyone down in that general vicinity.
	GS	As a cyclist finding new infrastructure newly built that you can't ride along, this is just soul destroying. Why couldn't this just be a straight section, making it easier for the cyclists. That would encourage cyclists to use it. I am happy to meet with someone and we can test it with our bikes. It doesn't join up, that little bit of cycle track doesn't link with the cycle path on the side of the road, there's no dropped kerb. The whole thing doesn't link.
ACCESS TO THE SECONDARY SCHOOL	PS	Summarised Gareth's review and suggestions regarding cycle access to and from the future secondary school. It would be useful for the points Gareth has made to be on the radar of

		OCC and ESFA so that they can be taken into consideration.
	WP	Thank you, Gareth, for your review of those access issues. It will be helpful when Ian and I are reviewing the application for the secondary school.
	PS	I will forward Gareth's comments on to colleagues at OCC Education who can forward it to the ESFA so that it can be considered prior to the consultation on the secondary school application.
USE OF DENCHWORTH SHARED INFRA- STRUCTURE	PS	We have discussed at previous forums that the issues with the provision of cycle infrastructure along Denchworth Road have stemmed from the ransom land strips, hence why the infrastructure starts on one side and swaps to the other. A cyclist has the option to use the infrastructure and also use the road.
	WP	There has been some discussion with one of my colleagues and the Parish Council. I am investigating where that got to – that was surrounding the provision of a controlled crossing. I will see if that can be progressed any further.
		Regarding the design of the roundabout, Ryan confirmed that the section 278 for that roundabout was signed a while ago. There is not immediate scope to change that design at the moment, but it is being reviewed. We are looking for opportunities to upgrade it, as it is along the main north to south cycle route. Unfortunately, it comes back to the point that permissions were granted a number of years ago, and in today's context we may have done things differently. That's not an excuse, but an explanation of how we've got to where we are now.
	GM	Sam made reference to a safety audit along the completed section of Denchworth Road in his presentation. Does that include cycle and pedestrian safety?
	WJ	It encompasses all road users.

	RM	The safety audit will encompass every aspect, vehicles, cyclists, pedestrians, partially sighted, less able people. It considers every part.
VIRTUAL VS. IN PERSON FORUMS	FP	With Government restrictions lifting, we ought to look at how we can get back to in person meetings. I don't see why we can't get back to that.
	PF	I will have a discussion with Frank and Graham about the practicalities of arranging that.
A.O.B S106 CONTRIBUTIONS	HR	Reverend John Durant and myself had a very productive meeting with Beth Elkins and Mark Hewer on Monday. Unfortunately, Sophie Milton wasn't able to join that meeting - but we are looking to arrange a meeting with her in due course.
	Cllr JHby	It would be really good to let us have a S106 breakdown, about what's coming up? Especially for Councillors who have got to look after all of their residents. It would be good to know when all the triggers are coming.
	PS	I have sent this previously - I can circulate it again.
A.O.B CIRCULATION OF MINUTES	JM	Thank you for the minutes, they are very comprehensive, I really appreciate them – but can we have them sooner please?
	PS	Yes, apologies. Unfortunately, caseloads are very high and resources extremely tight at the moment. This just slipped down my work priorities. Apologies for that, but we will do our best for the next lot of minutes.
NEXT MEETING DATES	PS	Friday 29th October 2021 Wednesday 26th January 2022 Friday 29th April 2022 Wednesday 27th July 2022 Friday 28th October 2022

ACTION ITEMS		
INITIALS	TOPIC / TASK(S)	TARGET DATE
GENERAL		
PS, SG	PowerPoint slides to be circulated, with minutes	DONE
PS	GS's cycle infrastructure comments to be recirculated with minutes	DONE
PS	S106 Contributions to be circulated, with minutes	DONE
SPORTS PITCHES		
SG	SG to check the arrangement of the 5ha of strategic public open space and confirm whether the (3.74ha of) sports pitches form part of the allocated POS, following JM's query.	ASAP
SUBMISSION OF PRE-APP & APPLICATIONS		
SG, JP	Persimmon to review the timings of application submission in respect of projected application determination and subsequent delivery of remaining infrastructure across the site, to ensure that triggers are more closely met going forwards.	Ongoing
LOCAL CENTRE DEVELOPMENT BRIEF		
SG, JP, SM	To compile details of Local Centre Development Brief for GADF members to provide feedback on. Parish and Campaign Group are to be notified and plans are to be made public on the public Wellington Gate website. Co-ordination may be needed with Sophie Milton . SG to confirm timescales.	29 th October 2021
278 AGREEMENTS WORKS/ REALIGNMENT OF DENCHWORTH RD		
PS	To circulate the approved S278 plans with the minutes, following FP's query regarding the crossing over the footpath and cycleway. <i>NOTE: numerous on-site changes have been made which are not reflected in the latest plans attached. Seeking a summary of changes from OCC.</i>	DONE
SG	To contact on-site construction colleagues with regards to maintaining the overgrown hedge along the new Newlands Drive footpath, following FP's query.	ASAP
ACTIVE TRAVEL; CYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE		
SG	To follow up with Ben Hale regarding the works Persimmon had agreed to do to the cycle lane along Liberator Lane (e.g. increased cycle path markings, a solid white line).	ASAP

SG, JP, (BM)	SG to follow up with Ben Maliphant on progress of the newsletter and updates on website. It was previously discussed that Persimmon would add reminders to the current Persimmon website, specific travel website, newsletter and current monitoring packs - actively discouraging residents from parking in dedicated cycle lanes.	29 th October 2021
GS, WP (OCC)	GS to circulate digital copy of the leaflet from the Wantage Road, Didcot cycle path example, so WP (OCC) may forward to the Travel Plans Team also.	29 th October 2021
RM (OCC), SG	RM to discuss the new (80cm) cycle path with Persimmon and confirm to members whether it is to be rectified or removed.	ASAP
PS, WP (OCC)	PS to forward GS's comments on to OCC Education , and the ESFA by extension, so that the access to the secondary school in particular could be carefully reviewed with GS's comments in mind.	DONE
NEXT FORUM MEETING; VIRTUAL VS. IN-PERSON		
PF	To discuss with GM and FP the practicalities of hosting the GDF in person and to confirm to members as soon as possible.	ASAP