



Kingsmere Residents' Association Meeting minutes

Date: Thursday 28 January 2016, 19:00 – 20:45
Venue: The Round, St Edburg's School, Kingsmere

Attendees

Graham Brogden (GB) – Co-chair, Fiona Chalk (FC) – Communications, Iain MacRae, John Bentley (JB), Mandy Bentley (MB), Ayad Ahmad (AA), Councillor Richard Mould – Bicester Town Council (RM), Dave Howard, Ann Howard, Vickie Zielinskie – Cherwell District Council (VZ), Bob Mott (BM), Barbara Mott, Donna Khan, Alam Khan, Tom Lloyd, Mike Henderson, Michael Cowley, Megan Cowley, Tori Sayce, Sarah Ross, Marcus Gilbert, Lyn Gilbert, Mike Cornes, Jules Gough, David Penhallurick, Matt Maunder, Debbie, Mark, Dan Kimpton, Suman Sharpe, Kit Sharpe, Alexandra Crofts, Steve Hart, G Carter, Mick Irving, Sheila Irving, Phil McMillan, Bryan Taunton, Steve Sheridan, Sharon Murray, Nicola Galleor, Margaret Greenhill, Char Alfoadari, Talal Alfoadari (TL), Rito Dipto, Katya Miles, Ally Pearce, Naomi Lilwall (NL), Chris Stratford – Cherwell District Council (CS), Linda Barlow – Cherwell District Council (LB), Margaret Kunzer – St Edburg's School (MK)

1.1 Welcome and introductions

All attendees were welcomed to the meeting by KRA Communications Coordinator FC, and FC stated that the agenda was being rearranged due to guest attendees' time constraints.

1.2 Apologies

Apologies noted from: Cllr Ian Hudspeth, Viki Heil (Co-Chair), James Hiscott (Treasurer), Scott Young (SY) – Countryside Properties, Richard Herbert (RH), Mary Herbert (MH), Przemyslaw Rybka (PR), David Lydiat, Claire Pickett, Duncam Lilwall (DL)

1.3 Minutes from previous meeting

Minutes from previous meeting (10/09/15) reviewed & agreed.

1.4 Matters arising from previous minutes

Action points & updates to be covered within meeting agenda.

2.0 Community Centre update

Chris Stratford and Linda Barlow attended the meeting with Vickie Zielinski to provide an overview of the community buildings situation for CDC. There are multiple community buildings across the CDC district, with some older buildings needing significant improvement, but there are obvious financial restrictions. A consultant has been employed by CDC to gather information about all existing community centres across the district, including general state, cost to run, maintenance and usage. This report will be presented to members of CDC to enable decision-making for the future of community centre buildings across the district. At present there are 10-11 buildings at various stages of planning/build, and one of these is the Kingsmere Community Centre. CS acknowledged that

there may have been rumours circulating about potential plans for community centres, but at present the consulting company have not presented the report so until facts are established no plans will be made.

Someone from the team will return to update Kingsmere Residents about the planning of management for the community building on the site at a future meeting, when progress has been made with the build planning side, and firm dates for build and completion are known.

Mark Baines (Architect) updated the meeting concerning the Kingsmere Community Centre and Local Centre.

General

- 43 car parking spaces with landscaping.
- Covered cycle parking is confirmed, and further uncovered cycle parking has also been added to the plan (which will need agreement from CDC planning).
- 5 retail units – 1 larger ‘convenience’ store and 4 smaller retail spaces.
- A commercial nursery.
- Recycling areas at side/rear with small area for parking.
- Public access at the front and works access/deliveries at the rear of the shops, etc.
- Main walkway leading through to a central point formed by the centre of the nursery building.
- One way traffic to parking areas with access from the school road and exit onto Whitelands Way.
- At the front of the local centre will be a public square between the community centre and the parking with trees/bushes planted to break up the area.
- A post box will be part of the scheme.
- Building materials are being reviewed and are planned to be low maintenance, predominantly brick built and possibly 2 tones to give the civic building a robust look to create a landmark area on Kingsmere. However planners are advocating rendering as this follows the Kingsmere Design Code.
- Additionally planners are advocating offices or flats over the shops to create further height.

Community Building

- The community building will link directly to the road the school is on, with frontage to both the main spine road and the school road.
- The community building will be over 2 floors. It will be split into 2 areas downstairs – a dedicated youth wing with a variety of spaces, and a community centre.
- The youth wing will have a small coffee area, storage, an informal youth space and meeting room, a secure walled garden space and an external tarmac area to the rear.
- The community centre will have a café area, hall area, kitchen, office, storage, toilets and other facilities.
- The upstairs of the community centre will have 2 further meeting rooms that can be used flexibly, and will have their own small kitchenette area and either storage or toilet facilities. This will be fully accessible via a lift.
- The hall will cater for approx. 220 seated in a theatre style, could be used flexibly and can link to outside terraced areas and the front area of the local area depending on event.
- Internally the design will attempt to avoid hard lines and aim to create an interesting space.

MB stated that currently the Local centre had outline planning agreed and that the final planning (Reserved Matters) was likely to be reviewed only by planners in mid Feb 2016 and would not go to

a committee review meeting. Residents can provide their feedback to the planning department, and the reference for the plans is - 15/02103/REM

Feedback can be given to the planners - by post - Linda Griffiths - Planning Officer, CDC, Bodicote House, Bodicote, Banbury OX15 4AA or by email to - linda.griffiths@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Questions addressed in the meeting

- Concerns were raised about the parking spaces if there were to be offices/flats above the shops. MB stated that the parking space numbers are limited by planning guidelines from CDC so will not increase in number.
- A query was raised about why planners are suggesting raising the height of the local area when part of the reason that the Retail Park was refused was due to excess height. Also, concern was expressed that adding height to the buildings would decrease the impact of the local centre. RM strongly suggested that feedback was offered to CDC planners about this issue if residents felt strongly.
- When will the work start on site? MB stated that, due to the delay in plans, work should start on site towards the end of 2016 with completion of the Community building by the end of 2017. This will be the first part of the local centre to be completed.
- It was asked if there are any specific retailers interested in the units? MB stated that there is a company interested in the large convenience store but that he could not disclose who this was at present.
- It was asked if the planners could be invited to discuss this issue to ensure residents' views would be included. GB stated that planners and councillors have been invited to site before to discuss other issues and have declined invites. MB reminded all present that the planners role is to try to follow design codes and planning that has already been agreed, and they are just doing their jobs.
- It was asked if wind was expected to present a problem for the local centre as this is an issue on site. MB stated that, as Kingsmere grows and more is built on site, wind will become less of an issue across the development.
- It was asked if there was a plan for how the café in the community centre would be run. MB answered that there were no plans at present, but this is the sort of issue that would benefit from residents' input going forward, and that the organisation of the community centre going forward could be a massive undertaking.

A KRA working group has been formed to look at the plans for community centre organisation and usage going forward. Please contact Viki Heil via email if you are interested in getting involved with the Community Centre planning – Viki@kingsmerecommunity.com

Action: RM will follow up with CDC re: potential of use of accommodation over shops as 'half way' housing

3.0 Bicester Town Council update

Councillor Richard Mould attended the meeting to discuss any relevant issues raised.

Bicester Retail Park – RM stated that this was recommended for refusal by the planning officer as it was not felt to be in tune with the local plan. Traffic was an issue due to the existing junctions for the new Tesco and Premier Inn which are already causing problems. The developer has appealed the decision made by the CDC planning committee so RM could not comment further. At present no date has been confirmed for when this would be reviewed. RM stated that Bicester Town council is not 'anti-shops' but that there is a need to protect the Town Centre. Additionally the height of the shops was an issue as they would have been taller than the nearby 3-storey homes. RM acknowledged that planning was a balancing act and that shops were wanted.

It was raised that the retail park would have been situated off a dual carriageway whereas the town did not have this capacity. RM answered that, although the main part of town did not have this capacity, there were other areas nearer to town that were an option, e.g. the Launton Road. Additionally as the A41 is a main route into Bicester, heavy traffic could impact the larger area around the town. He also commented that, as the consultation has just finished on the plans for the potential A41 diversion for Aylesbury bound traffic, alongside the longer term potential of the Garden Town status provision of a 2nd M40 junction for Bicester, there was a lot unknown about the A41 use in the long term.

A query was raised about the perception that there is a bidding war for traffic flow and Bicester Village appears to win every time? RM stated that BV has had problems with traffic which they have had to deal with through investment for their expansion to happen. Works start in February 2016 for the new access route to BV with an associated increase to 2 lanes into the parking areas. This should move more traffic off the roads around BV and into the BV site.

A statement was made that there seemed to be over emphasis on BV versus the rest of Bicester Community areas. RM disagreed with this statement.

A statement was made that if planning rejections aren't explained in the context of longer term plans, people cannot understand why the decisions are made. The support for the Town Centre is understood, but there seemed to be ongoing problems with empty retail units. RM acknowledged this and also agreed that there were empty units in Banbury and it still hadn't seen the full impact of the Banbury Gate Retail Centre. RM also stated that there were high rents on the premises in Bicester.

Free parking in town was suggested as a solution to help the poor facilities at present. RM stated that there are 2 hours of free parking at Sainsbury's, and that the cost of parking would just go on to the Council Tax if all parking was made free of charge. It was discussed that it can take up to 20 mins to access the parking at Sainsbury's due to the issue of traffic movement into Bicester Town. RM acknowledged that there was an issue in the Town Centre and the success of Sainsbury's parking and shopping. Bicester Town Council has asked for a review of the phasing of the lights and organisation of traffic movement in and out of the car park.

Another resident asked about the problems trying to leave the MSR over the Kings End/Oxford Road junction? RM stated that it was hoped that, in the long term, drivers will be encouraged to use the Bicester Ring Road and other routes. RM was then asked about the possibility of further cycle lanes being installed to allow safe access to the town and also what could be done to address the lack of independent and interesting shops, cafes, etc.

RM stated that cycle paths were difficult because of the layout of Bicester as a whole and the challenges of the very old buildings. RM acknowledged that Bicester has changed a lot in the past 30 years and most independent and family run shops, etc. have closed for a variety of reasons.

Finally RW was asked what could be done to encourage more growth in Bicester. GB acknowledged it would be difficult for the Council to challenge greedy landlords and that they should introduce free parking like Witney across the town.

GB thanked RM for his time at the meeting.

4.0 Middleton Stoney Road

RM provided some context on the planning of the traffic calming on the MSR. Outline planning was agreed in 2005/6 for all of Kingsmere and this included the traffic calming although these were not

defined at the time. When outline planning is agreed at Planning Committee level, reserved matters (the details) do not come back as the outline has been agreed. The 16 humps that were planned for the MSR in 2014 by OCC/Highways were opposed by Bicester Town Council and Cherwell District Council. However the decision was made to install them and there has been no movement since. The reason for the position of the speedbumps on the road is that they cannot be located closer to the cycle lane. All possible alternatives have been explored. RM also stated that, in the longer term, there could be other plans for better cycle lanes on the MSR. GB also clarified that the KRA had lodged a formal objection to the plans in 2014 opposing the pillows/humps, and suggesting alternative traffic calming measures, but these suggestions were rejected.

Questions addressed

- Would a 20mph limit be better along MSR? RM stated that the speed limit would need enforcing and that would be another issue.
- Who could residents speak to about the cycle lane? This is part of the long term plan, however parts of Bicester Town are very old, so it could be very difficult but all options are being reviewed.
- A statement was made that the humps were the worst allocation of funding – they were dangerous to cyclists, pedestrians and drivers. This is also an issue for car suspensions and drivers who want to protect them as they are expensive to repair. Drivers are avoiding the bumps and using the cycle lane or driving too close to the centre of the road which is an issue for drivers in the other lane. RM answered that the humps were planned and already paid for.
- Would like to see full cross-road safe humps replace the existing humps? RM acknowledged that Bucknell Village uses this approach. GB stated that there seemed to be inconsistencies across Oxfordshire even between Bicester and Banbury.
- Whitelands Way has a 20mph limit but it is not observed and there are no signs from the Vendee Road end? FC stated that Countryside has been made aware of this issue and they will be taking this forward.
- What can Bicester Town Council do about MSR? RM stated that they have been out voted in decisions about MSR, but the issue will be monitored and this will be ongoing. GB stated that Councillor Hudspeth from OCC (Leader of Oxfordshire County Council) and Linda Griffiths (responsible Planner) had been invited to review the MSR and had either declined or didn't respond.

RM stated that the new Town Centre Community Building opens in March with the Library opening in April. There will be a series of events in town in July for the official opening and he encouraged all residents to join in the celebrations.

MK stated that they had raised the issue of the positioning of the crossings from a school perspective and that someone from the council had come to site and issues have been discussed. Once the road humps/crossing/lighting are all complete, there will be a safety audit with parents from the school and residents. RM stated that the access to the school/Pioneers Way via the A41 is being reviewed, but at present there is no pathway.

GB suggested that the ongoing MSR issues could be added into the WWAG remit along with other traffic/parking issues, but this would need to be explored with the group lead.

NL offered to provide feedback on DL's attendance at the planning meeting in November 2015 where the planning for the Sports Pavilion was discussed. RM clarified that the pavilion and sports facilities plans are from the developers and go to the Cherwell Exec. Cost is obviously a challenge for any plans. The access from Whitelands Way was left unchanged from original plans as there is no alternative because parking for these types of facilities cannot be accessed from a main road such as

Vendee Drive. RM also stated that changes had been made to plans as a result of residents' feedback to address potential noise issues from a balcony.

NL highlighted that the crossing point to/from the schools at the bus turning point on WW (which could have up to 600 children using it) will have cars turning out of the parking access to the pavilion straight onto it. Other points raised were that the 3 traffic studies were undertaken 10-20 years ago, there is no parking provision for coaches on the pavilion site and the pavilion size is relatively small for the number of pitches. RM answered that planning conditions have to be satisfied, but acknowledged that these did not address the issues raised.

GB asked if RM could take the issue forward to see what could be done.

It was asked what residents could do to improve the representation of the voice of Bicester Town Councillors? RM stated that the councillors could only put forward their views, but how the plans are represented by planners may or may not take these opinions into account. He stated that all anyone could do was to ensure that they make their feelings known about planning. He also suggested that concerns could be addressed to Calvin Bell (DCD Director of Development).

Action: KRA committee to discuss with Claire Pickett. Feedback mechanism to OCC on MSR safety audit to be confirmed and shared with all residents - Strategy and Infrastructure Planning, Oxfordshire County Council, Speedwell House, Speedwell Street, Oxford OX1 1NE. GB asked RM to see if he could influence planners attending a KRA meeting to explain decision making process to residents behind planning decisions.

5.0 Overview of Kingsmere support

John and Mandy Bentley introduced themselves. John is the new Community Minister from St. Edburg's Church and his job is to create a sense of community on Kingsmere. He has been seen delivering cakes and welcome letters to the newest arrivals of Kingsmere. He explained that some consultation evenings had been held in his home on Kingsmere, and he is listening to what residents want and planning what can be offered with their role as part of the 14 Bicester Church groups. Events have occurred on Kingsmere over the past 2.5 - 3 years including Christmas, Easter and summer events. They will continue planning big events and there will be another at Easter, but the team is keen to continue smaller things and want opinions from residents. John has done some door knocking and there has also been a poll on Facebook.

Mandy is employed as the family minister coordinator and the team is now able to deliver more activities as the school is being used as a base. So far they have used the feedback from residents and held family fun, craft events, etc. Mandy offered paper questionnaires to all residents present to complete with further feedback on activities that could be organised in the future. The team are very keen that residents are part of future planning and contribute to activities in the future.

GB formally welcomed John and Mandy to Kingsmere and thanked them for all that they are doing for residents.

6.0 Countryside Properties/development update

SY was unable to attend the meeting but some questions have been answered by email (please see below). Due to time constraints, it was agreed that these could go on the KRA Facebook page and be added to the minutes. Any other questions can also be directed to Countryside.

Primary School - This opened in January 2016

Local Centre and Community Centre – The KRA are currently in discussions with the planners about the delivery of this. Mark Baines will be able to discuss this at the meeting.

Occupations - We are at approximately 450 site occupations to date.

KM5/22 (fenced off land you mention) - This land was sold to Bellway Homes last year and they are currently at the planning stage for their internal layout. I do not have a start on site date for construction. I will know more when their planning application is accepted.

Superfast BT - The BT cabinet locations and wayleaves were signed some 6 weeks ago. The delay in agreeing locations was due to having to get confirmation from adjacent landowners that the locations would not interfere with future access or homes (some of which had designs already in for planning). Some internal designs had to be tweaked causing the delay. We are currently awaiting an install date from BT – There is no expanse of cabling just the cabinets so it is a fairly straight forward job allowing the superfast option to residents. We are still awaiting confirmation from BT as to when this will be. I appreciate this is frustrating and we continue to chase them for information.

Future land sales - The next land to be sold will be that opposite the primary school and planned to be marketed in late summer 2016.

Commercial Site - Planning was refused by committee last year for Better Retail on the commercial land. This has been taken to appeal as we believe the implementation of this will be beneficial to residents and the wider Bicester. Many thanks for the support of the KRA in attempting to get this delivered and through planning.

Landscaping - There are some important landscaping aspects for residents to be aware of over the coming months. Firstly I have decided to upgrade all the bridges within Pingle Brook to a much better constructed and much better looking product. These have been ordered and are due for installation in March 2016. To allow us to replace these 3 bridges not on the public right of way will be removed in February with new foundations constructed for the new bridges. The fourth bridge which is located on the public right of way within Pingle Brook will remain in place so that pedestrians and cyclists can cross the brook. When the new bridge is installed beside it the old one will be taken away.

During this time there will not be any restricted access to the open space but there will only be the single crossing on the public right of way until all new bridges are installed. I apologize for the temporary inconvenience this may cause but it will be a benefit to all who use this as new bridges are much better in every respect.

We are currently replacing dead trees throughout the site and are currently working at the southern balancing ponds to replace the large oaks on the avenue and other trees that have not survived.

Play Areas - We are currently constructing 3 new play areas on site. There are two located adjacent to Bovis Homes, one of which is the small play area that has been unfinished for some time. There was a service conflict which has now been resolved by SSE. The third is along the public right of way which runs through the centre of the site and has no adjacent properties.

Traffic Calming - These works are almost complete. We are currently waiting the commissioning of the new streetlights which we have installed on the road.

Secondary School - We are in discussions with OCC to agree the red line boundary of this site which is located near Bellway Homes in the south. As yet they do not have a design or delivery date for this. We transfer the land to the local authority and they will complete the design and build.

Onsite Issues

Parking - This has been an ongoing issue. I have met with OCC Highways and have discussed the prospect of getting a temporary traffic order for the site. This means that the site can be enforceable under law even if it is not adopted. Measures could include double yellow lines at key locations and other parking restrictions. It would be good to get residents feedback on this before anything further is progressed.

Theft/Vandalism - We have had several instances where slabs have been directly stolen from the footways during the night. I wish I was making this up but it is true. The latest area affected is adjacent to Bellway Homes at the secondary school turning area. I initially thought that this may be a cheeky developer who was short on materials (it has happened before on other sites) but on investigating, all developers have these slabs in stock ready to lay so they would have no reason to do this. I ask all residents to be aware and to report anything suspicious to myself via the KRA.

Tree snapping – Again, this is continuing in Pingle Brook. All we can do is replace them which we continue to do.

Questions asked –

Do you have any update about a post-box being available on Kingsmere?

This will be installed when the local centre is delivered

Will the hedge between Ripon/Pontefract and the green corridor be trimmed and managed by someone official, or is it up to the residents?

This belongs to Cherwell. I will contact them on your behalf and ask them to maintain it correctly

Who is policing the parking of site workers on the roads across Kingsmere as it is still an issue?

This is an issue where they park on Whitelands Way. Any other area is specific to the developer that owns the land.

How often are roads supposed to be cleaned where developers are bringing mud across areas already occupied?

Our roads (Whitelands Way) are swept twice daily. Internal developer roads are individual developer roads and any issues should be directed to them.

When are the play parks opening that are built e.g. Taylor Wimpey area on Kempton?

This is TW's play area so I am not sure. Our play spaces throughout the site are now either open or under construction.

Is the lighting on all paths now on after dark? If not when will this lighting will be available? e.g. path through to Tesco?

This lighting is installed and working.

ACTION: FC to add responses to Facebook page

7.0 WWAG Update

GB stated that, as CP who leads the WWAG was unable to attend the meeting and the response from Countryside had only been sent on the day of the meeting, it had been agreed that the response should go to WWAG, be added to the minutes and possibly go on the KRA Facebook page. The question was raised if WWAG would include Pontefract Rd – GB confirmed that WWAG can include all residents on any part of Kingsmere, and asked RM for his support with issues going forward.

WWAG information to Countryside –

As you're aware Kingsmere Residents have formed an action group (Whitelands Way Action Group aka WWAG) to address parking concerns across the development and have initially focussed on the spine road, Whitelands Way. Parking has been a consistent hot topic for residents since the development began, but comments to the KRA have peaked since the spine road fully opened and the 'No Stopping' signs were implemented alongside the information that parked cars would be towed.

The action group met in early October and received a great turn out from residents who live across the development giving us a good representation. Residents' primary concern is of course the safety of residents, pedestrians and drivers. Residents shared examples of their 'near misses' especially at the Whitelands Way/Pontefract junction and people expressed concern that with the opening of St Edburghs School we will see an increase of children (and their parents) on the roads.

The group acknowledge that residents could be more helpful and ensure they are parking safely near junctions however we felt the parking issues were a result of a number of issues summarised below:

- Contractors using the spine road instead of allocated developer parking.
- Residents being told by developers during the sales stage that the road would be available for parking. These residents have been surprised the 'No Stopping' signs were implemented as this was not what they were informed. Some residents told the group they were aware their homes came with inadequate parking, but only purchased the home as they were specifically informed on-street parking would be available. As a result residents' contracts are also inconsistent as some residents report that their contracts hold no specific clause that restricts parking on Whitelands Way.
- Some David Wilson homes on Whitelands Way report that their drives only have space for 1 vehicle. All of these homes have two vehicles, therefore they are forced to use the road for their second car. It's not unreasonable for 3, 4 and 5 bedroom homes to have more than one vehicle.
- Limited or No Visitor parking has been allocated for homes on Whitelands Way. We are aware of ongoing correspondence between the KRA and Taylor Wimpey regarding visitor spaces being allocated to homes incorrectly and this has to be rectified. David Wilson homes also have no visitor parking resulting in their family, friends and others (cleaners, gardeners, childcare providers) having to use the road to park.
- Garage doors are too narrow. Many residents reported that whilst the garages are wide enough to house their cars, the doors do not allow for the width of the vehicles even with wing mirrors pulled in. This forces cars on the road. Customers who bought off plan had no opportunity to ascertain the size of garages and doors and took it on good faith they would be adequate.
- Insufficient parking allocated to Social Housing on David Wilson. This is causing 4 to 5 cars to park outside the Linden show homes.

Whilst residents are concerned (and in some cases very irate!) about the parking along WW, on the whole the group recognises that restricting parking completely will only push residents to park along the side roads (for the reasons outlined above) congesting the smaller roads which are already feeling the strain of parking themselves. Based on this the group have compiled some potential recommendations for discussion. Please be mindful that action group is made up of well meaning residents who are looking to provide outcomes which encourage Kingsmere to be a positive environment to live in, but they don't have the expertise you can provide. However I am confident they will go some way to address the concerns and start a meaningful discussion with Countryside and the Developers on the solutions to be implemented.

Potential recommendations:

- Introduction of Yellow Lines across dangerous areas i.e. corners and opposite junctions
- Visitor Spaces
 - Support to address the ongoing issues with Taylor Wimpey
 - Provide visitor parking to David Wilson properties on Whitelands Way who have no access to visitor spaces. Identified visitor parking would help resolve the issues, particularly at the weekends where we see an increase in parked cars. A suitable location would need to be agreed upon which provides residents with confidence vehicles are safe and encourage residents' visitors to use the spaces.
- Residents to be encouraged to use their garage as a parking space by frameless doors being funded by Developers (priority residents being Whitelands Way).

In conjunction with the above recommendations the KRA and WWAG propose to:

- Circulation of a customised Highway Code to all residents reminding them of the basics rules regarding parking.
- Encourage residents to share their parking spaces when they are not being used e.g. when they are away from home. This may help over the holidays, especially Christmas where many families are away from home and others will be hosting and need to allow for visitors cars.

The KRA and WWAG are keen to meet to discuss this in person and would request this can take place either before Christmas or early January. The next KRA meeting is taking place 28 January so it would be great to be able to provide residents with an update then.

Response from Countryside –

Whilst some of these measures could be implemented, the roads and development are constructed as per the approved OCC Highways design and any internal development including parking spaces are approved by the planners. I am looking at introducing the TRO as discussed in my other email however this is a double edged sword and we really need residents thoughts on this so I can relay it to the council.

In regards to installing visitor bays etc., this is not something I can add as it is not part of the design. One thing I have done is made it very clear to all developers about the obligations and misinformation from sales staff about parking. This should not happen. If it is, please let me know. I suggest that the best measure to push any of this through would be for the WWAG to contact OCC Highways and CDC planning to voice their concern. Even though Whitelands Way is not yet adopted, it will eventually belong to OCC so if there is anything they want us to change, it will need to come from them. If I change anything without their say so – they can refuse to adopt.

ACTION: GB to coordinate with CP

8.0 Broadband campaign update

Andy Levis (Broadband Lead) provided the latest update on progress on superfast broadband provision. Work was originally due to be completed by Openreach for January/February 2016. Unfortunately, this week there has been notification from BT/Openreach of a delay specifically for cabinet 53 which serves Bovis/Taylor Wimpey area. Bovis seem to have been aware of this issue and it now looks like works should be completed for March at the latest. There seems to have been a lack of communication from Countryside, Bovis and BT/Openreach but information had also now been forthcoming from David Wilson/Barrett Homes.

GB acknowledged the work/efforts of the Broadband Group has progressed the broadband provision significantly, and at least superfast broadband should be in for March this year. AL stated that it is of interest to residents that non-BT providers can fine Openreach if there is a delay in installation of any telecommunication services ordered. RM noted that CDC has also communicated their concerns

at the delay in installation as they have been included in communications. GB also highlighted that superfast broadband provision was not included in the original development plans for Kingsmere by BT/Openreach and that they have since acknowledged this error. However the plans should have been revisited as the overall Kingsmere build was significantly delayed.

9.0 Planning for the future KRA committee

GB stated that the next KRA meeting is the AGM and that new blood was needed on the committee as all officers would be stepping down. All committee members will be voted in at the AGM. Any interest would be welcomed in roles, and residents can contact the existing committee via Facebook or email info@kingsmerecommunity.com for more information. All residents were urged to become involved.

10.0 Any other business

A number of questions were raised by attendees:

- What can be done about some postcodes still showing as Chesterton on official Royal Mail information despite Kingsmere being officially part of Bicester Town with the change of wards and Bicester Council Tax being paid?
 - RM - Bicester Town Council can check this, and there are still changes in wards to happen in the next few years. RM and VZ agreed to take this forward through BTC and CDC.
- Whitelands Way signage at Vendee Road end has been pulled up for some time what can be done?
 - KRA will flag up to Scott
- Any news on a postbox on Kingsmere?
 - FC – This was chased by TA in October 2014 and there was supposed to be something being done within 10 weeks. TA offered that the Royal Mail then said there were issues with planning that would take some time. FC chased again by email to Royal Mail who said they were waiting for information from someone external – Countryside? Countryside has said this will be in the Local Centre, so there may be quite some delay. Information will be passed on via the KRA Facebook page if we hear anything else.
- Trees on WW to Vendee have been removed – what is going on?
 - These have died and will be replaced like for like, but there may be a problem with drainage which is being reviewed.

Action: KRA will flag WW sign to Countryside

11.0 Date of next meeting

The next KRA meeting is scheduled for Thursday 12 May 2016, and will be the AGM.

All present were thanked for attending by GB and VZ thanked the committee for their work

Meeting closed – 20:45