



## **Friends of Warneford Meadow Annual Report 2010-11** **for presentation at the AGM, May 16<sup>th</sup> 2011, at Cheney School**

*Friends of Warneford Meadow (FoWM) was formally inaugurated on March 1<sup>st</sup> 2007. This fourth Annual Report covers the year to May 2010.*

### **1. HEADLINES**

Friends of Warneford Meadow has not yet been able to agree any form of management plan with the Department of Health, which owns the site. The Meadow has been registered as a town green for over a year and continues to be enjoyed by people from the local neighbourhood. However, hopes expressed in last year's report, that FoWM would be able this year to redirect its efforts away from legal challenges towards environmental ones have been largely frustrated. Nevertheless, FoWM continues to aspire to meet all the objectives contained in its constitution and will work hard to make them a reality.

### **2. FRIENDS OF WARNEFORD MEADOW OBJECTIVES**

FoWM Objectives, as listed in the FoWM Constitution, amended June 2009:

1. To campaign to prevent building or any other development on the 18.5 acre area of naturalised grassland in East Oxford known as Warneford Meadow, including the land abutting Boundary Brook and the Orchard bordering Warneford Playing Field.
2. To campaign for the future maintenance and enhancement of the Meadow as a wild meadow and assist with the maintenance in agreement with the owners.
3. To encourage the protection and maintenance of the Orchard as a distinct cultivated area and assist with the maintenance in agreement with the owners.
4. To raise funds in direct support of the above objects.
5. To affiliate at its discretion to organisations whose objects are sympathetic to those of FOWM.
6. To promote and provide green care activities such as health walks and green gym on the Meadow and in the Orchard'
7. To develop environmental education in relation to the Meadow and Orchard by giving talks, guided walks and encouraging community involvement in projects such as reptile and moth surveys

### **3. WARNEFORD MEADOW – A TOWN GREEN**

Last year's Annual Report recorded a major victory for Friends of Warneford Meadow. The Meadow is now substantially protected against development, by its registration in April 2010 as a Town Green, following the rejection by the High Court of the NHS's challenge to the independent Inspector's recommendation. Registration means that the NHS (or any new landowner) can do nothing with the Meadow that would substantially interfere with local residents' right to engage in outdoor recreation on the land.

However, registration merely prevents unwelcome development: it doesn't require anyone to look after the Meadow (including the orchard), still less does it secure the enhancement of the land's recreational and ecological value that has always been a major objective for FoWM.

Following registration, we convened a "What next for the Meadow?" working group, bringing together representatives of the Residents' Associations and other local people with relevant interests and skills, to discuss options for the future management of the Meadow. A paper that provided a focus for the group's discussions is provided below at Appendix A.

The FoWM Steering Group quickly concluded that it wouldn't be possible to take our ideas forward without engaging with the current landowners, the Department of Health, to whom management of the Meadow has reverted now the local NHS Trusts no longer have an interest in securing the receipts from selling it for development. We first approached DH in April 2010, but unfortunately we didn't succeed in securing a meeting with the relevant officials until December.

Disappointingly, when we met them, officials made clear that DH was not interested in selling or leasing the Meadow to a local management body for a token sum as we had hoped. However, they were prepared to discuss a management agreement, whereby FoWM or another local body would take responsibility for looking after the Meadow. They asked us to produce a paper setting out in more detail how we envisaged such an arrangement would work. We submitted this at the beginning of February. This paper and a note of the December meeting can be found at Appendices B and C.

Since then, silence. We appreciate that the Department faces other pressing issues; nevertheless, three months should be long enough. We now plan to ask our MP Andrew Smith – who has supported our campaign throughout – to intervene directly with Andrew Lansley, Secretary of State for Health.

The determination by the Department of Health to hang on to the Meadow is also slightly worrying. They may be considering whether there is any economically beneficial use they could make of it – perhaps for sports pitches – that might arguably not conflict with local residents' rights, though it would destroy the special atmosphere of the Meadow. They might even be keeping open the option of using an obscure legal procedure whereby the landowner may – at any time in the future – go to court to argue that land shouldn't have been registered as a Town Green, though we can see no substantial legal basis for them to make such a claim. Or they may hope that the law will change. In any case, FoWM will keep a close watch on any proposals that would have a damaging effect on the Meadow.

#### **4. FoWM STEERING GROUP**

In 2010-11, the Steering Group consisted of Heather Armitage, Sietske Boeles, Andrew Carter, Anne Copley, Paul Deluce, Chris Dunabin, Graeme Salmon, David Sutton and Andrew Wilkinson. The Group met on four occasions during the year.

Alison Williams continues to act as Honorary Auditor.

The Steering Group would welcome proposals and volunteers for new members to join the group for 2011-12. In particular, we are looking for new members with specialist knowledge to help plan and organise maintenance of the Meadow and Orchard. We'd also appreciate some extra help with some of the secretarial work and an enthusiast to take on the running of the FoWM website.

#### **5. FUNDRAISING AND OTHER ACTIVITIES**

During the year, FoWM was able to clear all outstanding legal bills. Money raised from now on is spent on FoWM running costs or put aside to pay for future maintenance work on the Meadow and in the Orchard – once an agreement has been reached with the landowner. FoWM audited accounts are provided below.

FoWM merchandise – Christmas cards, notecards, prints and mugs – sold well over the year. Graeme Salmon's history of East Oxford, *Beyond Magdalen Bridge*, has been a best seller and is now in its second impression. Many thanks to Graeme for donating to FoWM all profits from sale of this fascinating book.

On 27th June, FoWM supported CPRE Oxford's sponsored walk, which followed a circular route, including North Oxford's Trap Grounds, Oxpens Meadow and Warneford Meadow. Walkers coming

across Warneford Meadow were offered refreshments and words of encouragement. The walk is happening again this year on Sunday 29<sup>th</sup> May.

FoWM's fourth annual Apple Day was held on 26<sup>th</sup> September. It was the largest and most ambitious so far, with a range of stalls to complement the apple picking and pressing. Many thanks are due to Elizabeth Mills for her meticulous organisation. Apple Day 2011 will be on Sunday 2<sup>nd</sup> October.

As always, many, many thanks are due to everyone who has contributed to the town green campaign by giving time or money and by buying FoWM merchandise.

*8<sup>th</sup> May 2011*

## Appendix A:

### What next for Warneford Meadow?

1. Warneford Meadow is now a Town Green: registered on 10 May 2010, following the success of a long (and expensive) campaign since Paul Deluce applied for registration in December 2006.
2. Registration means (subject to any possible subsequent appeal under s. 14 of the Commons Registration Act 1965) that:
  - a) the rights of local residents to engage in “lawful sports and pastimes” on the Meadow are protected in perpetuity;
  - b) the landowner (the Secretary of State for Health) may do nothing that would substantially interfere with those rights, in particular may not enclose or build on the land.Registration does not however place any duty on the landowner to maintain the land (beyond the legal duties to which all landowners are subject – see paragraph 4), nor does it prohibit sale of the land. And registration does not confer any rights on local residents actively to manage the land, nor to influence how it is managed.
3. Local residents’ objective in campaigning for registration of the Meadow as a Town Green was not just to protect it from development, but also to provide scope to enhance its recreational and ecological value. This note therefore considers how that objective could best be secured. It focuses on the institutional arrangements for managing the Meadow in the interests of recreation and conservation, and for engaging local residents in decision-making, rather than on the practical choices that will need to be made about the management regime (mowing, planting etc).

#### Do-nothing option

4. If the Meadow remains in the ownership of the Secretary of State for Health, and managed by or on behalf of DH, it is likely that the present regime of minimal management will continue. A landowner has certain legal obligations: (a) under the Occupiers’ Liability Acts, not to create or negligently permit foreseeable hazards to people legitimately present on the land (which would include recreational users); (b) to neighbouring occupiers, not to cause nuisance; (c) to keep public rights of way unobstructed and any bridges in a usable state; (d) under various specific statutes, for example to take action to deal with noxious weeds, to keep water-courses clear etc.
5. A minimal management regime – annual mowing of rights-of-way, occasional inspection of bridges and for hazards – would suffice to meet these obligations. There would be no obligation, or motivation, for the landowner to prevent the steady encroachment of scrub in the unmown areas, to prevent fly-tipping or to clear litter. Formal conservation designation of the Meadow (for example as a Local Wildlife Site) would not affect this position.
6. It would be open to DH to agree to transfer responsibility for management to another body: the City Council, a conservation charity, or a formal or informal residents’ / users’ organisation. It seems likely however that DH would insist that any such agreement should require the body taking on management functions also to take on the legal liabilities associated with ownership / occupation.
7. In particular, so long as the Meadow remains in the ownership of DH, which has no interest in its recreational use or ecological value, and for whom the Meadow is simply a burden because of the

cost of management (albeit small) and the risk of civil liability, it will remain open to them to sell it to a third party. It is not out of the question that a property speculator might buy it for a knock-down price, with a view to trying to get registration as a Town Green reversed, by means of a “Section 14 appeal” (which is not subject to any time limit), even though there is currently no reason to think that such an appeal would be likely to succeed.

### **Options for transfer of ownership**

8. The question therefore arises whether the future of the Meadow would be most effectively secured by transferring full responsibility (by sale or long lease) to a body committed to protecting and enhancing its recreational and ecological value.

9. This raises many questions that this paper can’t answer, such as whether DH would be willing to sell or lease the Meadow (but they have indicated that they might be) and at what price (but the Meadow in effect has a negative value for DH now, having no practical economic use and significant responsibilities attached). However, the most important prior question is what sort of organisation might buy it, which in turn depends in part on what type of management regime users and other local residents want to see adopted.

10. The same organisation need not be responsible for both owning and managing the Meadow. If for example the land was owned or held on long lease by an ad hoc local body, management might be subcontracted to the City Council or a conservation charity possessing the relevant skills and equipment, acting as directed by the owners.

11. Various types of organisation have been suggested as possible buyers: (a) the County or City councils; (b) a civil parish council for the Divinity area (if one existed); (c) an existing conservation charity such as the Oxford Preservation Trust; (d) an ad hoc body set up and managed by local residents.

12. Either the **County or City council** would have the statutory power to take on ownership of the Meadow as public open space, and the capacity to manage it. It is unlikely, given the pressure that all local authorities will be under over the next four years to make large cuts in spending, that either would want to take on a new unfunded responsibility, however small in the context of their overall budgets. Concern has also been expressed that a local authority acquiring the land might manage it in the same way as a public park, ie giving undue priority to recreation at the expense of conservation, and losing its distinctive character. However, the City Council manages other conservation sites effectively, for example Lye Valley local nature reserve; and the arrangements for the Trap Grounds in north Oxford – a Town Green, owned by the City Council but managed and maintained largely by the Friends of the Trap Grounds, a local voluntary body, assisted by Oxford Conservation Volunteers – appear to work well. No response has yet been received to an initial exploratory approach to the City Council.

13. In many rural communities, village greens are owned and / or managed by **parish councils** (which exist almost throughout rural England). In many ways this is the ideal solution, making use of an existing organisation with established processes for community participation in decision-making and an established statutory revenue-raising mechanism. However, parish councils do not exist in Oxford, except in small fringe areas (Wolvercote, Littlemore) incorporated into the City since 1973 and

which already possessed PCs, and one area (Blackbird Leys) where an urban parish council has been established more recently at local initiative. There is a statutory process for setting up new PCs, triggered by local petition. However, no great enthusiasm for this has been apparent in the Divinity area or other nearby areas; and it is ultimately subject to City Council veto. Also, if one or more new urban parishes were to be established in Oxford, it is unlikely that the areas south and north of the Meadow (Divinity and Little Oxford / Highfield) would be in the same parish, so a parish council owning the Meadow would not represent all local users.

14. There are several existing **conservation charities** whose objectives would permit them to acquire and manage the Meadow. These include most obviously the Oxford Preservation Trust, also possibly national bodies such as CPRE. Such a body might well agree to take it on, though this would probably be subject to the funds for the purchase being raised locally, possibly also an endowment towards maintenance costs. Such an existing body would have many advantages: an existing management structure, existing staff and equipment and / or contractors, access to volunteers etc. It might however prove difficult to reconcile the policies and practices of such a body with the desire of local residents and users to control how the Meadow is managed, although this might be partly overcome by setting up a consultative group of local residents. A preliminary discussion with the OPT has indicated that they would be interested in principle, but would not be willing to use their own resources to acquire the land, and would expect funds to be raised locally for an endowment to cover the cost of maintenance.

15. The remaining option is to set up an **ad hoc local body** to own and manage (or oversee management of) the Meadow. Such a body might be a charitable trust, community land trust or company limited by guarantee. (Each option has advantages and disadvantages, not discussed further here.) Its distinctive feature would be that its membership would consist of local residents, with an elected board, and purpose-designed mechanisms to ensure that management was carried out in line with the wishes of residents and other users. The nucleus of such a body exists in Friends of Warneford Meadow and the “What Next?” group. The principal disadvantage is that it would depend on volunteers to run it (though the actual work of management could be contracted out if money was available); this might become increasingly difficult over time as the cohort of people who campaigned to save the Meadow move on. Specialist advice on land management and ecology would also be needed.

16. Under each of these options it is likely that **fundraising** would be necessary to raise the cost of acquisition, and possibly an endowment towards the cost of management. (If a parish council owned the Meadow, revenue costs could be raised through the parish precept.) The price at which DH would be willing to sell is not known, but it would be hard for them to justify asking more than agricultural value plus transaction costs. The annual cost of management would depend on the regime adopted and how far volunteers were used. From the experience of the campaign to raise funds for the legal costs of registration, it seems likely that raising the sums needed would be within the capacity, and generosity, of the local community.

17. Before proceeding with any of these options, **local residents will need to be consulted**, both about the preferred model for ownership and management, and about the practical management regime proposed (eg how much of the Meadow to mow, scrub clearance, any new planting, possible grazing etc). The “What Next?” group should prepare proposals for consultation, to be carried out by FoWM and the RAs. Before proceeding, it may be helpful to make initial contact with relevant bodies such as the City Council, OPT etc, to establish whether any of the options set out in paragraphs 12 – 15

should be ruled out at the outset, and help refine those that survive. Contact should also be maintained with DH, to register the community's interest in buying the land and establish the terms on which they might be willing to sell.

18. There is no need to define precisely the area within which residents should be consulted (nor from which representatives on any management body should be drawn). However, it needs to be borne in mind that the formal right to engage in "lawful sports and pastimes" on the Meadow attaches to residents of "the neighbourhood", defined in the register (contrary to applicant Paul Deluce's proposal that it should be the Divinity area) as Hill Top Road. Although in practice it is expected, as was intended by all involved in the campaign, that the Meadow should remain accessible to all, any action that jeopardised the rights of HTR residents would be open to challenge.

### **Summary**

- a) Doing nothing is liable to result in the Meadow's becoming neglected and overgrown in DH ownership. A risk would persist of a "s. 14 appeal" against registration.
- b) At least four options exist for ownership and management in the interests of the local community, each with advantages and disadvantages.
- c) Following preliminary contact with DH, the City Council, Oxford Preservation Trust and others, the next step should be for FoWM and the RAs to consult local residents on the options both for ownership and management structure, and for the practical management regime.

Chris Dunabin

Revised 22 October 2010

## **Appendix B:**

### **FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF WARNEFORD MEADOW**

#### **Proposal by Friends of Warneford Meadow**

**Submitted to Department of Health January 2011**

#### **1. Introduction and background**

1.1 This note sets out proposals by Friends of Warneford Meadow (FoWM) for future management of Warneford Meadow in the short to medium term, following preliminary discussions with the Department of Health (DH) in December 2010.

1.2 Warneford Meadow is now a Town Green: registered by Oxfordshire County Council on 10 May 2010, in line with the recommendation of the Inspector Vivian Chapman QC after a lengthy public inquiry, and following the rejection by the High Court of an application for judicial review by the Oxon & Bucks Mental Health Trust. However, the Meadow remains in the ownership of the Secretary of State for Health.

1.3 Registration means that:

- c) the rights of local residents to engage in “lawful sports and pastimes” on the Meadow are protected in perpetuity;
- d) the landowner may do nothing that would substantially interfere with those rights, in particular may not enclose or build on the land.

Registration does not however place any duty on the landowner to maintain the land (beyond the legal duties to which all landowners are subject, nor does it prohibit sale of the land. And registration does not confer any rights on local residents actively to manage the land, nor to influence how it is managed.

1.4 Local residents’ objectives in campaigning for registration of the Meadow as a Town Green were not just to protect it from development, but also to provide scope to enhance its recreational and ecological value. The Meadow’s value has always been considered to include its potential use by the community and the neighbouring hospitals as a health resource. This note, designed as a basis for further discussion with DH, therefore considers how those objectives could best be secured. It focuses mainly on the institutional arrangements for managing the Meadow in the interests of recreation and conservation, and for engaging local residents in decision-making, rather than on the practical choices that will subsequently need to be made about the management regime of mowing, planting and so on.

1.5 The Meadow is valued in DH’s books at £0.5m, having been revalued following registration as a Town Green, but we understand from the preliminary meeting in December 2010 that DH does not currently wish to sell it. This, we understand, is because of (a) concern about the possible impact on adjacent land in NHS ownership (the Warneford and Churchill Hospitals), (b) the possibility that the NHS may find a use for the land compatible with town green status and (c) the possibility that future legislation might affect the definition and implications of town green status (though FoWM is unaware of any such legislation being proposed). The same objections would, we understand, extend to the grant of a long lease. This note therefore sets out proposals for an arrangement whereby local residents could take

responsibility for most day-to-day management of the Meadow, while it remains in DH ownership and ultimate control.

## **2. Issues**

2.1 We assume that DH will want to be assured that any agreement that it enters into is with a body that has the legal capacity to enter into such an agreement, is competent and adequately resourced to perform the functions it takes on, and commands the broad support of local residents (so that any work done under the agreement will not be challenged by others in the area).

2.2 DH has indicated that it would not want to incur any costs or liabilities, other than those for which it is any event liable by virtue of owning the land. At the same time the local body will not be acquiring any assets, and would therefore not be prepared to take on any liabilities other than those arising directly from any enhanced management work undertaken.

2.3 DH will retain an interest as owners in ensuring that the value of the land is not diminished, and that it is not exposed to any additional liabilities. Any work undertaken by the local body would therefore have to have DH's consent.

2.4 If FoWM were to assume the responsibility for management, members would need an assurance that, if money and voluntary labour is to be invested in enhancing the Meadow, the benefits will accrue to local residents for a reasonable period.

## **3. Proposed agreement**

3.1 FoWM, currently an informal association, would reconstitute itself as a legal entity (company limited by guarantee or similar). The possibility of securing charitable status would be investigated. Membership, requiring the payment of a subscription, would be open to residents of the Divinity area (including Hill Top Road and Southfield Flats) and the Highfield and Little Oxford areas, and possibly more widely. At the same time all residents of those areas would be consulted, to ensure that FoWM's proposals for managing the Meadow accorded with the wishes of residents at large.

3.2 FoWM (with partners – see paragraphs 5.1 & 5.2 below) would submit to DH a Management Plan for the Meadow, setting out the work it wished to carry out or have carried out. The Plan would be fully detailed for the first year, and in outline covering a further, say, five years.

3.3 Subject to approval of the Plan by DH, DH and FoWM would enter into a formal management agreement, initially for five years, whereby FoWM would be entitled, and would undertake, at its own expense, to carry out the works specified in the Plan. The agreement would be terminable early in the event of a serious breach but otherwise would run for the specified period. The agreement could then be renewed for a further five years, if all parties were happy to do so.

3.4 DH would retain the liabilities of the occupier of the land (under the Occupiers' Liability Act, Rights of Way legislation etc. FoWM would undertake any liabilities arising directly from the work it carried out, and would have to satisfy DH that it was sufficiently insured against such liabilities. Otherwise, no payment would be due by either party to the other under the agreement.

## **4. Proposed work**

4.1 At this stage it would be premature to specify in detail the work that FoWM wishes to carry out under the agreement. FoWM plans to commission an ecological consultant to survey the Meadow and make recommendations, whose report, together with consultation with local residents, would form the basis of the proposed Management Plan.

4.2 However, on the basis of current information, work proposed is likely to include:

- selective mowing of small parts of the Meadow, to provide spaces for informal recreation;
- possible annual (or less frequent) mowing of the whole Meadow, subject to ecological advice;
- clearance of scrub, in particular bullace and brambles in the orchard, and brambles encroaching along the boundaries;
- mowing and maintenance of paths (in collaboration with the County and City Councils in the case of those paths which are rights of way);
- possible eradication of invasive species, notably Himalayan Balsam (though the need for this is disputed);
- possible selective planting, to enhance the visual environment and enhance or create habitat for existing and new species;

FoWM would not wish to take responsibility for:

- maintenance of boundaries, including the bunds at the entrances designed to deter access by travellers' vehicles;
- maintenance and if necessary clearance of the Boundary Brook watercourse, nor of the bridges crossing it (which form parts of rights of way);
- any work that may be necessary for safety reasons to the large trees along the north-eastern and south-western boundaries.

## **5. Partners and other issues**

5.1 FoWM plans to work in close collaboration with a number of local partners. Among these are the following:

- the two adjoining hospitals, whose patients will benefit from access to and views of the Meadow;
- the Maggie's Centre currently under construction on the edge of the Churchill site, designed specifically to overlook the green space afforded by the Meadow;
- Southfield Golf Club, whose course borders the Meadow;
- the five Residents' Associations representing residents in the area, who strongly supported the application for town green registration;

- the Campaign for Greener Healthcare, which is keen to use Warneford Meadow as a case study in demonstrating the health benefits of green spaces particularly in urban settings;
- the City and County Councils where appropriate, for example on rights-of-way issues;
- the East Oxford Archaeology Project, who are keen to include a non-invasive geophysical survey of the Meadow in their research into the history of this part of Oxford.

All the above will help to meet FoWM's objectives to promote recreational use of the Meadow not only by local residents but also by patients and staff of the two hospitals.

5.2 FoWM has been approached by the County Council about the possible construction of a cycle track along the diagonal path (which is not currently a right of way) linking the Hill Top Road and Roosevelt Drive entrances. We recognise that this is an obvious "desire line", which is and will inevitably be used by walkers and cyclists, and that it may need maintenance to avoid its becoming excessively rutted. However, we would oppose any proposal for lighting or hard surfacing, which would damage the atmosphere of the Meadow and potentially the ecology; also elaborate measures would be needed to deter use by motor-cyclists. At most we would contemplate the installation of a permeable surface designed to resist wear while permitting some vegetation to grow through.

5.3 Some work – notably clearance of scrub in and around the orchard – is necessary in the very short term, preferably before the 2011 nesting season. Depending how long it takes to negotiate the formal agreement proposed above, FoWM would seek DH's agreement to such work being done by volunteers, subject to adequate insurance being arranged.

### **Friends of Warneford Meadow**

January 2011

## Appendix C:

### Note of a meeting on Tuesday 14 December 2010 at Warneford Hospital

**Present:** David Gubb, Head of Estates and Facilities Division, Department of Health  
Harold Caldwell, Director of Estates, Oxon & Bucks Mental Health Trust  
Sietske Boeles }  
Andrew Carter } Friends of Warneford Meadow (FoWM)  
Chris Dunabin }

1. The meeting had been called to discuss the future of Warneford Meadow following its registration as a Town Green. Andrew Carter's letter of 25 October to David Gubb, indicating interest in transferring ownership of and / or responsibility for the Meadow to a local body, set out the agenda from FoWM's perspective.
2. David Gubb confirmed that the Meadow was owned by the Secretary of State for Health and managed by his division. No routine maintenance was being undertaken; if any maintenance or other work was needed, DH would probably commission one of the two Trusts who owned adjoining land to do the work.
3. David Gubb stressed that DH was not obliged to take any notice of what FoWM wanted: DH remained the landowner, and was merely restricted as to the use it could make of the Meadow by its registration as a Town Green. He said that DH would probably want to retain control of the Meadow, for two reasons: (a) because it was bounded on two sides by NHS property, and (b) because of the possibility that future legislation might enable DH to make beneficial use of the land notwithstanding its current status as a Town Green. However, he was "not totally dismissing" the possibility of transfer of ownership. The Meadow had been revalued following its registration as a Town Green, and was now valued in DH's books at £0.5m, reflecting typical values of recreational land in urban areas. He was however interested in discussing FoWM's proposals for management of the land.
4. FoWM representatives expressed disappointment at DH's negative attitude towards transfer of full responsibility for the Meadow. However, they said that their main concern was to maximise the recreational and ecological value of the Meadow, including the benefits it offered to the patients and staff of the two adjacent hospitals and for the health of users generally. They were therefore interested in discussing options for greater community involvement in the management of the land short of transfer of ownership, but would need to consider the terms of any such arrangement carefully: they would not want to take on liabilities (eg under rights-of-way legislation) without any resources or assets. It was also important, if volunteers were to be encouraged to come forward to work on the land, that any arrangement should not be terminable at very short notice.
5. David Gubb said that there was no question of DH providing any resources to a local body to manage the land. However, he did not rule out the possibility, suggested by FoWM, of providing an indemnity against occupiers' statutory liabilities.
6. David Gubb said that any decision by DH to enter into such an agreement would probably be taken at official level; it was unlikely that Ministers would need to be involved. FoWM representatives mentioned that Andrew Smith MP had taken an interest in the future of the Meadow, and would

expect to be briefed on the outcome of the meeting; but they did not plan to encourage him to raise the issues with Ministers at this stage.

7. It was agreed that FoWM would set out in more detail their proposals for a local body to take on management of the Meadow, covering both the constitution of the body and what it would want to do to enhance the Meadow, and submit these by around the end of January 2011. DH would then consider the proposals and respond.

Chris Dunabin

26 December 2010

# **Minutes of Annual General Meeting of Friends of Warneford Meadow, held at 7.00pm on May 20th 2010, on Warneford Meadow and at Southfield Golf Club**

## **Steering Group**

Present: Andrew Carter (Chair), Graeme Salmon, Sietske Boeles, David Sutton, Chris Dunabin

Apologies: Anne Copley

In addition, approx 25 Members of FoWM attended.

## **Annual Report 2010**

After a celebratory drink on the Meadow itself, a review of this year's Annual Report focussed on the following points:

- the OBMH successful application for a judicial review of the Inspector's Report recommending that WM should be registered as a town green; the outcome of that review, which upheld the Inspector's recommendation and the subsequent registration of the meadow as a town green.
- the wish to come to an agreement with the Department of Health as to the future management of the Meadow and Orchard, in accordance with FoWM objectives 2 & 3 to 'enhance the Meadow as a wild meadow' and to 'maintain the Orchard as a distinct cultivated area'.

## **Annual Accounts**

Graeme Salmon presented the FoWM accounts for the year to 28<sup>th</sup> February 2009. These indicated an excess of income over expenses of £ 1,415.07 for the year. Accounts had been scrutinised by the Honorary Auditor, Alison Williams.

## **Steering Group**

Of the current members of the Steering Group, Sietske Boeles, Graeme Salmon, Chris Dunabin, Andrew Carter Anne Copley and David Sutton were happy to continue. Elizabeth Mills has decided to leave the Group. Her hard work and support were noted with gratitude.

Heather Armitage and Andrew Wilkinson were nominated to join the Steering Group and their appointment was endorsed by the meeting.

The AGM closed at 8.00pm and was followed by a presentation by Graeme Salmon on his forthcoming history of East Oxford, *Beyond Magdalen Bridge*.

## Friends of Warneford Meadow Accounts for year to 28 February 2011

INCOME		EXPENDITURE	
		<b>EVENTS</b>	
Open gardens	383.80		
Appleday	463.44		
<b>Total events</b>	<b>847.24</b>		
		<b>PRODUCTS</b>	
Mounted prints	257.68	Mounted prints	269.78
Mugs	1,678.50	Mugs	1,287.17
Note cards	526.01	Note cards	193.99
Beyond Magdalen Bridge	923.83	Beyond Magdalen Bridge	571.30
Calendars	258.00	Calendars	166.50
<b>Total products</b>	<b>3,644.02</b>	NET gain on products	<b>1,155.28</b>
			<b>3,644.02</b>

gain on products:
-12.10
391.33
332.02
352.53
91.50
<b>1,155.28</b>

### GENERAL ACCOUNT

INCOME		EXPENDITURE	
			<i>(2009-10)</i>
Events	847.24		979.43
Products	1,155.28		1,434.08
Donations	705.34		501.30
Oxford Times photos	85.00		
<b>Bank interest</b>	<b>0.70</b>		
<b>Total income</b>	<b>2,793.56</b>		
		Loan repayment	500.00
		Insurance	165.90
		AGM refreshments	46.94
		Web site	95.00
		Green fair	27.00
		Newsletter printing	59.00
		Ox Times	20.00
		<b>Total expenses</b>	<b>913.84</b>
		<b>Excess income over expenses</b>	<b>1,879.72</b>

### Balance Sheet at 28 February 2011

Bank balance at 28/2/11	3,121.89	Reserves at 28/2/10	231.62
		cleared loan	500.00
		Excess income over expenses	1,879.72
Loan for part book printing	-571.30		
cash in hand (float)	60.75		
	<b>2,611.34</b>	<b>Assets at 28/2/2011</b>	<b>2,611.34</b>

G L Salmon, hon. Treasurer, 14/5/2011

I have checked these accounts and the financial records of FOWM, and confirm that they are in order.

Alison Wilson

14/5/11