

Joint St Helen Without and Wootton Neighbourhood Plan

Minutes of the Steering Committee (SC) Meeting

held on Wednesday 13th April 2017 at 7.00pm Wootton & Dry Sandford Community Centre

Present: Carole Page (CP) (Chair), Janet Banfield (JB) (Vice Chair), Richard Bahu (RB), John Ashton (JA), Phil Painting (PP), David Churchouse (DC), Andrew Lane (AL), Cllr Mark Fysh (MF), Rose Osborne (RO), Cllr Geoff Fitzgerald (GF) and Cllr. Madeleine Russell (MR).

Members of Public in Attendance: None. CP asked for clarification on the role of Ted Carter. MR confirmed that he was a member of the JMC and had attended the last meeting as a member of the public.

1. Apologies for absence: Cllr. Ian Bristow (IB), George Edmonds-Brown (GEB), Janine Elliott (JE) and Kate Aydin (KA).

2. Declarations of Personal or Personal and Prejudicial Interests (PorPI)

None in addition to those previously declared and noted in the minutes of the SC dated 29th March 2017.

3. Minutes of Last Meeting

Adopted.

Note: RO requested that she receive hard copy of the minutes in addition to them being emailed. MF offered to assist RO by reading the minutes to her.

4. Matters Arising from the Minutes

- Mr Bahu to send out the list of roles to fill to all the volunteers on the list. DONE All to mark their names against anything that they would be interested in doing. Mrs Elliott showed interest in the role of Public Engagement Co-ordinator. JE CONFIRMED. KA HAS OFFERED TO COVER SUSTAINABILITY. JB HAS OFFERED TO WORK ON DALTON BARRACK SITE ISSUES. CP SUGGESTED THAT THE SC HOLDS OFF ON THE NP UNTIL THE LPP2 CONSULTATION ENDS ON 4 MAY SO AS NOT TO CONFUSE RESIDENTS AND OTHERS. THIS APPROACH WAS ENDORSED.
- Cllrs from both Parishes will be attending the meeting with the Vale on 7th April. DONE SEE REPORT IN ITEM 6
- Cllrs to request minutes of the meeting with the Vale and circulate accordingly. MR CIRCULATED MINUTES AT MEETING (SEE ATTACHED)
- John Ashton to put together a list of pertinent questions for the Vale. DONE
- Cllrs to ask for an extension for responding to LPP2. REJECTED BY VWHDC
- To look at creating Shippon as a conservation area. Cllr Russell will be taking this up with the Vale as they have moved the brown line. MR IS CONTINUING TO LOOK AT CONSERVATION AREAS. MR NOTED THAT THERE HAD NOT BEEN ONE CREATED IN THE VALE SINCE 1990. BOTH PARISH COUNCILS WILL BE ASKED TO INCLUDE FURTHER INVESTIGATION OF CONSERVATION AREAS ON THE AGENDA AT THEIR NEXT MEETINGS. HOWEVER, THE IMMEDIATE PRIORITY FOR THE PARISHES IS THE CONSULTATION ON LPP2. CONSERVATION AREAS COULD GIVE THE SC A QUICK WIN BUT THE SC

NEEDS MORE DETAILS ON THE PRECISE PROCESS FROM THE VWHDC. HOWEVER JB EXPRESSED CONCERN THAT PURSUING CONSERVATION AREAS COULD BE INTERPRETED AS ACCEPTANCE OF THEIR REMOVAL FROM THE GREEN BELT. MR AND MF HIGHLIGHTED THE GREEN GAP RULING IN COURT AT EAST HENDRED. RB NOTED THAT IN A RECENT SHIPPON PLANNING APPLICATION CHALLENGE HE WAS TOLD BY THE VWHDC THAT AS IT WAS COVERED BY THE GREEN BELT THERE WAS NO NEED FOR A CONSERVATION AREA. JA NOTED THAT CONSERVATION AREAS HAD TO BE OF HISTORICAL INTEREST. JB HIGHLIGHTED THAT SOME RESIDENTS IN A PROPOSED CONSERVATION AREA MAY NOT BE HAPPY WITH ANY CONSEQUENTIAL RESTRICTIONS ON DEVELOPMENT.

MR STATED THAT YESTERDAY (12TH) THE DESIGNATED AREA HAS BEEN CONFIRMED WITH THE WHOLE OF DALTON BARRACKS / AIRFIELD INCLUDED FOLLOWING A MEETING BETWEEN MR WILL SPALDING, VWHDC AND THE DEFENCE INFRASTRUCTURE ORGANISATION (DIO). MR WILL SPALDING FROM VWHDC WILL BE INVITED TO A FUTURE SC MEETING. THE VWHDC WILL PUBLISH THE DESIGNATED AREA ON 21 APRIL FOR CONSULTATION. THE VWHDC (RACHEL RIACH) ASKED FOR LISTS OF BUSINESSES IN THE AREA AND LANDOWNERS. IT APPEARED THAT NEITHER PARISH HAD FULL DETAILS OF THESE. MR HAD HIGHLIGHTED THE BINNINGS AS MAJOR LAND AND PROPERTY OWNERS IN SHIPPON. CP WILL CHECK WITH MR WILL SPALDING ON WHAT DATA THE VWHDC HOLDS.

- All to send any relevant Acronyms that they are familiar with to Carole or Richard in order to put a glossary together. NONE RECEIVED. AT MEETING: SPECIAL AREA OF CONSERVATION - SAC / SITE OF SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC INTERET - SSSI / AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY - AONB / STRATEGIC HOUSING MARKET ASSESSMENT - SHMA WERE NOTED. RB WILL START THE GLOSSARY.
- All to consider what 10 Big Questions the group would like to take out to the Community. SEE ITEM BELOW 8. GIVEN GF'S EXPERTISE ON MARKET RESEARCH HE WAS ASKED TO TAKE THE LEAD ON THE QUESTIONNAIRES. HE ACCEPTED AND NOTED THAT THIS WOULD REQUIRE A PROFESSIONAL APPROACH WITH SETTING CLEAR BRIEF FOR RESEARCH, PILOTING, ETC.
- Mr Lane has made the Oxford Preservation Trust aware of the Plan, so suggested the Steering group gets them involved too. RB HAD CONTACTED MR IAN SCARGILL CHAIR OF THE OXFORD GREEN BELT NETWORK AND THEY WILL BE RESPONDING TO LPP2. MF STATED THAT THE CAMPAIGN FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (CPRE) IN THE VALE WERE ALSO AWARE OF AND VERY INTERESTED IN LPP2.
- Mrs Page will be building a list of key agencies to work with. WORK IN PROGRESS. CLLR RICHARD WEBBER HAS BEEN CONTACTED BUT MAY BE UNABLE TO DISCUSS MATTERS UNTIL AFTER 4 MAY DUE TO LOCAL ELECTIONS. SECRETARY'S NOTE: SUBSEQUENTLY CATHERINE WEBBER AND RICHARD WEBBER AGREED TO MEET WITH CP AND RB ON 18 APRIL - A REPORT ON THIS MEETING WILL BE CIRCULATED TO THE SC SEPARATELY.
- All to email Richard with any comments on the Framework. NONE RECEIVED

JB NOTED THAT THE NP CANNOT REJECT VWHDC DEVELOPMENTS IN AN ADOPTED PLAN BUT CAN PROPOSE ADDITIONAL SITES - COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ORDERS IN COLLABORATION WITH LANDOWNERS. CP HIGHLIGHTED THAT THE SC MIGHT WISH TO PROPOSE NEGLECTED SITES FOR DEVELOPMENT.

MF LEFT THE MEETING AT THIS POINT BUT WOULD RETURN LATER AS NOTED BELOW.

GF HIGHLIGHTED THAT THE JMC HAD TO UNDERTAKE A MORE FORMAL DUE DILIGENCE PROCESS BEFORE CONSULTANTS COULD BE APPOINTED. IE THREE QUOTES ASSESSED AGAINST CAPABILITIES AND

JUDGED ON BEST VALUE. THEREFORE, COMMUNITY FIRST OXFORDSHIRE'S PROPOSAL WOULD HAVE TO UNDERGO THIS PROCESS. THIS WILL BE UNDERTAKEN BY THE JMC.

TERMS OF REFERENCE BETWEEN JCM AND SC WILL NOT BE COMPLETED BY THE NEXT MEETING ON 26TH APRIL BUT SHOULD BE AVAILABLE BY THE FOLLOWING MEETING ON 17TH MAY. GF HIGHLIGHTED THAT VWHDC WILL BE APPROACHED FOR MODEL TERMS OF REFERENCE. CP NOTED THAT SOME WERE AVAILABLE ON THE VWHDC'S WEBSITE. CP SAID IF WE DON'T GET VOLUNTEERS TO FULFIL ROLES THE SC MIGHT CONSIDER EMPLOYING SOMEONE. MR CONFIRMED THAT ANY SUCH PROPOSAL WOULD BE CONSIDERED BY THE JMC.

5. Matters raised by Members of the Public

None

6. Feedback from Parish Councils' meeting with VWHDC re LPP2

See attached minutes of this meeting produced by MR. GF summarised the minutes.

CP asked if the VWHDC was looking for DB to be a garden village and if they would be applying for government funding? MR confirmed that they were looking at a garden village and that it would be the VWHDC that would seek funding. GF noted that they were a bit vague on this but would work with the Parishes in consultation. CP stated that this was important for the NP. MR said that the VWHDC would be seeking funding for infrastructure eg roads but that they haven't got the money yet. GF highlighted that the VWHDC admitted there would be a funding gap and would need to look at other sources for some £40-60M. They also admitted they do not have a master plan as it's still all emerging and evolving. CP, DC and MR noted that the NP was an effective tool for influencing the master plan and GF added that it would acquire statutory rights. PP expressed concern that at present there was no consideration of how the DB development would impact on the local community and current problems. GF highlighted that a garden village should be a standalone community / development whereas the VWHDC saw Shippon coalescing with it, which is clearly very important for the NP and getting residents views on such a proposal. GF noted that the number of houses suggested longer term for the DB site was rising and now stood at some 3500 and given the area of land could go significantly higher.

In discussing their proposal for removing significant tracts of land from the Green belt beyond DB, they were unable to put forward any material reasons for why Shippon was being taken out of the GB and would lose its identity. It was noted that it is the whole of Shippon and the whole of Whitecross that are being taken out in the proposal. JB highlighted that LPP2 only talks about GV principles which is where the complication arises in that they include the distinctiveness of any new settlement and that it is self-contained. It is not a GV in their minds but a mass expanse which slightly adheres to being a garden village. There was then some discussion over the pros and cons of conservation areas versus green belt and their removal from the green belt but this should be clarified once the process and criteria for proposing a conservation area have been elicited by the PCs. JB noted that if we can stop areas being taken out of the green belt this time then it could be some 15 years before the issue arose again. GF highlighted that if DIO does not release DB then the wider areas taken out of the green belt could be vulnerable to development and it was felt that this should be promoted to residents as a potential scenario.

RB said that there are interesting documents which underpin the main LPP2 document, in particular, the Detailed Policies and Additional Sites - Preferred Options Consultation document (see <http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/services-and-advice/planning-and-building/planning-policy/local-plan-2031-part-2>). p15 highlights 3 options. Option 1 is what has been proposed in LPP2. Option 2 and 3 have limited developments at DB with the increased load being taken by smaller identified sites around the Vale. In option 3 there is only one site in our parish areas, namely in Wootton for 150 houses and none in Shippon nor Whitecross. Noted that the VWHDC only considered sites with the potential to deliver over 50 houses. AL expressed concern that eventually all of these sites could be allocated for development as well as further expansion at DB ie thousands of houses in our area! It was noted that this could well form part of the next local plan beyond 2031. PP asked if these additional sites would be compulsorily purchased? These sites, subject to planning approval, could only be developed if the land owner and a developer agreed to go ahead. JA highlighted that any proposed development site has to be deliverable in the plan otherwise alternative site(s) would have to be found. MR noted that Community Right to Build Orders (CRBO) can be used to put sites forward eg the one at Dry Sandford which is being fought.

GF highlighted that Deliverability was discussed and Cllr Cox was very confident that DB land would be deliverable by MoD / DIO although he did not offer any evidence for that. If not then other options would have to be considered. If DB was not available till 2029 then this would only give 2 years to deliver the housing so it's very dependent on them releasing the land. The MoD/DIO stated that they have to give a 5 year option so that families have some warning of it coming so the earliest could be 2022 but could go up to 2029.

CP asked JA to comment and he emphasised that the key issue for residents was whether they are happy to support a large allocation at DB but we don't know the views of the community. MR said she hoped this would be clearer after the meeting on the 23rd April. CP asked if Wootton were having a similar meeting? MR clarified that Wootton was waiting to see what St Helen Without's response was and if Wootton's views challenged those of St Helen Without it would place the NP in a difficult position. Flyers (see attached) for the 23rd April are going out to the whole of Shippon and Whitecross and some properties in Radley. There will be comment forms for everyone attending on the 23rd which will be analysed and also encouraging them to individually submit comments to the VWHDC. Concern was expressed that Wootton residents may not appreciate the major impact on them of such a large development at DB. At present only communication with Wootton residents has been through the WADS newsletter. JB noted that the April issue should have had an item on p12 about LPP2 but this was missing.

JA suggested that we should formally ask the VWHDC why they had expanded the area beyond the operational boundary of DB as part of the presentations? JA empathised that the VWHDC has to listen to, and take account of, the views of the PCs. MR said that a new road around the periphery of the new development at DB had been suggested and that this might offer more protection for Shippon's identity. CP highlighted that residents need to be fully informed of what is being proposed.

JA highlighted that LPP2 blows out of the water the spatial strategy in LPP1 as this is probably the biggest site in the district and there is an argument that the VWHDC should be reviewing LPP1 now, considering DB as a strategic site. They should be looking at other alternative sites in the green belt as there could be landowners around the Vale questioning why their site was not being considered alongside DB. MR said the PC would be covering this in their response. There was some discussion as to

how far this should be taken, eg all the way to a judicial review, but it was felt that this was not practical. JA noted that a barristers opinion could be sought at a more modest cost of some £3-4,000.

RB noted that people should look at the expression of interest for the proposed Cotswold Garden Village at Eynsham (see <https://www.westoxon.gov.uk/media/1483153/West-Oxon-Garden-Village-Eol-July-2016.pdf>) as he felt it was quite attractive in how it was laid out and the principles adopted. RB also highlighted that the Eol referred to the Oxfordshire Growth Board as key to supporting development of infrastructure.

7 Steering Committee's response to LPP2

JB is taking the lead in drafting the SC's response to LPP2 and outlined her proposed approach. Secretary's note: JB produced a draft (see attached) on the 14th April to be reviewed at the next SC meeting on 26th April. The following extract sets out the core objections relating to DB:

"The SC concludes that there are no exceptional circumstances to justify deletion of land from the Green Belt for three primary reasons: deletion of land from the Green Belt is not necessary to achieve the strategic aim of developing the Barracks site; the scale of the proposed development is inappropriate given the adopted policies in Part 1 of the Local Plan 2031 and the intention to apply 'garden village principles' to the new development; and the size of the site that is proposed for deletion from the Green Belt is excessive relative to established and likely housing need."

At the meeting it was highlighted that LPP2 and our NP would have the same weight and that the SC had the opportunity to influence LPP2 as it's timescale for adoption was similar to that for our NP. It was suggested that the SC produce an information sheet for residents setting out the possible legitimate objections that could aid them constructing their individual responses to LPP2. MR did not think this was suitable as she felt people should make up their own minds and have a view on LPP2. RO suggested may be we organise a petition and that at the meeting on 23rd April there is a board where people could sign up For or Against. CP said she had created a SWOT analysis (see attached). GF and MR noted that Facebook had worked in mobilising people when there had been a proposed development on Dry Sandford under a CRBO. GF will use Wootton's Facebook to supplement the flyer for the 23rd meeting.

MF rejoined the meeting.

MF stated that Wootton PC was supportive of building on the DB site and creating a conservation area in Shippon (around the pub) but not taking land out of the green belt. MF would check how best to encourage Wootton residents to attend the meeting on 23rd April eg extend leaflet drop beyond Whitecross and get back to CP. MF noted that the next Wootton PC meeting is on 2 May at which they would draft their response to LPP2 and that all were welcome to attend. MF was not aware that the item on p12 about LPP2 was missing. MF said he would investigate (Secretary's note: This appears to have been an error referring to p12 in the contents list which was carried forward from the March newsletter where there was an item on p12 on LPP2.).

8. Next Steps

- DC offered a draft timeline for the NP (see attached) ALL TO REVIEW AND COMMENT
- CP said Priscilla Dudding, Chair Radley NP Working Group would attend our next meeting to talk about the Radley NP.

- MF will look at the list of volunteers and how those from Wootton could be mobilised to be more active in taking roles for the NP.
- CP noted that there was a need for an initial high level consultation on the top 10 issues for the NP .GF will take the lead on this because of his market research expertise. He noted that this would requires us to develop a brief for the research, piloting etc.
- CP highlighted that we still needed a SC meeting minute taker. GF will ask the Dry Sandford school Clerk if they might take on this role. MF will raise the issue with JMC members.
- : RO will receive hard copy of the minutes in addition to them being emailed. MF will assist RO by reading the minutes to her.
- Both PCs will be asked to include on their next meetings agendas an item on further investigation of conservation areas and seek more details on the process for applying.
- Mr Will Spalding VWHDC will be invited to a future SC meeting.
- CP will check with Mr Will Spalding on businesses and landowners data held by VWHDC.
- RB will create a Glossary
- JA to draft a formal request to VWHDC on why they had expanded the area beyond the operational boundary of DB.
- GF will use Facebook to alert Wootton residents about the LPP2 consultation meeting on 23rd April.
- MF will check how best to encourage Wootton residents to attend the 23rd April meeting.
- MF to check room availability at WADS community centre for future SC meeting dates.

9. Communications

CP noted that IB had developed a dedicated NP website (<http://wshwnp.org.uk/>) which needed to be updated.

10. AOB

None

11. Date of Next Meeting - 7pm Wednesday 26th April 2017 at WADS Community Centre

Dates of future Steering Committee meetings for 2017:

17th May then every three weeks: 7th June, 28th June, 19th July, 9th August, 30th August, 20th September, 11th October, 1st November, 22nd November, 13th December.

MF will check room availability at WADSCC and inform CP. Alternatives could be Shippon Church Hall or Dry Sandford School.

DC offered his apologies for the meeting on 26th April.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.05 p.m.

Minutes produced by Richard Bahu