

# Benson Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee Meeting

16 Jan 2017

## Minutes

**Present:** Jon Fowler (JF), Dave Rushton (DR), Edel McGurk (EM), Frank Farquharson (FF), Michael Winton (MW) Philip Murray (PM), Catherine Murray (CM)

SC= Steering Committee

Actions highlighted in **bold**

### 1. Review of Actions from previous meeting

1.1 PM sought volunteers for the roles discussed, and has had an offer on desktop publishing. **Action PM to follow up.**

1.2 EM followed up with Emma Simpson about shooting footage of the village from a light aircraft. Unfortunately, Trevor doesn't have time to arrange within our timeframe.

1.3 Refreshments planning for the village event is underway. An offer has been received from the Bensington Society to run a pay bar, but FF will continue to organise as the intent was to offer free refreshments. The SC decided to simplify the arrangements for nibbles and provide crisps. **Action FF**

1.4 Publicity - A planning meeting was held. Emails were sent to volunteers and nominated chairs of clubs. An A4 flyer and poster have been designed/printed and are being posted later this week. Relevant FB pages have been updated. **Action JF** to draft a notice for inclusion in the next issue of Benson Bulletin.

1.5 EM reported that the briefing session at the school will need to be deferred till week of 6-10 Feb due to constraints on her time.

### 2. Plan Structure

2.1 JF outlined the structure employed in other plans:

- Simple list of policies presented up front with no background information
- Intro and context setting for each workstream
- Policy and relevant justification/rationale - these two can be presented in reverse order. Workstream leads explained that they had adopted a format of 'issue description, followed by policy to address'

2.2 AA advised the SC needs to:

- Be clear about the vision in the plan;
- Show that our policies support the vision, and will allow the planning officers in SODC to understand the policies such that they can make decisions;
- Create policies that add value to the national and local policies but do not repeat them.

2.3 Our vision is in place, and our plan should identify how we would wish to see development brought forward at those sites allocated. It may indicate for example that we want to take a positive approach to residential development in the village; that we want a green corridor; that we want design standards to be high.

2.4 The plan does not need policies for sites that are not allocated, but our plan must show the workings for how we reached our decisions. The draft plan will flush out some issues and provoke some productive conversations with landowners and prospective developers.

2.5 All housing allocations will be criteria-based: for example, 'Land at xx is allocated for housing purposes (up to x no) subject to x criteria'. The criteria, which are site-specific policies, could include, for example, a landscape buffer strip maintaining separation from another settlement, construction of an edge road etc.

2.6 The plan will also set out a green corridor, reserving space for an edge road. GVA's advice is that it is feasible to accept one site and refuse another nearby on the grounds that the one selected is contributing to the communal good.

### 3. Policies

3.1 AA offered some general advice on the approach to policy writing:

- The plan will have a set of general policies that will have an impact on development. In some plans they come at the end, in others at the beginning. The design statement will avoid us needing to repeat details in the policies.
- The plan will need to have site-specific policies (or criteria as mentioned at 2.4 above), effectively creating a 'mini design brief' for specific sites.
- The SC should focus the majority of its attention on the development that will have biggest impact i.e. those allocated for housing development.

3.2 AA had reviewed the combined set of generic policies, and advised as follows:

3.3 Housing Policies - HP1, 2 and 3 should be retained. HP4 should be covered by the allocated sites; HP5 and 6 are matters covered by building regulations so are not needed; HP7 will probably be covered by Design policies. HP9 re affordable housing policies, most NPs rely on district 40% policy.

3.4 Green Infrastructure - GI4, designating Local Green Spaces, is the most fundamental to retain. Connectivity policies (GI2, 5, 6) can be merged with similar policies in DR's Strategic Infrastructure policies, with appropriate links to the GI narrative. GI3 (allotment provision) can be a site-specific or general policy, but may work best as the former. GI8 & 9 should be merged. GI13, 14, and 15 can be merged.

3.5 Design - There will be one or two over-arching policies that will set the context both for allocated sites and generally. These will link to the Design Statement/Brief. The village boundary demarcation aspect will fit within the spatial strategy section of the plan.

3.6 Local/community infrastructure - Merge CI1 and CI2; merge CI3 and 4. Distances from village centre should be covered by the spatial strategy. Remove duplication between community assets lists and Local Green Spaces. The plan needs a policy that identifies community facilities and prevents change of use.

3.7 Strategic Infrastructure - Merge T1, 2 and 3; Merge T4, 5, 6, 7. Consider whether E9 is valid because it does not cover a land use matter. CP1 stands - We should indicate through the plan how we want CIL moneys to be spent. (This is where we could require funds for maintenance of GI assets.)

3.8 It was agreed that Strategic Infrastructure (Transport) would be providing generic policies to apply across all sites but the other work streams would also be producing site specific policies.

#### 4. AOB

4.1 DR reported on a Berrick and Roke Parish Council meeting he attended. They are concerned with Ben 3 and 4 and Chalgrove. Their County Cllr (Steve Harrod) is setting up a pressure group to oppose and intends to extend an invitation to a member of this SC to join their steering committee. The SC agreed that this would not be appropriate.

4.2 DR advised that OCC are consulting on road plans associated with Ben 1 Phase 1. There are some problems e.g. a zebra crossing instead of the expected light controlled crossing. DR believes that the PC should set up a meeting (perhaps attended by John Howell) to encourage OCC transport team to discuss this. PM suggested that GVA be asked to intervene.

4.3 EM flagged the need to ratify the list of Local Green Spaces for designation by the SC. JF suggested this be tackled at a subsequent meeting. EM asked AA's advice on whether new green spaces proposed through the plan can be included in the GLS designation; they cannot. EM raised the need to consider the location and usage of amenity green space needed by the village.

#### 5. Date of next meeting

Weds 25th Jan, 7pm in Parish Hall.