

Benson Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee Meeting

19 Apr 2017

Minutes

Present: Jon Fowler (JF), Dave Rushton (DR), Edel McGurk (EM), Philip Murray (PM), Catherine Murray (CM) Michael Winton (MW); Martyn Spence (MS) Andrew Ashcroft.

Actions highlighted in **bold**. SC = Steering Committee

1. Review of Actions from previous meeting

1.(i) All actions have either been discharged or are substantive items on this meeting's agenda, except for:

1.(ii) Action all to review their materials and consider items for website, sending to Lorna Denby asap. Update - No further progress has been made with this. Now that the FAQs are published, it was agreed that Edel should advise Lorna to proceed with the posting the Green Infrastructure material already provided. **Action Edel**. Other material can be posted as it is made available.

1.(iii) Action FF to ask the Medical Practice what calculation has been used to estimate the number of extra patients yielded by x number of additional houses, and to confirm the ownership arrangements. Update - No reply yet. **Action FF** to pursue. However, the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group is interested in supporting the discussions about how to meet the village's future needs.

1.(iv) Action all to provide JF with draft responses to Alice Jones-Evan's points. Update - Mostly complete. **Action CM** to double-check whether that there is anything to add from her perspective.

1.(v) CM would like to have the Conservation areas shown in a different colour on the maps to prevent confusion with green spaces. Update - Not yet commissioned. **Action CM** to follow up once wider mapping needs are clear.

1.(vi) DR has heard from a contact that GVA may be about to host a workshop in early April. The SC agreed that DR should follow up with Charlotte from GVA. Action DR to contact GVA Update - Done but no response. **Action DR** to pursue.

2. Key Worker Policy

1.(i) MF reported that he contacted SODC, which does not have a specific key worker policy in their plan, and no intention to prepare one. If we were to pursue this, we would need to convince the council that there was a rationale and a strong evidence base to support such a policy i.e. a particular Benson-specific need. The SC agreed that we are sympathetic to the proposition but we haven't got an evidence base to demonstrate the need so it is likely to attract opposition from developers. We would be taking up a position that was difficult to defend. No further action.

3. Dealing with comments on draft Plan

1.(i)JF sought AA's advice on how we need to respond to the feedback received on our pre-submission draft. AA remarked this is the most exciting part of the process but often the most complicated. This has been the first real test of our plan with the statutory agencies. His view was that generally our plan was very high quality.

1.(ii)AA provided the SC with a summary outline of the requirements to move forward to SODC submission. There are the following requirements:

1.1.(i)Demonstrating how the plan meets the basic conditions - AA has agreed to draft this statement.

1.1.(ii)Preparing the Consultation statement - this is a comprehensive statement on how we have engaged with the local community from the outset, describing what they've said and explaining how we have responded.

1.1.(iii)Producing a Matrix, Comment by comment - it's best to do this on a policy by policy basis. It is a time-consuming process. We will need to explain why we don't take any particular comment forward into the plan in terms of national or local policy with which it does not accord. It is best to break the analysis into 3 categories: local resident, statutory agencies and developers.

1.(i)AA's strong recommendation is that we assess the comments and come to a decision on each collectively rather than as individuals with our sub-groups. That will reduce the risk of discrepancies arising between related but distinct policies and will ultimately save time. This detailed mapping and analysis is only required for this consultation stage, not our previous informal consultations. JF reported that our consultation statement does describe all of those events and comments have been collated, which AA advised is sufficient.

1.(ii)AA drew out some of the main areas of comment will require significant attention, and responding to those may require meetings with the respondent. These are:

1.2.(i)The developer responses to the road issue. (including by West Waddy and its consultants; Cala Homes, and David Wilson Homes (and their planning consultants Turley).

1.2.(ii)Impact on the viability of those developments of our plan

1.2.(iii)Relationship of the road in development against the contribution to development in the wider area

1.2.(iv)The road itself, the process, funding and drainage issues.

1.(iii)AA advised that we don't need to do a technical rebuttal of every comment that we receive, but we will need to demonstrate how we have taken account of the feedback.

1.(iv)PM reported that a meeting has been arranged with SODC on 2nd May to discuss their comments. In particular we need to understand the background to the section of the draft Local Plan that proposes to 'safeguard land in Benson for a bypass' and the state of

play with gathering an evidence base for it. We could commission further evidence gathering via consultants to address the areas questioned in the consultation responses, but it is best if our approach is coherent in terms of the SODC progress so far. We also need to understand what SODC envisages the road to be: a traditional bypass, a distributor road or an edge road. We might re-consider how we present the edge road in the plan as front and centre in a master plan for the village.

1.(v) Changes to PPG last year require a Neighbourhood Plan to take account of an emerging Local Plan. SODC comments are expected by the agreed extended deadline of 21 April.

1.(vi) AA advised that if SODC are happy to do so, in order to make the examination straightforward, we will need a 5 way meeting between SODC, NP team and all of the relevant landowners and their agents (Cala, West Waddy, Thomas Homes and DWH). The meeting invitation would share a summary setting out the generality of comments and states that the purpose is to find a way forward. The agenda will need cover a flood risk response, technical traffic modelling, and a view from SODC on the contributions that will be expected from all parties. We should restrict attendees to 2 per organisation being represented.

Action PM to start collating the feedback on the draft plan into the matrix

4. AoB

1.(i) PM advised that a meeting is planned on 5th May with West Waddy. [This has now been rescheduled for 19th May].

1.(ii) DR is anxious to pursue a discussion with GVA. AA advised that their input to any meetings with developers and statutory bodies would be important.

1.(iii) CM highlighted that Historic England wants a heritage objective included and sought advice on whether that can be done. AA advised that it is acceptable to retrospectively add a clause to the NP objectives.

1.(iv) Heritage team has identified all the entries for a list of buildings of interest.

1.(v) PM sought SC views on the best way to tackle the consultation matrix. The SC discussed options, taking AA's advice - he will send PM some examples.

Date of next meeting: **Weds 10th May** at the Parish Hall.