

Blewbury Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of Meeting on 2nd November 2015 in the Melland Room

Present: Dermot Mathias (DM - Chair), Ian Bacon (IB), Nick Chancellor (NC), Eric Eisenhandler (EE), Richard Farrell (RF), Angela Hoy (AH), Lydia Inglis (LI), Miriam Jacobs (MJ), Jo Lakeland (JL), Mike Marshall (MM), Helen Mathias (HM), Pat Mattimore (PM), Anne Millman (AM), John Ogden (JO), Gwyn Rees (GR).

Apologies: Mark Blythe (MB), Joe Goyder (JG), Chris Lakeland (CL), Andrew Maxted (AMax), Alex Musson (AMus), Anton Nath (AN), Kally Peigne (KP), Charlotte Perry (CP),

1. **Minutes** of the meeting held on 12th October were agreed.
2. **Matters arising** not otherwise on the agenda:

Sustainability scoping/SEA. DM reported that Dave Chetwyn of Urban Vision was reasonably certain that an SEA would be needed as Blewbury is in a conservation area surrounded by the AONB. He had spoken again to AMax who still thought it would not be necessary but was checking further. IB reported that a start had been made on a draft and submitting the SEA should not delay the completion of the BNDP.

Landscape Character Assessment. RF reported that he had not heard from Tanya re the anomaly in Area 8, Eastfield Farmstead.

3. **Advice from Dave Chetwyn.** DM reported on the further advice received from DC. He made four major points:
 - (i) **Conservation Area Character Assessment.** Prior to the recent meeting with DC, LI and Peter Saunders had already raised concerns that such an assessment was necessary to protect the built area of the village. DC also thought this was essential. LI had been able to recommend Dorian Crone to carry out this work. (See 4. Below)
 - (ii) **Policies.** These needed to be more clearly evidence based.
 - (iii) **Growth Strategy.** Our limited growth strategy was acceptable given the restraints to development but should be more clearly articulated. DC considered that the built area of the village should be defined (See 5. Below)
 - (iv) **Design Statement.** Further work was needed on this. DC felt that the policies were not clearly evident. He had submitted a detailed mark up. (See 5. Below)

In addition he commented that too much detail from the Landscape Survey and Housing Needs Survey was contained in the body of the Plan. He would prefer a briefer summary and that the reader be directed to the complete surveys in a

separate document. He also thought that the Living in the village section should be briefer. It should be made clear in the section on The Community that certain statements could not become policies because the BNDP had no control over certain issues e.g. traffic.

DM reported that subsequent to the meeting with DC it had been agreed that the necessary work would be undertaken as follows: Improvements to summaries: **AM** and **EE**, design and related policies: **IB**, all other policies: **NC**, growth strategy: **DM**.

Some discussion then took place. DM pointed out that DC tended to view the plan through the eyes of an inspector. EE said that the plan also had to be understood by the village and that therefore definitions and explanations that DC might not think necessary were essential.

- 4. Appointment of Dorian Crone.** DM reported that subject to formal confirmation from the Parish Council, Dorian Crone would undertake the Conservation Area Character Assessment. RF stated that the appointment of any advisor must follow the correct procedure. DM apologised that he had not consulted the full steering committee before now but had thought it essential to act quickly because of time pressures to start the consultation procedure and complete the NP.

DM informed the group that he had discussed the appointment with both CL and the clerk to the PC; Dorian Crone had excellent credentials; Locality and Urban Vision had also been considered and although their rate would be the same (£500 per day), they could not do the work within the timescale required. DM has applied for a grant from Locality to finance the work. The steering group were unanimous in agreeing the appointment. DM would send the terms of reference to **LI** for approval and then circulate to the whole committee.

Subsequent to the meeting CL said that he would ask the PC to formally ratify this appointment on 12 November.

5. Outstanding points on the plan

- (i)** Design statement. DM reported that DC considered that some matters included here related to building regulations rather than design and that it was too prescriptive on some issues e.g. building materials. RF wished to query several detailed points but was happy to wait until **IB** had redrafted the section.
- (ii)** Built area of the village. DM reminded the group of the problems of defining this and the pros and cons of drawing a line round the village. DC was in favour of such a line because the Vale did not have a definition of 'built area'. NC reported that other councils, including the one he worked for, used a line on the map to define the built area. **DM** said that he would seek informal advice on this from a

friend who is a planning barrister. It was agreed that **DM, IB, AM, EE,** and **NC** would then agree a policy and make a recommendation to the group.

- 6. Timing of consultation.** It was agreed that the village consultation meeting should go ahead as planned on 22nd November and be used as an opportunity to update the village on the progress of the NP with a talk at 3pm. It was agreed that the Landscape Appraisal boards should be displayed again together with frequently asked questions and answers. Members of the steering group should be available to lead small discussion groups. Further discussion on the exact format of the meeting could be agreed at the next steering group meeting on 16th November.

- 7. AOB.**

LI agreed to draft an objection letter to be submitted from the steering group in relation to the proposed Woodway Road development

- 8. Date of next meeting.** Monday 16th November 7.30pm, venue to be advised.