

## **Blewbury Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group**

### **Minutes of Meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> January 2016 in the Melland Room**

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

**Apologies:** Joe Goyder (JG), Angela Hoy (AH), Chris Lakeland (CL), Andrew Maxted (AMax), Alex Musson (AMus), Charlotte Perry (CP), Gwyn Rees (GR).

**In attendance:** Michael Pennington

1. **Minutes** of the meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> December were agreed.

2. **Minutes** of the meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> December were agreed.

### **3. Review of Policies**

(i) **Report on meeting with AMax, DM, IB, NC and EE, held at 6.30pm on 12.1.16.**

DM reported that AMax was apologetic for not being able to provide more support due to staff shortages and work load. He had agreed however, to read the complete draft plan by 22<sup>nd</sup> January and to read the policy section as soon as he received it.

DM reported AMax's view of the Vale's opposition to the establishment of a red line to delineate the built area of the village. AMax had made the following points:

- Blewbury was adequately protected by the AONB classification.
- Although the Local Plan was in examination, until it was adopted and a 5 year housing supply agreed, a red line would only provide limited additional protection.
- Our housing needs survey had identified a need and as there was little capacity within the built area, it therefore did not make sense to limit all development with a tightly drawn line.
- When the Vale established Part 2 of the Local Plan, they might be slightly more inclined to allocate some housing to Blewbury if the red line is very restrictive. He was at pains to say that this was not a threat, which we accepted.

Discussion then took place on whether we should go against the wishes of the Vale and establish a red line. DM reminded the group that our professional advisors (Dave Chetwyn (DC) of UV) and a planning barrister) considered a red line to be the clearest method of defining the built area and therefore controlling

unacceptable development outside that area. No written definition could match the clarity of a red line. Individual views of the group were then expressed and all but one were in favour of a red line. DM reported that **DC** would talk to AMax by 15.1.16 to reinforce the steering group's views. DC has warned us that if the inspector rejected the policy of a red line, the 6 week consultation period might have to be repeated.

There was further discussion on the desirability of including a policy which provided 'wriggle room' to allow limited development outside the red line, eg housing for an agricultural worker. This idea was rejected.

**(ii) Comments on Policies**

P1 & P2. DM reported that some of the material in P1 had now been moved to P2.

P3. Redrafted according to the Vale's requirements

P4. AMax considered this unnecessary but does not object to its retention.

P7,8,9,10. Changes had been made.

P16, 17. DC to reword.

Section 9. EE reported that much of this was new and included issues of importance to the village that were beyond the remit of our Land Use Policies.

**ALL** were asked to read and consider and it was acknowledged that further issues might need to be added as a result of the consultation process.

#### **4. Preparation for and timing of consultation**

DM reminded the group that until DC had spoken to AMax and we had his views on our final draft policies a date for beginning the consultation period could not be finalised. It was hoped that this date would be during w/c 25th January with the first public meeting being on 7<sup>th</sup> February. A decision would be made on the dates at the next steering group meeting on 18.1.16.

In the meantime:

- **JL** would prepare posters and a flyer for the Bulletin ready to announce the consultation and public meeting. **JL** will confirm the siting in the village for hard copies of the plan assisted by **LI** (preschool and Style Acre), **PM** (doctors' waiting room and Ladycroft) and **IB** (both pubs)
- **IB** agreed to print 15 hard copies of the plan
- **EE** and **DM** would draft a statement including details of consultation and where copies of the plan will be available, to be included in the Blewbury Bulletin (deadline 20.1.16).
- **EE** would provide LI with the up to date copies of the plan to be circulated to the PC.
- **EE** and **DM** would prepare a summary of the policies together with a covering letter from CL to be distributed to every household.
- **AM** and **NC** would review the list of volunteers to help distribute the above and check their availability to deliver the fliers on 23/24 Jan or later if the policies are delayed.

- **PM** and **MM** would insert flyer into the Bulletin on 25<sup>th</sup> Jan.

DM reminded the group that all feedback during the consultation period needed to be in writing. This could include electronic records. Woodcote had produced a pro forma for this purpose and **DM** would review.

**AM** volunteered to collate all consultation comments. Informal meetings for further consultation would be set up after the first public meeting.

#### **5. Any other business**

Michael Pennington asked whether members of the steering group were prepared to help raise awareness in the village of the need to object to the proposed

Woodway Road development. It was agreed that any members who felt able to help should contact Michael outside of the meeting.

**6. Date of next meeting:** 18<sup>th</sup> January, 7.30 pm in the Melland Room