

Blewbury Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of Meeting on 12th October 2015 in the Melland Room

Present: Dermot Mathias (DM - Chair), Ian Bacon (IB), Mark Blythe (MB), Eric Eisenhandler (EE), Richard Farrell (RF), Angela Hoy (AH), Lydia Inglis (LI), Chris Lakeland (CL), Jo Lakeland (JL), Mike Marshall (MM), Helen Mathias (HM), Pat Mattimore (PM), Anne Millman (AM), John Ogden (JO),

Apologies: Nick Chancellor (NC), Joe Goyder (JG), Miriam Jacobs (MJ), Andrew Maxted (AMax), Alex Musson (AMus), Anton Nath (AN), Kally Peigne (KP), Charlotte Perry (CP), Gwyn Rees (GR).

1. **Minutes** of the meeting held on 14th September were agreed.

2. **Matters arising** not otherwise on the agenda:

Sustainability scoping/SEA. DM reported that the Vale had still not responded to the completed questionnaire but as advised at previous meetings and confirmed by UV (Urban Vision) he did not think an SEA would be required.

Landscape Character Assessment. RF would email Tanya of HAD re the anomaly in Area 8, Eastfield Farmstead.

3. **Feedback from Urban Vision.** DM proposed that this was discussed in the order listed in EE's email of 10.10.15 Draft Plan Version 6. He pointed out that changes had been made to the Draft plan since receiving UV's Health Check Review.

(i) **Introduction.** DM explained that it was difficult to ensure that the BNDP complied with the Vale's Local Plan Parts 1 and 2 when these were not complete. It was anticipated that Part 1 would be recommended to the Secretary of State in mid-2016 and Part 2 at least eighteen months later. It was agreed that this should not stop the formulation of the BNDP and that UV considered minor changes might be possible later to ensure compliance.

(ii) **Summary of Process.** UV had agreed this

(iii) **Aims and Objectives.** AM reported she had drafted a vision statement which would be circulated to the Steering Committee once the editorial group had commented.

(iv) **Our Village.** DM congratulated PM, EE and the team on this section which UV had found very helpful and considered that the Inspector would too.

- (v) **Housing needs Survey.** NC to shorten but full version to be included in Appendix
- (vi) **Landscape Character Assessment** to be summarised further
- (vii) **Design Statement.** Further work to be done by **IB** and **AM**
- (viii) **Land Use Policies.** NC and **DM** to draft with help from UV
- (ix) **Community issues.** To be further developed in the light of consultation

Further feedback from UV.

UV's report said that our growth strategy was unclear. **DM** said that we could articulate it more clearly. He also said that we could consider a policy which allowed limited development on the fringe of the village. It was also noted that a majority of villagers preferred any development to be on the fringes of the village as opposed to infill. **DM** reminded the group that the Vale's draft plan had reinstated control over development outside the built area.

Considerable discussion then took place. Points raised included:

- Whilst the Housing Needs Survey identified a majority (55%) preferred development on the fringes of the village, strength of opinion varied in line with the phrasing of the question (e.g. 'Strongly agree' to 'Agree') **AM**
- Although development on the fringes of the village was preferred, the number of houses should be limited. **LI**.
- Development on the fringes of the village could conflict with Vale's policy of not developing outside the built environment. **RF**.
- Any change of policy needed to prevent 'creep' on the fringe of the village. **IB**.
- The policy of limited growth should be retained but if necessary discussed with the inspector at a later date. **MB**.
- The constraints of planning law need to be explained to the village. **IB**
- Allowing fringe development will not make any difference to the amount of future infill. **DM**.

After a lengthy discussion it was agreed that we should stick to our existing policies subject to further advice from UV. However, such advice did not necessarily have to be accepted (**IB**, **DM**, **MB**)

4. Consultation – logistics. PM updated the meeting in line with **IB**'s logistics sheet

5. Consultation – printing and distribution. The action list provided was discussed. It was agreed that the draft plan would be available by 9th November and the 6 week consultation period would start from that date. **LI** and **RF** to draft Q&A. **IB** offered printing facilities. Distribution of door to door flyers to be undertaken by the whole committee and the wider group used to distribute the Housing Needs Survey. **DM** to ask whether **AMus** would take on leadership of this group

6. AOB

- EE reported that the 6 appendices were now incorporated in the draft plan. GR had drafted the water and drainage appendix which was acceptable to Thames Water. Further detail was needed on the Design appendix and a summary of feedback received was needed for the Consultation appendix. **JL** to draw up a list of events already held to demonstrate consultation and feedback.
- RF queried the actions to be taken after the consultation period. DM replied that there would probably be two areas to consider: a) comments received on policies to be discussed and considered whether changes needed to be made. b) community issues.

7. Date of next meeting: Monday 9th November, 7.30pm in the Melland Room.