

Wheatley Neighbourhood Plan (Wheatley NP/WNP) Committee

Meeting number:	10
Date	Wednesday 7 th September 2016
Venue/Time	7.30 p.m. Wheatley Park School 6th Form Centre
Present	Audrey Parsons David Harverson Doug Lamont David Mancey Ellie Freeman John Fox Kevin Heritage Lucy Thomas Michael Vaughton Roy Gordon Rachel Newman Rebecca Beadman Simon Shew
Apologies	Andrew Johnson Chris Hallsworth Cyril Newton Mark Davies Roger Farrow Toby Newman

Item	Description	Action	
		Who	Date by
1	Apologies		
1.1	As noted above.		
	JF welcomed participating visitors: Anthony Yeates, Holton P.C. Chairman Simon Rowberry, Planning Policy Manager, Gayle Wootton, Planning Officer (Neighbourhood)		
2	Minutes of meeting on 20th July 2016 – all agreed		
	Also JF noted that we have received 548 completed surveys.		
3	PRIORITY ITEM– SODC Planning Guests to answer questions. Simon Rowberry, Planning Policy Manager, Gayle Wootton, Planning Officer (Neighbourhood),		

3.1	Simon reports to Adrian D and will be our point of contact from now on. Confirmed Charlotte Colver now is working for another part of the SODC. (Note: Gayle is leaving).		
3.2	SR confirmed there are complications in role of NP (neighbourhood plan) and LP (Local plan). Complicated and ever evolving as more plans become approved and made.		
3.3	JF show SR and GW the headline article in the Henley Standard. SR said he was happy to comment in as much as it is "sensationalist reporting".		
3.3.1	SR said Henley and Wheatley differ in that of lack of a 5 year housing supply. Both Henley and Wheatley have green belt. However, case law states in the absence of 5 year housing supply this does not constitute use of green belt. Wheatley and Henley are protected.		
3.3.2	Where other NP's are losing appeals they are in the middle of the not green belt or NOAB (?). ie Chinnor Stadhampton.		
3.4	Questions for SODC planning to answer – refer to separate sheet for actual questions.		
Q1	This totally wrong. Preferred options consultation. Met OB and its statement of fact referring to housing was in reference to the LP, NP was not raised at this meeting.		
Q2	This was a high profile meeting with various stakeholders; NP, Town Councils, Parish Councils. Confidential meeting not for public knowledge. JF for WNP was invited to meeting on 31 st May. Note: at Roadshows held around the district public able to speak to SODC as did developers.		
Q3	<p>SODC had a figure put to them by OB (Oxford Brookes) – they do not yet agree this. The public document spoke of 300 and now 600 is a figure that has now been stated for housing in the OB site. DM addressed SR and asked "is 600 not going to be put forward?" SR confirmed SODC cannot agree they will not approve, they do not know what the capacity is for that site - has a property assessment been done? Before they can confirm either way a survey needs to be done.</p> <p>SODC say 300 houses "feels" right but this does not mean they will accept 600. Adrian D stated a number given is minimum and 300 is an approx. figure.</p> <p>JF confirmed OB had written to WNP as a "neighbour".</p> <p>SR quoted that there are approx. 2000 groups and bodies, 8,000 – 10,000 individuals which SODC needs to respond to and therefore they are to produce a report reporting all these representations.</p> <p>SR also stated there are 12 larger villages, of which Wheatley is one, but Wheatley is excluded due to the green belt.</p> <p>SR confirmed mixed development not discounted. Have to make housing number work. Need to look at land availability, can it accommodate housing and local businesses on the site.</p>		

<p>Q4</p>	<p>The site map in the Preferred options document, SR said was drawn up in 15 minutes to just give some idea, not a definitive boundary. It shows the whole OB site, not the built up area. SR confirmed anything taken out of green belt has to be exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Although the OB site is green belt, the built up area of the site which is "washed over", therefore allowed to be developed. This foot print may not lead to the best development of the site as may be "cramped", may be possible to use existing buildings with a bit of green belt taken out but not the whole site.</p> <p>SR quoted LP sets out how much land we have for developing – looks ta planning permission and allocation suggested in NP. Supply differs due to timing of plans.</p> <p>Question raised "is OB vulnerable to predator developers?" and SR confirmed no due to being answerable to Charity Commissions. They have a public duty of care to the community.</p> <p>AY (Chairman of HPC) said they were very specific about it being the built up area of OB site being in the WNP. HPC were not told by SODC about this boundary.</p> <p>RG raised a point about brownfield opportunities and quoted from the document, "will be agreed by the LP". SR confirmed.</p>		
<p>Q5</p>	<p>SR suggests WNP stays as a group after the referendum and plan made/approved so group is available to meet and review the plan as it progresses, ie successes etc. Meet 3 – 6 months. Become a NP forum rather than committee. Need to check terms of ref for this. Check with WPC and request they keep WNP being involved.</p> <p>SR suggest as an example of this look at the Ascott and the Sunnings, NP work closely with their PC on applications etc.</p> <p>DH remarked that with the village plan, the WPC ignored the plan and the group.</p> <p>WNP must stay as a group to work with WPC and make sure WNP is being followed.</p> <p>SR confirmed SODC review the LP, before it is even adopted!</p>		
<p>Q6 and 7</p>	<p>Confirmed WNP not an infrastructure specialist and confirmed approached OCC who agreed to have on free meeting with WNP after that WNP would need to pay.</p> <p>SR disagreed that WNP should have to pay. SR requested JF send him more information on this OCC should provide NP's help as working together. Contact at OCC is Carina Santiago.</p> <p>With the amount of housing suggested, WNP confirmed access in and out will be an issue. Traffic already an issue in Wheatley! RG quoted Witney and still awaiting ring road!</p> <p>SR quoted Section 278 and 106:</p> <p>Onsite and immediate access in/out, the developer would need to do this. Highways to review what is needed. Through a planning making process a Highways assessment must be done.</p> <p>WNP subject to examination due to OB being part of plan – evidence will have to be in</p>		

<p>Q8, 9 and 10</p> <p>Q11 and 12</p>	<p>place so any concerns given are not valid as all issues can be resolved. SR confirmed Highways impact evidence will be needed, can then work out funding (Government funding). An IDP (Infrastructure Development Plan) will need to be delivered with LP (early summer 2017). This is tested at the examination.</p> <p>SR confirmed LP and WNP need to work quickly together as information from NP needs to filter into LP – ie share evidence. Jointly gather evidence (strategic and costly) SODC can and will look at this but need to work together.</p> <p>SR stated that SODC does not have as much control as people think. OB will of course seek the best return and most likely will sell to a 3rd party. Land within the boundary if allocated to housing and mixed development - hard to know what this might be (possibly light industry, retirement homes/settlement), but this is where developers know the market. They produce a development brief. OB won't have a master plan as they need flexibility and will work with developer to shape the application. obviously profit comes into this.</p> <p>WNP to have evidence of why their suggestions are needed on the OB site – then this is out forward in the examination.</p> <p>With the Harringtons it's all about scale.</p> <p>SR confirmed there has been too much hearsay and misunderstanding and must keep up open communication .. SR very happy to help with a policy writing workshop and will assist WNP going forward. Also to remember the toolkit on the SODC website. GW did suggest contacting other villages around to discuss NP and requirements/evidence.</p> <p>JF thanks SR and GW for attending our meeting – very much appreciated.</p>		
<p>4</p>	<p>WNP Vision and Objectives – Road Map to mid-Winter</p>		
<p>4.1</p>	<p>RG shared roadmap slides – all members received a copy. Discussed acceleration of local map and therefore WNP. Everyone to make themselves familiar with all documentation.</p> <p>JF/RG require volunteers to attend the workshop meetings in October/November.</p>	<p>All</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p>Surveys</p>		
<p>5.1</p> <p>5.2.1</p> <p>5.2.2</p> <p>5.2.3</p>	<p>548 returned so far. JF hoped we would get 600.</p> <p>All members to take 50 surveys away and analyse results and complete spread sheet with the findings and return to RB by 24th September. Spread sheet and instructions to be emailed separately.</p> <p>Do not lose the surveys as the our a public record that form part of our evidence.</p> <p>On the basis of the results/findings of the survey we then go into a distillation process. DH will be the point of contact for this. Noted, really looking at the points of "dissatisfaction".</p>		
	<p>Next meeting: [] at 7.30pm at Wheatley Park, 6th Form centre</p>		