

Wheatley Neighbourhood Plan Meeting 10-Aug-2017

Item 1 – Introduction / Background

- Currently 17 members on the committee; started with 21
- Consultation lasted eight weeks instead of six, due to the general election
- The group has had difficulties with communications and mixed messages, specifically with whether the map boundary should be updated and if the group required outside help
- Seeking clarity over housing numbers at OBU site – 300 homes?
- To discuss the proposed A40 bridge and if it is needed
- To discuss issues with the neighbourhood area
- RTPi advised the group that:
 - o The neighbourhood plan is vulnerable alongside unmade local plan
 - o The neighbourhood plan should influence the emerging local plan
- OBU has been a distraction – Infrastructure implications denied?

Item 2 - Review of SODC Feedback

Key Points:

WNP Group has made a good start

There are some changes to make

SEA required for plan in it's current form, or to make changes and re-screen it

Response to the consultation differs from screening response

SODC can advise the WNP Group on making changes to the neighbourhood area boundary, but it is ultimately the decision of the group

Ricardo acknowledged that the team could have been more pro-active in communications with the group

The WNP effects the entire designated neighbourhood area. No more or less.

Statutory Bodies disagree that there is no OBU allocation in WNP. Supporting development allocations that are within the emerging Local Plan (LP) is an allocation. This is because the allocation has not been assessed through the Local Plan making process. An alternative is to make support for the LP allocation of OBU a community aspiration.

The OBU site includes re-development of brownfield land, and as such is already subject to policy constraints.

- If the WNP proceeds with an SEA, would need to review the site selection process.
- Adding evidence for policies – Robust
- Green Belt – Exceptional circumstances were not given to remove the land
- Burial ground Issue to be discussed

Item 3 – Non Contentious Issues

Review language and presentation, as well as consistency throughout.

The term “key worker housing” is no longer used. Is also restrictive. Use “Affordable housing” – Engage with Jan Phillips at SODC Housing Team to amend approach

WHE25

- Separate the OBU section – For readability and structure (ref: Tattnehall NP)
- Arboricultural Assessment: Highlight visual amenity (CA can protect)

Item 4 – General Issues

A) Role of WNP Committee

- a. WNP wants to be useful and valued in the process
- b. Cannot set out in policy that developers must consult with parish council. NPPG encourages engagement, but not law – Set out an engagement protocol [GRCC Guidance]
- c. No requirement for the LP to conform with WNP
- d. The community can influence the LP through correct channels

B) How is validity of WNP effected by the emerging LP

- a. Not a matter if OBU is allocation is made, but how
- b. If WNP wants significant influence over OBU, an SEA is required
 - i. There is an issue of timing, an application could be submitted before the NDP is advanced enough to influence it.
- c. Framework of policies that influence the OBU site is in place (Adopted Core Strategy, Saved Policies of the adopted Local Plan).
 - i. Should WNP add further detail, or the LP?

C) Consistency

- a. LPP2 target still late 2018?
 - i. Does WNP wait until late 2018 before submission?
 - ii. How long does an SEA take?
 1. Would need to get a legal opinion re: OBU
 - a. Its location on the Green Belt may preclude the NDP from having any significant influence over it.
 2. SEA takes approx. 3 months
 3. More work required in support of SEA
 4. Funding and Support available from Locality
- b. OBU developable area and Neighbourhood area
 - i. OBU site remains in the Green Belt, therefore a developable area has not been identified.
 - ii. If WNP boundary is changed, would be subject to an eight week consultation.

- iii. Would be more coherent if the whole area were designated, but it is questionable whether that would actually give WNDP any more influence over the OBU site.

D) OCC – Schools and roads

- a. Primary Academy – Capacity for more than 300 homes?
 - i. Seek a statement from the County Council on this
 - ii. Evidence required re: teachers & affordable housing
- b. Oxfordshire/Cambs Expressway
 - i. WNP should not be asked to grapple with the implications of this
 - 1. Highways England concerns over A34?
 - 2. Increase in traffic not in the scope of WNP
 - 3. Would not impact green belt allocations
 - 4. Nothing WNP can do to influence this
 - a. Community can engage through correct channels
 - ii. Action – OCC to clarify what they expect of WNP in this matter

Item 5 - Specific Issues

OBU Site

- WNP Group want to safeguard the community from the potential impacts
- OBU not going to tender because of STRAT 10?
- Green belt restrictions ignored?
- If WNP is not made pre-sale of site, risk that community views are ignored
 - o Can WNP make policies to mitigate the implications of this?
 - Yes, by making an allocation supported by evidence. It may be too late for this and the Green Belt may preclude the NDP from playing a more significant role.
 - Alternatively, could have a benign policy that sets out aspirations, without placing unjustified obligations on developers. It is important to make it clear that the NDP is not making an allocation.*
 - Action – Rachael to prepare skeleton
 - *A developer is not obliged to consider this style of policy, as it wont have been tested by an SEA
 - Applies little planning weight, but applies pressure to influence developers and decision makers
 - This approach may raise unrealistic expectations. Expectations would need to be managed in community
 - o One way of mitigating this risk may be to keep expectations broad, i.e. suggest that the OBU site should be well connected to the village rather than asking for a bridge.

OBU Outcomes will depend on when an application is submitted. It is possible that an application could be submitted before the NDP reaches a stage where it could influence the proposal. It will also depend on whether any application is submitted in outline form and what matters are reserved. Implications on temporal distribution in traffic with change of use from employment to residential – Impacts on congestion at peak times

- Giving preference to access layout not binding
- Could be pursued through the LP

A40 Footbridge

- Development of the OBU site would not generate enough CIL funding to cover the cost of the project. Consider other financial sources
- Justification – Development has to create a need for a bridge that can be demonstrated / evidenced
 - Connectivity with infrastructure (schools, shops, village centre)
- If you were making it a requirement for a bridge to be built, you would need to identify cost and whether it would be viable and reasonable for a developer to provide.
 - Hard to identify scales viability at this stage

WNP is not a tool to object or respond to the LP

- Engage through the proper channels

Parking provision / transport – Limited influence from WNP

- OCC like to know community aspirations
- Bridge weight limit – Address through OCC, not WNP
- Consider actions to take outside of the WNP – Ref: Pyrton
- Consider policy that requires developer contribution to parking provision at the GP surgery if any development has a large / negative impact – Again, evidence required to support this.

Playing Field

- Mitigation required if the greenfield land in OBU is developed
- Need for more recreation sites due to ageing population
 - Possible CIL issue if connected to development
 - Allocation in WNP if land owner gives consent

Green Belt

- Without exceptional circumstances to build on greenfield, any development under current WNP policies would be restricted to brownfield land
- The content of the powerpoint presentation gave a better justification than what was submitted in the plan to SODC
- PosCheck with Holly Jones the best course of action in light of new information.

Burial Ground

- Burial ground in the green belt would be natural burial ground
 - o SEA required if allocating the site
 - o Would require a willing land owner

CIL

How can the group assess viability of WNP without knowledge of nature of future development?

- Seek advice from the CIL Officer at SODC
- Consider costing and ranking of projects

Item 6 - Next Steps

- Decide SEA / Boundary Change / Burial Ground
- Exclude term "key workers" – Teachers and affordable housing
- Create OBU chapter – consolidate text from throughout the plan
- Arboricultural Assessment – Add further detail in character assessment
- Protocol for Parish Council consultation
- Remember RTPI is not a statutory consultee
- Neighbourhood Area Map – Consider the implications on your project plan
- A40 Bridge – Sustainability concern (enrichment and connection)
- OBU unknown status – Community concern – Aspirations for site
- Rachael – Prepare skeleton by 25-Aug re: green belt
- Add to / improve evidence base
- WNP group to contact CIL officer at SODC as well as OCC
- Next meeting to be held in September (7th or 8th provisionally)
- Legal advice in future re: redevelopment of brownfield land on Green Belt through neighbourhood plans.