

Wheatley Neighbourhood Plan (Wheatley NP/WNP) Committee

Meeting number:	22
Date	30 July 2018
Venue/Time	7.30 p.m. Chapel Hall
Present	Audrey Parsons Andrew Johnson David Mancey John Fox Kevin Heritage Michael Vaughton Rachel Newman Roy Gordon Roger Farrow Toby Newman
Apologies	Chris Hallsworth David Harverson Ellie Freeman Lucy Thomas Mark Davies Rebecca Beadman Simon Shew

Item	Description	Action	
		Who	Date by
1	Apologies – as noted above		
2	Minutes for 27 March – agreed (noted website not user friendly, Audrey is looking into this and will touch base with Mark when he is back from holiday.)	AP/MD	
3	John as Chairman went through agenda		
3.1	Survey ref burial ground in Wheatley newsletter		
3.2	Wheatley newsletter –John to look at timing for an article to go in the next one (Oct/Nov edition) needs to be in by mid Sept, update on progress and detail with maps – another way of notifying people there will be a public meeting and a referendum.	JF	
3.3	Bespoke maps have now been produced (thank you Mike). Audrey asked if pavement map could also be included, Mike to look into. A3 map may be included in WNP document.	AP	
3.4	Sites now refined.		
3.5	Thanks given to those in the smaller group who have been progressing all of this on behalf of the full WNP members.		
4	SEA/ER report from AECOM		
4.1	They have had this for 7-8 weeks and Roy in weekly email correspondence. Roy showed map SODC showing green belt review in 2015 in relation to sites for WNP.	RG	

5	Site option assessment from AECOM		
5.10	Site area number 13A susceptible to flood – alleviation pipes in place. Taken out of WNP proposed sites as not suitable.		
5.2	Site area number 15 and 17 (Miss Toms field and Mobbs field) are preferred due to links with village and existing industries.		
5.3	WHE2 (other side of London Road) – not chosen as proposed site, not linked with village.		
5.4	AECOM working on wording for this and then the report should be final – hopefully the end of August. Roy to follow up.	RG	
5.5	WHE16 is included in the WNP proposed sites but not in SODC review map. From this location there will (hopefully) be a green route through the village to Littleworth, subject to available routes.		
	WNP agree burial site needed and this is included in the WNP document. WHE16 could be a potential site. Note land = money and you get more for housing than if a burial site. Also cannot use for burial or building if cables go underground.		
6	Viability statement		
6.1	This states that the land is sustainable and viable to be put forward as sites by WNP. (Note: density to be contained in sites and not to sprawl across the village).		
7	Statutory consultation statement		
	This is an 18 page document and nearly complete and this is evidence that WNP have consulted and communicated with the village and have done so in a variety of ways, with a variety of ages as well as locations and CFO survey specifically asked for ages and numbers of persons per household.	JF	
8	Basic conditions statement (West Waddy)		
8.1	What is the purpose of this document? The purposes is to show the WNP are compliant and conforming with law and policies.		
8.2	SODC want WNP to meet Ricardo’s boss, Emma Baker to discuss Miss Tombs field – mixed use, housing and green area.	JF/RG	
9	Draft final WNP		
9.1	Document is very nearly there - need to refer to SEA in it - once SEA is completed, then reference this and it should be able to circulate draft to members by end of August.	JF/RG	
9.2	V27 is very similar to V15 which went to public consultation, the differences being policies have been “tweaked” to make them clearer and strong enough to stand up to unscrupulous developers.		
9.3	It also states SODC released some green belt at the request of WNP.		
9.4	Brookes site – still uncertain of its future and WNP has no influence with this. WNP just needs to make sure the plan services the village’s needs. David M did say he had met with the Chancellor at an alumni event and he thought people might hear soon – not sure of this though.		
9.5	Local plan – Toby updated WNP members. Chalgrove airfield will not get through election - might support 500 homes but not 2000. Reviewing other sites for a fall back position ie reserve sites like Grenoble Road, Culham etc		
9.5.1	Brookes site is not a strategic site as they could sell to another University. They have put forward a planning application to SODC and if they get planning through, then sell the land, they will get more money for it.		
9.5.2	Park Hill site – application has been withdrawn for an 80 bed care home.		
10	Final consultation days – Roy showed the timetable on the screen. Due to various delays, the timetable will be revised. 20 weeks to the proposed end date will take us to 2019. However also noted that it is all subject to when the Inspector can fit in his examination.		
	WNP is unique due to land swap and the Brookes site and so not straight forward.		
11.1	Bespoke maps show more clearly the sites and conservation area.		
11.2	Data protection – report is complete and covers our legal requirement for GDPR. Any persons not responded Audrey will follow up.	AP	

11.3	Confidential register of issues – John and Roy have prepared for the examiner only. Have only had a few issues.		
11.4	Parish council / WNP – John attends PC meetings. He updated members that PC will form an infrastructure committee in September 201. Link to local plans and planning committee to ensure policies are enforced and also link to OCC.		
11.5	Sustainability – covered in viability statement and SEA and to note it’s not about environmental matters, it’s about asking questions like “can people get from the village to Oxford ie is there a bus service, cycle path etc?. Is there a school, and places at the school for additional children?		
11.6	Green route – route from one end of the village (Asda) to the other (Littleworth)		
11.6.1	A route has been located but there is a gap at Station road where the BT exchange is (Note: need to seek express permission and agreement that a route could cross their land) and also an adjacent garden by this as well, which goes all down the back and would link to the Hess land. The Hess’ are not adverse to a green route across their land. The family with adjacent garden are not willing to sell a strip of their garden. Also differing heights, which means it may not be viable as will cost money and prove difficult to resolve to walk / push pushchairs/ cycle safely. It was suggested that lighting would be needed on the green route to make it safe for people using it in the evenings. Roy noted that the Hess’ would want lighting		
11.6.2	Suggest putting a safe guard in place stating a “specific wide area” between to gap will be considered for future discussion to link the two green routes together.		
11.6.3	Alternatives options: Howe Close – too far up Station Road. Simon Close still need access via adjacent garden which family do not want to sell. Traffic lights at High street/Station Road junction – not to be considered due to stationary traffic and air pollution. Old burial ground and if put a ramp at entrance then help make it easier to access in and out. Can only gravel as not allowed to tarmac or concrete. Note – there will be a pelican crossing opposite the Coop and the Station Road development.		
	Next meeting: September to be confirmed		