

## Appleton with Eaton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting

# MINUTES

**When:** Monday, 24<sup>th</sup> July @ 7:30pm

**Venue:** Appleton Village Hall, Committee Room

**Present:** Susan Blomerus (Parish clerk), Liz Gilkes, James Mansfield (Chairman), Mark Richards, Annewen Rowe, Mrs Claire Salmon, Will Sparling (Senior Planning Policy Officer), Sam Townley (Enquiries Officer for Neighbourhood Planning), Alison Trinder, Anna Yalci

**NP114 Apologies for absence:** John Adams, Mary Carey, Richard Dick, Jane Dymock, Kerrie Gaughan

**NP115 Declarations of interest:** None

**NP116 Signing of the minutes:** The minutes of the 15<sup>th</sup> May 2017 and 19<sup>th</sup> June 2017 meeting were signed as a true record

**NP117 Matters arising from the previous meeting and not appearing elsewhere on the agenda:** None

**NP118 Will Sparling (WS) (Vale of White Horse District Council Planning Policy Officer):**

WS said that the start of the draft NP is very good; it starts with the vision and leads into objectives. He mentioned that we only have a few objectives for each theme, which is good and keeps the plan focused. WS feels that we can expand on the themes, e.g. Village Character under the objectives it mentions well-designed buildings and spaces are vital to an areas character and distinctiveness; we need to elaborate on what that means. Explain why they are well designed buildings. WS suggested doing research on this and use the architect in the committee to help with the wording. The idea is to expand on what we are saying using the evidence to it back up.

WS suggested to rather name the policies e.g. policy 1, policy 2, this will help keep the policies in order.

With regards to the list of facilities, WS said it will be helpful to have maps and mention where the facilities are, expand and reference why they are important to the community and what is it about the facilities that we want to protect. He suggested adding more local details to the facilities. Why are they valuable to the community? E.g. Appleton Community Shop: mention that it has recently been refurbished; it is a well-used facility and is supported by the community, volunteers help keep the shop running. The shop is also a social hub for those in the community that don't drive and can't get out much. A list is quite dry but more details help the planning officers understand the situation and why it is important to the community. WS said that if we have any facilities that are unique we need to mention this and include the reasons why they are unique. It was suggested that the playground is a special site as it is on the ridge and looks down into the valley.

Pub policy: WS thinks that the policy is good but we need to ensure it conforms to the local plan. There are one or two bits that are too restrictive.

WS mentioned that labelling the policies CA could be confusing as it could be misinterpreted as Community Action rather than community access. Therefore the previous suggestion of numbering will help

WS said that we could leave the NP draft as it is, as it is very good but he said it would add more value to add more details about the village.

Policies:

**Design policy:** WS said it was good. WS suggested that we must define what the important things are and take key points from evidence base and put in the text of the policy.

E.g. consideration should be given to following:

- Existing built and natural features
- Layout, form, density, frontage setback, plot positioning, and scale,
- Efficient use of land whilst respecting the site context and local heritage.
- Existing hedge rows, trees, walls and other boundaries
- Important local features, such as views identified in map x below

WS said that we should mention where they are, why they are important and what they look like. E.g. Efficient use of land whilst respecting the site context and local heritage: Add what the heritage is and why it is important. Include maps as it helps the decision maker visualise the area. Use standard explorer maps and include the North arrow, scale bar and grid reference

**Local Green Space policy:** WS said that we need to use a template and assess the green spaces; describing the green space etc. (This has already been done by Jane Dymock.) This is particularly important if we have any green space that is controversial. If there is going to be any controversy then the NPPF criteria sets out a certain set of words that we need to meet. We need to demonstrate to the examiner that it is a green space and ensure that we say that it meets the criteria for a green space.

Review the evidence base that has been prepared for the green spaces and let the planning officers know if there are any controversial green spaces.

WS said that the last sentence of the green spaces policy should be deleted. (*Development which would enhance its use but remain ancillary to its function as LGS would be considered.*)

**Village Facilities policy:** WS said that the sentence should read: The purpose of Policy VF1 – Village Facilities is to protect and *enhance* the existing facilities. (Page 9)

The policy should be more positive and not restrictive. Remove references to the asset of community value as it has nothing to do with planning criteria.

Think of what the facilities might need, or if the buildings need to be extended or enhanced and include this in the policy.

Local plan part 2 includes a policy on shops; WS suggested having a look at this policy. Don't remove what is mentioned in the existing policy but add more detail from the local plan policy into our existing policy.

**Public houses:** need to check that it conforms to local policy. Referencing the CAMRA document that was used to help write the policy is helpful but don't copy and paste.

**Business policy:** WS said that it seems sensible. WS suggested looking at how the supporting text can be extended, find examples.

**Community Access 2:** This needs more justification. It will be helpful to include maps of the key areas and mention where it is safe and where it is not safe. Encourage development proposals to support safer cycling paths and footpaths. Include more detail, explanation and supportive text of what is going on and where the community engagement is. Think more of connectivity rather than access (community connectivity). Mention how we can make connectivity safer and open up new routes.

**CIL:** there is no development therefore it won't be necessary to include this in the NP. Rather name it Developer Contributions rather than CIL. It is about trying to do the best we can to try and influence the developers and friendly people who live in the parish.

It was suggested to remove monitoring and implantation of the NP. If an SEA is required then it would be necessary to monitor the NP but it is unlikely that we will need an SEA.

**Consultation statement:** Mark Richards is working on the statement but it is a lot more work than anticipated therefore he will ask the Events Group to assist. Mark has logged all the engagement that has been done to date.

**Basic Conditions Statement:** This statement takes the basic conditions and says how the plan meets them. There is a set way to do this. It was suggested to look at what the basic conditions are online, assess the plan and how it meets these conditions. Look at the framework and start to populate it. It was suggested to look at Tattenhall's Basic Condition Statement for guidance.

**Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA):** The VOWH DC needs to access for an SEA therefore the committee needs to complete an SEA questionnaire. The VOWH DC will take the completed questionnaire, look at the draft plan, screen it and inform the committee if an SEA needs to be completed. It is unlikely that we will need one. The screening needs to be done before the pre-submission of the NP. Sam Townley will send the most up to date copy of the SEA template to the secretary.

#### **Further advice from WS in point form:**

- We need to think about where our priorities lie? What do we want the NP to achieve?
- The supporting text needs to have justification, planning evidence and detail.
- Think about what is going on that is important to the community and include this.
- Think about what young people want.
- Ensure that the NP directs the decision maker to make the decision we want them to make.
- Tease out key issues rather than copy and paste.
- The evidence base document won't be easily available to the decision maker therefore ensure that there is enough evidence mentioned in the NP itself.

## APPLETON WITH EATON PARISH COUNCIL

c/o Tamarix, Netherton Road, Appleton, Abingdon, Oxfordshire, OX13 5QW

E-mail: parishclerk.appletonwitheaton@gmail.com [www.appleton-eaton.org](http://www.appleton-eaton.org) Tel: 01865 596272

- NP itself is the strongest consideration so put at least some of the evidence base summary into the NP. The evidence base should have much more evidence and detail, whilst the NP policy should have a few sentences supporting the statement.
- Think where we could add more information and include what the planning officer does not know. This will help the planning officer to know that the project/idea is supported in the NP.
- There are grey areas within the NP, things you can't do or things you can. It can be mentioned that connections need to be improved in the village, enabling us to mention the footpath to the A420 in the NP.
- Use the Engagement work that we have done and add more detail of the findings. E.g. people said that they like green spaces, so mention this. Use bullet points that use percentages. Who we spoke to what they said and why we have gone in the direction that we have.

**NP119 Infill policy:** Evidence collected from community involvement suggests that the community would like to see smaller properties built in the parish. WS said that the best thing to do is have a look at what we want to achieve, write it in simple wording and send it to the planning officers.

The policy should mention that the village would like to see modest proportionate and scale development and primarily meet the local needs and also mention what the local needs are. The Housing Needs Survey from 2014 is out of date but we could try using it as evidence.

The biggest issue is that parishioners would like some form of development but the parish is tightly bounded by greenbelt. There is also a concern that this policy will be an issue with regards to the plough development proposal. This will need to be a policy to have more weight. It was resolved to include this policy in the Neighbourhood Plan to represent what the community wants. After the pre-submission the community will have a clear view if the plough garden will be protected or not.

WS was asked if we as a committee are able to propose development on rural exception sites in a NP. WS said no as it will no longer be an exception. If the community would like to allocate an area as a rural exception site it needs to be separate from a Neighbourhood Plan.

**NP120 Village character assessment:** It has taken 8 hours to complete two parts of Appleton. This task needs to be done in pairs therefore we need as many volunteers as possible. Annewen Rowe and Liz Gilkes will appeal for volunteers and help train them. WS said that volunteers should always have in the back of their mind: 'Why are these features important?' James Mansfield thanked Annewen and Liz for all their hard work.

**NP121 Project wish list:** Anna Yalci created a wish list using the results of the scoping survey and feedback from the community engagement event in May. These items are issues which are outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. It was suggested to put them in a different coloured text box so they don't get actioned.

- Bus service in the village
- Pavement to the A420 and the sportsfield
- Access to the lock and Thames Path

**NP122 Outstanding tasks for allocation:**

Amending policies:

John Adams – Business policy

Mark Richards – Public houses

Access Policy - Claire Salmon

Village facilities – Anna Yalci

Green Spaces – Jane Dymock and company

Design – Mary Carey

Housing Infill – Mary Carey

WS said the committee don't necessarily need to do another survey but we do need to ensure that we have sufficient evidence that we have engaged with the community. It was suggested that we are missing engagement from individuals between the ages of 13 – 30 years old. It was suggested to go to OX13 youth club and to utilise the Jubilee Park Facebook page.

**NP123 Date of next meeting:** 25<sup>th</sup> September 2017 @ 7:30pm

Meeting closed at 9:35pm