



East Hagbourne Neighbourhood Plan (EHNP)

5th Steering Group Meeting, 7:30-9:30pm, 26th September 2016, 12 Main Road

This meeting was convened to CFO's planning expert David Potter and consider how to use the survey results to formulate policies and statements for the Neighbourhood Plan report.

1. Attendance and apologies, declarations of interest

The meeting was attended by Crispin Topping (Chairman) plus Bill Barksfield; Sally Barksfield ; Iain Duff ; David Rickeard ; Justine Wood ; Marcus Wood and for CFO: Tom McCulloch ; David Potter.

2. Developments since the last meeting

Since the last SG Meeting on 14th September, comments on the survey report have been incorporated and a final version prepared. Key results will be presented at a public meeting arranged for Tuesday 25th October in Hagbourne Village Hall.

3. Implications for potential policies

David Potter explained that he had an extensive background in planning including Neighbourhood Planning and was therefore able to provide practical guidance on how the NP process works and what information is needed to make a convincing case and a robust plan.

General points:

The discussion was aimed at a better understanding of what is possible and realistic in policy development terms so as to give effect to the wishes of residents as expressed in the survey

The NP concentrates primarily on planning matters and it is around these that the policies need to be developed. Nevertheless there are a lot of other issues that relate to the character of the community and those raised as important by residents in the parish survey. These should be included at least as statements and many of them may help and provide context for policies.

Some NPs have included 'Community Policies' to cover this type of item. David believes it is better to consider them rather as 'projects' which can be pursued outside the framework of the NP.

The views of residents as expressed in the survey are important and should be reflected in the report even if they do not lead directly to policies. Policies should grow out of the survey responses.

Specific questions related to development of the NP:

Housing needs: The survey results indicate that the expected allocation of about 25 houses to 2032 from the Local Plan is about right to meet identified needs. The village has many larger houses and nearly 13% social housing properties, but there seems to be a shortage of smaller 2-bed houses. Infilling is the preferred option for most respondents but will probably not be enough to meet all the growth. The question of site designations remains contentious. CFO's advice is not to make specific allocations, because allocating a site would bring other similar sites into consideration. They suggest rather to survey all land for its characteristics and value to the community.

Protection of Green Spaces: The village has a number open spaces that are important to the community and character of the parish. It is possible to allocate Green Spaces provided they are locally identified as valuable and special and 'used' by the community. Not everything can be nominated, so concentrate on the most important.

Parking: While this is an OCC responsibility, David feels that parking is worth mentioning in the NP to promote a debate in Oxfordshire.



Flooding: This is not a NP policy area, more for the Local Plan (where we may wish to comment), nevertheless concerns and issues can be included as statements.

Extending the conservation area: This is the responsibility of the DC but EH could include a character assessment that identifies the area concerned as special and use to lobby the District.

Protection of Key views in/out of the village: A design policy can cover this particularly if backed up by a character assessment and photos. We already have a Character Assessment of the EH Conservation Area prepared by SODC in 2000 which is a valuable asset. This should be extended to cover the wider area. Tom commented that we could do this ourselves - there are toolkits available to help.

Highways/road safety/transport: These topics figure strongly in the survey responses. David advised that these topics are outside the scope of the NP, but can be covered as a project. DR pointed out that there had been a lot of work in the past through the Parish Plan and even before, and that it was important to distinguish between the challenge and the potential solution which would take a lot of discussion. Bill noted that we needed to manage expectations of the community given the strong views expressed in the survey.

Design Policies: We would like to create robust local design policies that require buildings to be in character with the surroundings and be of good build quality. This is a difficult area: if a detailed character assessment identifies key design criteria then it may be possible but being so specific would be very difficult outside a conservation area or listed building regs.

CIL/S106 monies: If development takes place within the parish then CIL/S106 contributions should come to the parish, but can only be secured if there are identified needs to which they can be applied.

4. Planning of next steps

The group felt that David's practical guidance was very helpful. Crispin proposed that the SG should progress preparation of policies as quickly as possible, with each of the topic groups covering their area. This 'plain language' input could then be reviewed by David and Tom to help make it effective. The SG will prepare for the public presentation on 25th October at which Tom will be present to answer questions.

The next steps identified by CFO at the last meeting are:

1. Establish objectives, consult with parish and amend as necessary
2. Draft policies, consult with village and amend as necessary
3. Complete character assessment
4. Prepares a draft NP document
5. Go through the statutory pre-submission consultation
6. Amend NP as necessary following the consultation
7. Draft other final submission documents: Basic Conditions and Statement of Community Involvement
8. Go through 6 week statutory final submission consultation (then the plan can go to the examiner)

Tom will advise any updates and further detail to this list.

5. Next Meeting

will be the public presentation of the survey results on Tuesday 25th October