

# **North Hinksey Parish Neighbourhood Plan**

## **Minutes from Steering Group meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2016**

### **Present:**

Voting members:

David Kay (Steering Group Secretary, NHPC and WG4 member)

Non-voting members:

Grant Nightingale (WG2 Dep. Chair)

Charles Stone (WG4 Dep. Chair)

Barbara Witkowski (WG6 Dep. Chair)

### **Conflicts of Interest:**

No conflicts of interest were declared.

### **1. Review of draft policies:**

In the absence of representatives from the Vale or detailed comments from them in advance of the meeting the current versions of the draft policies were reviewed and the following changes suggested. **Working Groups to amend / update their policy documents and send revised versions to D. Kay by 15<sup>th</sup> January 2017. D. Kay to pull together in one document as suggested by W. Sparling, by 31<sup>st</sup> January. D. Kay also to review other supporting documentation requirements** (community feedback etc.) as mentioned in W. Sparling e-mail sent shortly before this meeting.

#### **General changes all Working Groups:**

- Where possible add percentage approval ratings in community feedback (some Working Groups have already done this).

#### **Working Group 1 Housing:**

- Community feedback needs more detail on what the feedback actually was.
- A number of draft policies that simply repeat policies already covered in other legislation (e.g. the Local Plan) still need to be removed to narrow down to a manageable number the actual policies we want in our Neighbourhood Plan.
- The policies are grouped into three sections (probably a good idea) but these would benefit from section headings, and although the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> section have introductory paragraphs the 1<sup>st</sup> one doesn't yet.
- There is reference to "the new dwelling units proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan" but these aren't actually identified anywhere.
- Appendix A is mentioned but still needs to be added.

- Reference documents:
  - (a) Which SPD is being referred to?
  - (b) The local Character Assessment should be added to the list.
  - (c) Any additional documents?
- Overall it would make sense for at least some policies to reflect the specific character of sub-areas within the Parish as defined in the Character Assessment (e.g. North Hinksey Village).

### **Working Group 2 Economy and Employment:**

- Important to identify owners' plans for commercial sites in reasonable detail as you can't impose development on them and if they have ideas totally counter to what is being proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan that could lead to unnecessary conflict (plus their plans might be beneficial to the economy and employment locally even when they are taking a different approach to the current Neighbourhood Plan policies).
- Statement "The community would like to see refurbishment of the ageing and poorly-structured light industrial areas in Old Botley to create a new 'smart centre' focusing on IT companies and linking to the needs of the many scientific businesses around Oxford". This is rather different from the policy encouraging flexible multi-use spaces. Does 'the community' really want this or does this simply reflect an opinion of a few keen people providing comments? Presumably you wouldn't want all of the current successful businesses in the ageing Old Botley sites which offer practical services and support for small home based businesses (e.g. plumbing supplies, garages etc.) to be thrown out and completely replaced by IT companies?
- The list of comments at the end isn't very useable in that format. Can a selection of these be grouped into categories relevant to the vision and policies (or possibly referring to other Working Group policies where that topic has been handled elsewhere)?

### **Working Group 3 Transport:**

- Policy 3.1 is mainly about cyclists and pedestrians but the second bullet point is about parking which looks like it would fit better under policy 3.2.
- Policy 3.5 supporting A34 improvements conflicts with the protection policies for green spaces and social infrastructure and doesn't reflect previous discussions on this subject in our combined meetings, plus there doesn't seem to be any community feedback supporting the position stated here.

### **Working Group 4 Social Infrastructure:**

- Overall too wordy and needs some serious pruning.
- Support documentation on health and education infrastructure not completed yet.

### **Working Group 5 Utilities:**

- Sustainable design and energy efficiency policy 1 – which developments? Commercial and/or housing plus would there be a minimum size where this applies? It wouldn't be

reporting in to the Parish Council, and what ability would the Vale have to monitor and enforce the suggested requirements? Also what are the 'highest standards'?

- Renewable energy policy 2 – do we actually have any spaces where large scale renewable energy projects could be set up? Also anaerobic digestion units are great but not very popular stuck near to housing so would there be a suitable site and what restrictions would you want to include in a policy assuming that we wouldn't want one put anywhere in the parish without considering the suitability of the site?
- Flooding policy 4 (which should now be policy 3) – “will not contribute to the flood risk at the bottom of the hill or elsewhere” no need for the last 8 words or could be simplified to “will not contribute to the flood risk within the parish” as you aren't being specific.
- Sewerage policy 5 (which should now be policy 4 if kept in) – not sure that this is necessary as Thames Water always involved already in major developments?
- Community actions project 4 maybe “investigate the practicalities of ...” rather than “campaign”, plus who would do this?

#### **Working Group 6 Green Spaces and Natural Environment:**

- Continue refining map(s) and adding detail to the defining features table.
- Policy 1 clearly protects identified important green spaces but other policy elements (areas of wildlife, TPO trees etc.) could be gathered under another policy as they all relate to land not already protected from development under policy 1.
- Appendices to add as noted on current document.

#### **Working Group 10 Brookes University, Harcourt Hill:**

- Will need updating following briefing meeting with Brookes on their development plans.

## **2. Date of next meeting.**

To be arranged in the New Year. W. Sparling not available for a meeting until February.