

Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Development Plan

Notes of Clarification Meeting

St Mary Magdalene Church Hall, Shippon

3 April 2019 14:00

Present

Andrew Ashcroft	Independent Examiner
Cllr Andrew Ludlow	Wootton Parish Council
Cllr Ian Bristow	Wootton Parish Council
Cllr Caroline Parkin	St Helen Without Parish Council
Cllr Mike Page	St Helen Without Parish Council
Carole Page	Steering Group member
Jan Banfield	Steering Group member
Andrew Maxted	Vale of White Horse District Council
Deborah Bryson	Vale of White Horse District Council
Ricardo Rios	South Oxfordshire District Council

Introduction

AA asked the various attendees to introduce themselves

AA then explained the three related purposes of the clarification meeting as follows:

- to address the potential implications of the publication of the Main Modifications for the emerging Local Plan part 2 on the neighbourhood plan examination;
- to assess the overlaps between any potential implications from the Main Modifications and the Parish Councils' responses to the clarification note; and
- to discuss the timetable for the remaining parts of the neighbourhood plan examinations.

All parties were happy to proceed with the agenda and the list of points circulated by AA before the meeting. The remainder of this note is based around the discussion around these matters.

To what extent (if any) has the publication of the Main Modifications affected the on-going relationship between the policies in the submitted neighbourhood plan and strategic planning policy?

The discussion was wide-ranging on this point. AM explained the VWHDC position and how the Planning Inspector had addressed the issue of the Sports Ground and the potential for further development of the barracks in the future.

There was specific discussion on the significance of the proposed Shippon Buffer.

AM outlined the conflict between the strategic allocation at Dalton Barracks (in the main modifications) in the emerging Local Plan Part 2 and the proposed Shippon Buffer and local green spaces c/d/h.

AM also explained the way in which VWHDC had approached the Garden Communities initiative promoted by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government in August 2018.

MP/JB explained the Parish Councils' position on the relationship between Local Plan Parts 1 and Part 2 in general, and how its intended approach remained unaffected by the published Main Modifications in particular. They also explained how the submitted Plan had been prepared to take account of feedback from local residents in general, and to respect their views on the location of new development relative to existing built development.

When will the Planning Inspector be considering the responses to the Main Modifications?

AM commented that the Main Modifications consultation process closed on Monday 1 April. The comments received were being sent to the Inspector on Wednesday 3 April.

What is the anticipated timetable for the adoption of the Local Plan Part 2?

AM indicated that there was no clarity on this matter at this stage. Plainly it would largely depend on how the Inspector responded to the contents of the representations received. The meeting was however advised that VWHDC has already approved the Main Modifications for consultation purposes.

To what extent do the proposed Strategic Green Gaps 1,3 and 4 remain relevant to the emerging neighbourhood plan in the event that the main modifications are incorporated into an adopted Local Plan part 2?

JB commented on this matter on a site-by-site basis. In each case the Gaps were considered to remain relevant. The significance of proposed Green Gaps 3 and 4 in their roles as preventing the coalescence of existing settlements was highlighted. The long-term significance of proposed Green Gap 1 in formalising the identification by the DIO of the separation provided by these fields was also highlighted.

AM commented that the areas of land will remain within the Green Belt irrespective of the outcome of the neighbourhood plan examination.

Do the Parish Councils have any thoughts on the extent to which any refinements are necessary to the intended approach to strategic green gap 2 in the event that the main modifications are incorporated into an adopted Local Plan Part 2?

JB commented that the gap was considered to remain relevant. The significance of its role as preventing the coalescence of Shippon and Abingdon was highlighted.

Do the parish councils wish to reconsider their position on the relationship between local green space designation and the Green Belt and/or to carry out further work?

The parish councils indicated that they would undertake a proportionate assessment on this matter. It would be submitted as supplementary commentary to its earlier response to the clarification note. The parish councils also indicated that they had undertaken a proportionate assessment of additional benefit of LGS designation in the Green Belt as part of their designation activity, and that they would compile this information into supplementary commentary to its earlier response to the clarification note.

AM indicated that VWHDC considered LGS B (the paddock behind Barrow Road, known locally as George's Field) to be a sensible LGS designation.

Do the parish councils have any comments on the desirability or otherwise of the examination of the neighbourhood plan proceeding before the Planning Inspector considers the responses to the published Main Modifications?

Does the District Council have any comments on the future timetable for the neighbourhood plan examination?

These matters were considered together. Both parties agreed in principle that the neighbourhood plan examination could proceed separately from the adoption process of the emerging Local Plan Part 2.

Next Steps

AA thanked all who had attended the meeting for the positive way in which the issues had been discussed.

AM suggested that VWHDC produce an indicative map for this meeting showing the latest situation with regard to master planning and green space provision around LGS C, D and H to facilitate this discussion.

AA indicated that it would be helpful if VWHDC and the parish councils would have a further discussion and attempt to identify an agreed approach towards the relationship between the revised boundary for the strategic allocation in Local Plan Part 2 and its separation from Shippon. This would be a key step in resolving the existing conflict between the emerging local plan and the neighbourhood plan.

AA also asked that the parish councils send the assessment of the added value of the proposed local green spaces within the Green Belt to him via VOWHDC as a supplement to the earlier responses to the clarification note.

The meeting finished at 16:15.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

10 April 2019