

MINUTES
BERRICK SALOME PARISH COUNCIL
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP
13TH DECEMBER 2017

A Meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group ('the Group') was held in the Berrick Salome Village Hall on Tuesday 13TH December 2017 at 7:30 pm.

Present:

Brian Tracey (BT) (Chair)
Ian Glyn (IG) (Chairman - Parish Council)
Chris Cussens (CC) (Parish Clerk)
Ray Perfect (RP)
Derek Shaw (DS)
Sarah Russell (SR)
Chris Kilduff (CK)
Sue Lyons (SL)

1. Apologies for Absence

Sarah Vaccari (SV), Douglas Taylor (DT), Conrad Shields (CS)

2. Declaration of Interests

Nothing new.

3. Minutes of Previous Meeting

The Minutes of the previous meeting, held on 14TH November, were unanimously approved.

4. Matters arising from the Minutes

None that weren't covered in the agenda.

5. Feedback from public NP presentation/consultation (Nov 25th)

Visitors tended to focus on the preliminary suggestions for traffic mitigation, rather than other aspects of the plan. Written comments on this were circulated to the NP team in the email issued by CC on Nov 25th. It was acknowledged that the main drive for mitigation measures would be via the Parish Council, though this would certainly not be excluded within the NP; Ricardo Rios has advised us to present the traffic element in the NP as a "challenge", to avoid an Inspector from disallowing its inclusion. (see Appendix below on IG notes on conversation).

IG and RP have had productive meetings with Mark Francis of OCC and it was agreed that improvements to village signage would take place in January and road line re-painting would take place in the spring. It was agreed that traffic counting should be considered, with IG consulting Mark Francis and BT consulting his own contacts for quotes. **Action: IG and BT**

It was agreed that the analysis of the findings of the questionnaire should be published to the parishioners. **Action: CC**

6. Briefing on, and matters arising from IG's recent conversations with Mr Rios of SODC concerning version 2 of the draft document and related issues

IG reported on his conversation with Ricardo Rios (RR) in an email sent to the NP team on Dec 5th. This report follows these minutes as an Appendix.

The team agreed with RR's comments. It was further unanimously agreed that

1. We will complete the plan, without housing site allocation.
2. The completed plan will be reviewed later to produce a new version including possible allocation – but only if then required.
3. IG and SL will work together to incorporate IG's note from Ricardo into an updated draft of the NP. **Action IG, SL**
4. Assuming Neil Homer is confirmed as consultant (see below), the above update would be provided to him to continue developing the plan from January 2018.

7. Strategic Environmental Assessment Questionnaire (SEA)

As we are not making an allocation, we do not need to respond to an SEA.

8. Appointment of an NP Consultant

It was unanimously agreed that Neil Homer should be appointed as our NP consultant. This would be subject to getting the locality grant-- IG to discuss NH starting, but not incurring more cost than we have in our existing grant arrangements until we get the locality grant. The intention is that the Locality grant covers NH fees in full and the SODC grant to be available for other costs. **Action IG**

IG to discuss funding / grant arrangements with the Parish Council. **Action IG**

9. AOB

None

10. Next Meeting

The date for the next meeting is 9TH January at 7:30pm in Berrick Salome Village Hall.

Appendix: Report by IG on conversation with Ricardo Rios, Dec 5th 2017

GENERAL POINTS.

- 1) He was " pleasantly surprised by the quality of what we'd done so far. He thought the Plan was well drafted and showed a good understanding of what's needed. It's in good shape to go forward
- 2) When asked about an involvement from Neil Homer he said he knew Neil and that while his plans adopted a certain structure it was " method tested" and he had regard for Neil's judgement. He wasn't convinced that we really needed Neil as we were not proposing to " allocate" but that his clarity, experience and guidance may be useful.
- 3) With regard to the SODC grant -- that was proceeding and his colleague Sam was instructed to pay it. In addition to the SODC grant there is up to £9,000 available from Locality -a central government organisation and we should go for that to cover Neil's fees. He thought Neil's fees were reasonable and should be covered by Locality leaving SODC grant available for other needs. Sam is to send us the link to Locality funding.

SPECIFIC ISSUES.

Page 6 For Gavin Barwell's statement to be relevant we need to make an allocation. Absent that it is better to refer to para198 of National Policy Framework which is embodied in National Policy as the minister's statement may be overruled by the High Court.

1.1 If we do not make an allocation we do not need to do an SEA. There is a process to go through if this is the case involving (inevitably) a form which Ricardo will get to us and a screening/ authorisation by SODC after consultation with others.

Page 8 et seq. In general we need to cross refer all statistics mentioned to the Questionnaire by means on an * to the effect that we've run a process of consultation and the " statistic" comes from that consultation.

In several paras we've made judgements ie " ill-suited to modern traffic flows etc. " We should not do so but rather we should describe the problem -- delivery vans block roads -- lots of 90 degree bends etc.

To keep our concerns re traffic/ lanes etc in the Plan we need to engage with OCC Highways and refer to their shared concern and support for our chosen remedies. Otherwise an Inspector is likely to remove those concerns from the Plan on the basis that they should be dealt with by the Planners at the time of a specific Application.

We should describe the challenges that Benson and Chalgrove bring to the Parish as -- just that-- challenges removing reference to perceived fears and replacing it with as much evidence as possible. The whole section 2.5 could be expressed as a " challenge" otherwise a difficult examiner might remove it completely.

page 15. Section on SODCLP We should cross reference to the " core " Strategy in the 2012 adopted plan. It is a legal obligation that NP's do so. We can refer to the emerging Plan in terms that our approach is consistent with it only.

In that context we should refer to ourselves as a " smaller village" as that is what we are in that document. We can refer to us being reclassified as an " other "village in the emerging plan. The effect of this is neutral on us as " smaller villages" in the 2012Plan are not required to allocate or contemplate extra housing. Only in the emerging plan is that suggestion postulated.

P19. Et seq. Ricardo thought we were confusing " objectives " with policies in several of our " policy " statements. If they are to be policies they need to be much clearer, more specific and sharper. They must also comply with National Policies. He thought several of our policies were weak and platitudinous.

Page 23. With regard to the biodiversity issue he thought we should cross check the things we were trying to protect with The Thames Valley Centre for Environmental Records or TV Wildlife Centre. He also thought that in several of our more esoteric statements we would do well to follow what Britwell Cum Sotwell had done.

All Policies should be shown in clear and distinct boxes to make them stand out and they should all be drafted to be robust and say why they are important and of value to the community

Page 26 BSP4. He thought this was a hostage to fortune- particularly the bit about smaller houses. Maybe more appropriate to include this if we make an allocation as developers could come along in five years' time and question its current validity

Monitoring. Do we really want to commit to ongoing monitoring? Again leaves us open if we don't do it.