

**Aston Rowant Neighbourhood Plan  
Steering Group Meeting  
17th July 2018 7:30pm  
Kingston Blount Village Hall**

	<b>Minutes</b>	<b>Actions</b>
1.	<p><u>Introductions</u> <u>Present</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Mark Thackeray, Jeanette Ewen, Andy Green, Paul Overton, Steve Sowerby, Kathi Davis, Richard Lockwood, Peter Tinson, Tim Sloane, Mark Jones, Paul Fincken, Guy Cunningham</li> </ul> <p><u>Apologies</u> Debbie Chaplin, Richard Lockwood</p>	
2.	<p><u>Minutes of the previous meeting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● June 2018 minutes were accepted</li> </ul>	
	<p><u>Declaration of Interest</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No general declaration by all present however members aware that as items arise declarations should be made if parties may have an interest</li> </ul>	
	<p><u>Matters arising</u></p> <p>Planning applications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Hill Cottage in KB conversion approved with several conditions that need to be met including a traffic plan</li> <li>● Hill Barn deferred</li> <li>● Donkey Paddock to resubmit re drawings not accurate</li> <li>● Rectory Homes may appeal on AR paddock however with backlog at the planning inspectorate the ARNP proposals will be further advanced by then.</li> <li>● Application at Windrush for infill</li> </ul>	
	<p><u>Updates from SODC and AECOM</u></p> <p>a) Red site assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Discussion regarding the allocation of Amber sites by AECOM particularly the 3 paddocks in KB. Steering group feel these should be red with the justification of their historic context and support of the conservation officer. Agreed that dialogue with AECOM should continue ensuring they are aware of the Saxon Square Field system and continue to press for a red designation of these paddocks.</li> <li>● Discussion regarding what appears to be an inconsistent approach by AECOM to designating red/amber using previous planning refusal as the criteria. Sites 34, 4, 5 and 11 were considered and using the logic of the previously rejected sites 4 and 5 it was felt that this criteria should be applied to sites 34, 26 and 27. It was agreed that building on these sites would categorically will be detrimental to the character of KB village.</li> <li>● In response to a resident's question about the number of houses that could potentially be built on red site 3 there was further discussion about the potential density of any designated sites and concern that these could be approved for more than the preferred option of less than 5. Options were considered regarding how sites could be limited to small developments.eg reduce the size of sites or split them into red and green sections or possibly introduce buffer zones around any development with strategic landscaping. It was questioned whether it was the group's role to stipulate density but were reminded that the public consultation was for sites with no more than 5 houses. It was agreed that strategies would be sought to ensure only low density development.</li> </ul>	<p>MT to continue discussion with AECOM and Ricardo regarding these issues</p>

	<p>b) Environment assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion whether an environmental assessment was necessary</li> <li>• Natural/Historical England suggest an assessment.</li> <li>• Majority of red sites suggested do not compromise Historic/Natural England but the paddocks in Kingston Blount do</li> <li>• Suggestion to proceed with Environmental assessment</li> <li>• It was pointed out that the colour coding of our assessments were confusing against the RAG rating used by AECOM and maybe a different colour could be used in our assessments to clarify</li> </ul> <p><u>c) Housing Needs Assessment</u>  Discussion whether a housing needs assessment is necessary given the small numbers of expected development  Suggestions from the group for a broad mix and also a perceived need for smaller or affordable housing  Questionable whether there is need locally or whether a quota of 5-10% is a contribution towards protecting green spaces in the plan  Concern raised about AECOM reliance on postcode OX39/49 data which may or may not be indicative of local preferences or need  Concern that the plan is in danger of stalling and that it needs to move forward to a draft</p>	
	<p><u>Writing the Neighbourhood Plan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A meeting on 24/7 has been arranged with Ricardo to discuss policies</li> </ul> <p>A reminder of actions agreed at previous meetings to be followed up in matters arising at the next meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• So far policies are written (except housing) and vision and objectives</li> <li>• Volunteers would be required to complete the other chapters and PO volunteered to bolt together</li> <li>• DC to contact Di Eaton to ask if “Foot of the Chilterns” could be referenced to provide the historical context</li> <li>• SS agreed to provide information on the demographics</li> <li>• AG has previously provided a lead on vision and objectives and will blend this with MT introduction</li> <li>• AG and PO to update the communication document</li> <li>• PT will start to develop an action plan for what the Parish Council will do moving forward</li> <li>• MT has written the green space policy</li> <li>• MJ/RL will proof read drafts which should be sent sent to PO by 31<sup>st</sup> May</li> <li>• MT to clarify next steps with SODC</li> <li>• Still need clarification on mechanism for insertion of maps, photos etc. Question regarding Mark Lloyd, photographer, to take photos of the parish referenced to provide the historical context</li> </ul>	<p>MT to meet with Ricardo</p> <p>Review of actions in matters arising</p>
	<p><u>Timetable</u>  It was accepted that this was as previously decided and as communicated at the Aston Rowant village fair</p>	
	<p><u>Communication</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current and future communication needs were discussed</li> <li>• It was agreed that stakeholders in the Parish eg allotment society should be consulted and Tracey Lambourne would be able to supply a list from the annual report to a Parish.</li> <li>• It was agreed that when 1st draft is ready, to publish notification on KBAR</li> <li>• Availability was still a key issue and sites 3, 6, 7, 9, 38 would need to meet the availability as well as suitability criteria. Contact details need to be established and MT agreed to make contact before the next meeting</li> </ul>	<p>MT to write article for Parish Notes</p> <p>PT to ask TL for contacts</p> <p>MT to contact potential sites</p>

		re availability KT to ask DC for a couple of articles regarding communication with the community

Next Meeting: 21st August 2018,  
7:30pm at Kingston Blount Village Hall