

**Aston Rowant Neighbourhood Plan
Steering Group Meeting
13th March 2018 7:30pm
Kingston Blount Village Hall**

	Minutes	Actions
1.	<p><u>Introductions</u> <u>Present</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Thackeray, Jeanette Ewen, Andy Green, Paul Overton, Steve Sowerby, Kathi Davis, Richard Lockwood, Peter Tinson, Tim Sloane <p><u>Apologies</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Jones, Paul Fincken, Debbie Chaplin, Guy Cunningham <p><u>Visitors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike and Rebecca Smith, Ian Kimber 	
2.	<p><u>Minutes of the previous meeting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • February 13th 2018 minutes were accepted 	
3.	<p><u>Declaration of Interest</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No new declaration, however it was reconfirmed that all assessors involved in the assessment of possible “red” building sites did not contribute to assessments of land adjacent to, or in anyway connected to, their own property. This was as per Peter Tinson’s email on 12 January ahead of the assessments. Group members have and will also respect this need in NP meetings going forward. 	Assessors to email JM with said red sites for appendices
4.	<p><u>Feedback from SODC.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SODC confirmed that 9 of the 10 criteria used for assessment of “red” sites together with the weighting system were valid. They recommended that instead of “settlement boundary” in criteria 3 we should refer to “Built up area” 	
5.	<p><u>Effect of SODC advice on ARNP assessment scores</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Steering Group considered whether this change of wording and emphasis had a significant effect on scoring of the “red” sites • A number of sites at the boundaries were considered and scores adjusted to reflect the new emphasis with the result that two sites at the top of the list were interchanged. Otherwise their was no significant changes 	PO will update the full list of red sites with amended scores
6.	<p><u>ARNP steering group assessments and ARPC planning support decisions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group discussed the mismatch between the similar Steering Group assessments of two sites and the subsequent decision of the Parish Council to support a planning application for one and not the other • PT explained that until the Neighbourhood Plan was approved the Parish Council (PC) had to abide by their own guidance and PT agreed to circulate this to the group • There was some concern that the PC had not consulted the community before making their individual decisions, in line with the good council guide. This was defended by saying that PC meeting was an open one for all to put their point of view forward. However, PT accepted that it was an omission that the residents of the two properties directly opposite the St Johns Homes site hadn’t been spoken to and therefore this hadn’t been done well. • Questions were asked whether the PC had made declarations of interest before voting and PT responded that this would not have influenced the final decision. However he did agree that in hindsight that councilor Hill’s “vote” should have been disregarded. • It was agreed that questions regarding the PC should be put to them directly and that this was not the appropriate forum to question the Parish 	PT to circulate Planning application criteria to the group

	Councillors	
7.	<p><u>Application for technical support from My Community/Locality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MT had made a timely application for technical support from AECOM who are able review the Steering Groups assessments, make any recommendations necessary and write that section of the pre submission • AECOM have agreed to take the job and review up to a maximum of 20 sites • The group discussed how many sites to give AECOM and at which score they would consider them suitable. After examining the scores there appeared to be a natural cut off at over 30 points which would reduce the number of sites to a suitable level • Regarding further work from AECOM it was understood that Landscape, Environmental and Eco impact studies would probably not be required 	MT to engage AECOM and continue liaison
8.	<p><u>Suitability and Availability the way forward</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion regarding who should be approached regarding availability of sites and it was agreed that this should come after the AECOM analysis • It was felt that the Communication Officer Jodie Webb might be able to give advice about this stage 	
9.	<p><u>Writing the plan in the light of SODC housing targets and current planning applications</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some preliminary work has been started between PO and AG regarding the timeline of the decisions and consultation • MT has been reviewing models from other local plans to find ideas and similarities with our own • There was discussion regarding the number of dwellings/sites to be identified in the future plan given that the target was 5% (17 dwellings) and that a number of planning applications were pending. The SODC target was 4.1% and it was felt that our plan didn't need to exceed this. However it was recognized that site(s) would still need to be identified even if the target had been exceeded by the time of the submission, even if this was just two • There was a reminder that the plan would also be protecting green spaces and/or accepting infill. 	PO and AG to report of work so far on these sections
10.	<p><u>Communication to parish</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debate as to whether all the information about the red sites should be made public and it was decided until AECOM had made an evaluation it would be premature to release details at this stage. This decision was backed by the SODC advice. • Communication of the process will be published in Parish Notes • A report to be delivered at the Annual Parish Meeting in April. AG offered to present if necessary 	MT to provide report for the next edition of parish Notes
11.	<p><u>Timeline</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timeline was considered and the updated version was agreed • A referendum date was on track for November 2018 	
12.	<p><u>Responsibilities</u></p>	
12.1	<p><u>Communication</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was felt that a member of the Steering Group was required to liaise with the SODC Communication officer, Jodie Wales to discuss the quality of the group's communication so far and receive advice on actions moving forward. KT was asked and agreed to work with DC to make contact before the next meeting. 	MT to forward Jodie Webb's email to KT and KT to make contact.
12.2	<p><u>Governance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RL agreed to monitor minutes, agenda and declaration of interest. A point was raised about early meetings not having been formally minuted and that it would be useful to have a historical record of these. Information 	JM to forward March draft minutes to RL

12.3	<p>regarding early meetings would be available through: MT's notes, PC minutes on the website and Parish magazine.</p> <p><u>Administration</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AG agreed to work with MJ to rationalise the Steering Group's Dropbox • The group recognised their duties regarding GDPR and where appropriate would anonymise data held regarding any individuals 	Members with information/ links to be sent to RL
------	---	--

Next Meeting: 10th April 2018, 7:30pm at Kingston Blount Village Hall