

| | Action |
|---|--------|
| 1. Welcome: RH (Chairman) In attendance: HW, DP, RR, JW, SM, CM, CMit | |
| 2. Apologies: SS, AVB, AF, PG, RP, RG | |
| 3. Welcome to Ronan Lendon and Andrew Maxted from VWHDC who are the link officers re NP and Planning Policy | |
| <p>4. Questions to Roan re our analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RL reported that VWHDC were still processing over 3000 responses to the Local Plan. No decisions had yet been made and other proposed sites had still to be looked at. • RL had looked at the questionnaire response sent to the VWHDC and the idea of 200 houses on strategic site and 90 elsewhere in the village. Many other requirements across the Vale need to be also looked at. • It was suggested that our next step should be to consider 3 options:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ How would our NP progress if the Local Plan decided not to build the 290 houses? ➤ How would our NP progress if the Local Plan accepted our suggestion of a 200/90 split? ➤ How would our NP progress if the Vale carried on with the proposal of 290 houses on the one site? • There were various elements being proposed that is making the planners review their figures and look at possible new sites which may be better or worse. New sites have come up which VWHDC are looking at. • Senior VWHDC councillors will make the final decision but they will need to have all the options and evidence before them. • The time scale is still to produce the Local Development scheme at the end of the summer but with all the responses to answer it may be later. All the options in the Vale must be explored. The VWHDC want to regain control of development in the area as soon as possible; however the District Councillors will make the ultimate decision so there can be no indications about what may or may not happen until this decision is made. • It was suggested that we need to focus on what we want for Stanford in the Vale in our NP rather than responding to the Local Plan suggestions. However, it was pointed out that our NP does need to align with the Local Plan. We can do two things: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Wait until all the decisions are made to complete our NP ➤ Be ready to produce a draft NP when the Local Plan is published. • There was a discussion about the lack of support from the DC at the recent Horsecroft Planning meeting for the Parish Council suggestion, on advice from the NPSC, for the 200/90 split site option. • Our NP next steps should be to consider the 3 different scenarios that could result from the Local Plan. We need to assess and collect evidence from possible development sites – sustainability, landscape, constraints, infrastructure, conservation etc – to show why they may or may not be suitable for development • Where could any housing go in the village if the strategic site in West Stanford not allocated? What infrastructure is needed in the village and suggest possible development sites to pay for this? • We were recommended to proceed with drawing up some draft NP texts, with a development number we would be happy with, that can be used as necessary when LP published: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Do we support development? ➤ Where do we suggest development goes? | |

Minutes of the Village Steering Committee developing a Neighbourhood Plan for Stanford in the Vale
Monday 2nd June 2014 at 7.00pm in the Village School

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>➤ Where do we not want any development?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These questions should all be backed up with reasons and evidence. But be positive about trying to make development work. For example – what do we most dislike about the recommended strategic site west of Stanford? Lack of infrastructure – drainage/sewerage/ water pressure ; broadband; other side of A417. But smaller development could take place elsewhere and could be presented to the village in an appealing way so they would support it- with evidence to back up the suggestion. • Roan and Andrew both said they are here to support and help us to develop a NP and would come to as many meetings as possible. | |
| <p>5. Declarations of Interest – No declarations of interest</p> | |
| <p>6. Minutes from 19th May accepted as correct and signed as a true record by CMit</p> | |
| <p>7. Matters arising from the minutes not on the agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not now borrowing the model from Rose Seagrief • HW is going to the Vale of White Horse Design Guide Consultation Workshop on Wednesday 11th June 2014 at 2.30pm | HW |
| <p>8. Summer Festival Exhibition and Leaflet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RR showed the analysis of Section 1 in the questionnaire where people had a blank space to fill in. It was organised on the basis of the common themes commented on. Percentages were lower as no prompts given, but the fact various ideas were mentioned means they must be acknowledged and thought about. All ideas now need to be passed on to the Parish Council. • Leaflet had been sorted out through e mail communication. Going to printers tomorrow and to be delivered around the village at the weekend – 6/7th June. • One banner to display on the tent to be ordered • Large 4m x 8m marquee available for us to use. • 4 red display boards from school • 4 tables needed – 1 provided , others CM and CMit • RR to produce charts to be enlarged to A3 and laminated. Photos to be printed off from DVD • SM to assemble the displays • CM to write introductory text • A complete set of charts to be available in a ring binder • Extra copies of leaflet to be available for people’s comments and then one of the DC boxes to post them into. • Manning – Saturday 1.30 – 5.30pm CMit & HW Sunday 1.30 – 5.30 pm SM, RR & RH Others to be asked to be around to talk to villagers | <p>HW & SM HW HW JW, CM, CMit RR & JW</p> <p>SM CM RH</p> |
| <p>9. Implementation Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was discussion about who is going to look at the analysis results, prioritise action and then pass on the information to the relevant people – possibly the Parish Council. • To be discussed at a later date. | |
| <p>10. Update on objectives / WG composition/ members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Options to be discussed at a later date following tonight’s suggestions for the next steps. • It was agreed that the Woodcote Plan could be used as our template for a draft NP so that a skeleton plan with our relevant information could be started. | CM & AF |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>11. Update on NP Programme dates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RL and AM had quickly put down their thoughts about the time schedule needed to get a draft plan ready by November and would send it round. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 1st phase over the next 3 months – develop and test options ➤ 2nd phase – other topic areas like design and type of houses and infrastructure needed ➤ September – Community consultation offering comment`s on various options ➤ Oct/Nov – draft plan • There was discussion about the relevance of a housing need survey when there was the possibility of 200+ houses. • The Vale’s sustainability appraisal could be used for the strategic site but any other sites suggested would need to demonstrate how sustainable they could be. | |
| <p>12. Any Other Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was suggested that Drayton NP group be contacted as they are just going to consultation and would be even more up to date than Woodcote. • RL and AM to come to next meeting at 8.00pm, after Geoff Botting from Woodcote, to look at the programme for the next 3 months, the sustainability appraisal and the 3 options in more detail. | |
| <p>13. Next meeting – Monday 16th June at 7.00pm in the School Monday 30th June at 7.00pm in the school and then every 2 weeks.</p> | |