


CONFIDENTIAL**Minutes of NP Committee Meeting – 8pm 29 January 2019 in The Close.**

Attending: Giles Baxter (Chair), Jerry Moscrop, Simon Russell, Glenn Pereira, Jaqi Mason, Debbie Croft, Laura Buxton, Chris Neill, Annette Godfrey

Apologies: James Hammond

Ser	Item	Action	Action By	Due Date
1	<u>Welcome (GB)</u> Main purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome Annette • Brief committee on outcome of spatial modelling • Review project plan and assign actions • Initiate CRBO/NDO workstream 			
2	<u>Previous Minutes (GB)</u> Actions in lieu of cancelled meeting 27 November ■■■	Actions complete, except as outstanding: DC to follow up Dave Croft for Scouts and Sports Club GB to follow up Penny Hill for Village Hall DC to write formal response from school		

Ser	Item	Action	Action By	Due Date
3	<p><u>Project plan (GB)</u></p> <p>As at 25 January</p> <p>█</p> <p>Progress against Oneneillhomer project plan (GP)</p> <p>█</p> <p>Payment of Invoices</p>	<p>On track</p> <p>Cheque will be signed off at next PC meeting. (Afternote: posted by Anne Davies to Chris Neil and Jaqi Mason for signature. Should be ready to send to NH in next few days.</p>		

<p>4</p>	<p><u>Spatial Modelling Meeting 16 January 2019 (GB)</u></p> <p>Minutes or 16 Jan Meeting: </p> <p>Attendees at that meeting (GB, GP, SR, GM) agreed the minutes are an accurate reflection, (not a verbatim record) of what occurred, and the decisions taken.</p> <p>Record of discussion about the spatial modelling and decisions (at this meeting):</p> <p>Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GB supported by LB and JM explained s144, s 145 and s146 of NPPF. • Meeting agreed s146 as the basis to proceed, but may consider s144 if s146 fails. • Two options on the table (A, B). This is a start. • Do not meet our full requirement for a new surgery, 20-30 low cost housing, and 5-10 market houses (to generate funding) • Wish to explore further options to get closer to what we need. <p>Agreed to commission an LVIA on sites A, A+, B, E, and G (map attached) so that we have an evidence base from which to assess impact on openness, with a view to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore how much could be fitted into A/A+ and B. • Really test E & G, as we still need to find some space for more low cost housing and market housing to generate funding. <p>The committee agreed that there was no prospect whatsoever of Sites H, C, D, or F meeting the openness test and should not be subject to LVIA or considered further.</p> <p>The committee also considered whether two further sites, namely a site about the size of E running N-S to the east of Burcot farm lane, and a site along the eastern boundary of the recreation ground, but agreed that there was no</p>	<p>Glenn to approach Locality to see if they can offer an LVIA.</p>		
----------	---	---	--	--

<p>prospect of these sites either meeting the openness test, and should not be considered further.</p> <p>Meeting noted that NH's firm have produced a sketch of A and B schemes, based on outcome of 16 Jan meeting. Attached.</p> <p>Agreed to review recent case law on housing development in the Green Belt (as signposted by Landmark Chambers during their planning seminars)</p> <p>In terms of NPPF, committee agreed to continue to use s146f as planning policy basis.</p> <p>However the committee also agreed to monitor how the SODC LP proceeds through inspection.</p> <p>The committee noted the SODC officers observations on 16/1 that the surgery may constitute VSC, but housing does not. Given the weight attached in SODC to the housing justification for VSC to take Culham out of the Green Belt in the SODC LP, it seemed totally illogical to the committee that the SODC should concurrently reject housing as a VSC here. The committee noted that an application under s144 (VSC) may yet be considered if this is the only route remaining to meet our needs.</p> <p>The committee agreed that there is now a need for some further financial modelling. James Hammond and Gerry Moscrop are leading. GB to ask them to touch base with NH</p> <p>There was a discussion about negotiating strategy with landowners, noting that we understand both A & B are under the same ownership which weakens our position. But on the other hand, the NP/CRBO is the only option for them on the table. LVIA of the other options notwithstanding, the only site under consideration owned by someone else (E) could only be a stalking horse, and we do not wish to create false hope purely for our own negotiating purposes</p>	<p>Simon</p> <p>JH, GM</p>		
---	----------------------------	--	--

Ser	Item	Action	Action By	Due Date
	<p>GB to discuss how to approach landowner of A & B with NH.</p> <p>In the meantime, all committee members agreed not to give any information to any landowner who asked about the outcome of the spatial modelling until agreed by the committee.</p>	<p>GB</p> <p>All</p>		
5.	<p><u>Next steps (GB):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Get SODC agreement to minutes of 16 Jan meeting and sketch of sites A & B • Approach landowners • Financial modelling • CRTB/NDO Grant Applications 	<p>GB</p> <p>GB advised by NH. (GB will consult committee before doing so.</p> <p>JH and GM</p> <p>GB</p>		
6.	<p><u>CLT Matters (GM)</u></p> <p>CLT number issued by FCA is 7887.</p>			
7.	<p><u>AOB/DONM (All)</u></p> <p>March meeting: 13 March at 8pm in The Close.</p>			