



## **Drayton Parish Council**

www.DraytonPC.org

### **Minutes of the Special Meeting of Drayton Parish Council, Held on Wednesday 27<sup>th</sup> November 2013 at 7:30pm At Drayton Village Hall, Lockway, Drayton**

**Present:** Daniel Scharf (Chairman); Pat Athawes; Janet Manning; David Mercer; Graham Webb; Richard Webber; Richard Williams; Laurence Zipson **Not present:** Naomi Broomfield; Julian Fowler; Mark Jesson;  
**In attendance:** David Perrow (Parish Clerk)

#### **144/2013-14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

No Apologies had been received in advance of the meeting.

(Naomi Broomfield had emailed apologies to the Clerk prior to the start of the meeting but this information was not available to the meeting)

#### **145/2013-14 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

No members of the public were present.

#### **146/2013-14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS**

There were no declarations of interest at this stage of the meeting, nor any dispensations received in advance by the Clerk needed for consideration.

#### **147/2013-14 MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING**

The Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting of the Parish Council held on 13<sup>th</sup> November 2013 were **confirmed**. Daniel Scharf (Chairman) signed the Minutes as a correct record.

**Proposed:** Richard Williams

**Seconded:** Laurence Zipson

**Resolved Unanimously**

Whilst accepting that the minutes were as accurate a record as possible, Janet Manning wishes it to be recorded that she was dissatisfied with the conduct of the meeting. She did not remember abstaining from any vote, but her vote was recorded as such on occasion, due to the rushed nature of the meeting. She was nevertheless willing to sign off the minutes.

#### **148/2013-14 DRAYTON2020 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

The Special Meeting had been called to consider the initial DRAFT of the Consultation Copy of the Drayton2020 Neighbourhood Plan. This had already been considered by the Parish Council's Planning Committee at its meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> November, and the Minutes of this meeting were available to the present meeting and were commended to the meeting by the Chairman. The DRAFT Plan was not, as had initially been hoped for, ready to be signed off by the Parish Council, since VWHDC had indicated that the DRAFT needed amendment both in its format and content. Discussions on these changes were now taking place with VWHDC and a meeting of the Drayton2020 Drafting Group was to be held on Friday 29<sup>th</sup> November to receive the VWHDC feedback.

It was decided to proceed straight to comments on the DRAFT2020 Plan rather than spend time on Agenda items 5 & 6 which allowed for the process and policies leading to the DRAFT Plan to be explained to Councillors who had not been involved in the Drayton2020 Planning process.

**The following comments and recommendations were made on the DRAFT Drayton2020 Consultation copy for the Drayton2020 Steering Group to note and consider:**

Reference to DRAFT	Comment/Recommendation	Action
Forward:	Will now include acknowledgements to funders and Foreword by the Chairman of the Parish Council	Done
P6	Should mention: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No Strategic Local Plan in place yet</li> <li>- NO SHMA yet available</li> <li>- Contacts with VWHDC to ensure that the Drayton2020 Plan is in conformity</li> </ul>	
P9	Reference needed to Housing Policy Guidance?	
P11	Community engagement – need to include mention of dissent? e.g. those against any significant housing development but none evident at October meeting?	
P13	Drayton2020 Vision – should include NPPF para. 14 reference to “Presumption”	
P15	Policies, Noted that VWHDC advice is to follow practice of highlighting Policies in a box (as per the Local Plan) rather than Upper Case/Lower Case convention as used previously	
P16 & following	<p>Look &amp; Feel Note VWHDC advice that only Planning Policies should be included NOT aspirations. Gareth Bradford’s (DCLG) advice is that both can be included in same document provided each is distinguished from the other. This could lead to confusion when a referendum is held if people are unsure when voting on the NDP or the document as a whole, so situation needs to be clear for voters.. DCLG also advise that a Neighbourhood Plan can be agreed in advance of a Local Plan</p> <p>It may be advisable for the Drayton2020 Plan to follow the format example of the VWHDC Local Plan – so that there is no argument about what format is correct/acceptable.</p> <p>Also: Look at Thame Local Plan, which has been passed by an Examiner</p> <p>It may be that some issues can be noted as ‘referred to the Parish Council for action’. This formula was used by Woodcote to deal with some non-planning issues</p> <p>S106 Issues <b><u>MUST</u></b> be dealt with as policies, otherwise they cannot be justified as being eligible for developer contributions</p> <p>It was pointed out that the DRAFT would be subject to further revision through the process of consultation and Examination. The Examiner him/herself would recommend changes to tighten wording of Planning Policies, and may choose to hold a clarification meeting prior to the formal inspection of the Plan.</p> <p>LF1 Size of Village Hall &amp; Car Park. Concern was expressed that this proposed Community Building on the Manor Farm development was now much smaller than originally envisaged, and would not replace the existing Village Hall for larger meetings or as an entertainment venue. The new community building is now intended for the Pre-School, a café and small meetings rooms, including one for a clinic. A feasibility study was needed on the present Village Hall/new community building to inform what uses each might be put to, whether two buildings were affordable or sustainable, and whether the existing Hall should be</p>	

	<p>refurbished or demolished and rebuilt. This should be mentioned in the DRAFT Plan.</p> <p>LF2 Development within existing village boundaries. Wording on this policy is imprecise and needs tightening. One Councillor felt that the questionnaire did not support this policy (only 9% showed concern about development outside the village), but it was pointed out that plans and discussions at the three village consultation events had evidenced this policy, and that it had been supported.</p> <p>It was suggested that the comments made at the Curry Night be included as an Appendix, to serve as evidence.</p> <p>Community building/village green – separate out this as a policy from other aspects of the site development?</p>	
Design Code	<p>This needs drastic revision, The Steering Group had accepted this point, and references to Building for Life and the VWHDC Design Code would be strengthened and the Drayton Building Code slimmed down and made more specific.</p> <p>There were examples of good design (e.g. Mott Cottages) and poor design in the village which might be cited in the Plan.</p> <p>Some Councillors felt that a Drayton Building Code was not needed at all, and that Building for Life and the VWHDC Design Code would be sufficient alone – if reference were made to these.</p> <p>It was pointed out that whilst traditional design/materials might suit the Conservation Area, the Drayton Design Code should not be so prescriptive as to stifle innovation in design and use of different materials. There could be virtue in the existing variety in the village rather than uniformity.</p> <p><b>Resolution:</b> That a Drayton Design Code should be given low priority by the Drayton2020 Steering Group. The Parish Council will not demand that a Drayton Design Code be included in the Drayton2020 NDP  <b>Proposed:</b> Daniel Scharf <b>Seconded:</b> Laurence Zipson No Vote Taken. <b>Not passed</b></p>	
LF3/4/5	VWHDC unlikely to agree these	
Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Add reference to Climate Change Act/climate change justification for transport policies (sustainability)</li> <li>- Add Developments should contribute to Science Vale Transport package</li> <li>- Redraft policies to ensure that developers contribute through s106</li> </ul>	
Car Clubs	<p>There was a lengthy discussion on this issue. The Planning Committee had voted for an e-car club contribution by developers. However, the Drayton2020 Steering Group did not support this as a new policy because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New policies should not be added at this stage, without evidence</li> <li>- Questionnaire response gives little support</li> <li>- Nothing in additional comments on this issue</li> <li>- More support for additional bus services and improved/more cycle paths</li> <li>- If car clubs are s106 funded, what other community improvements might be foregone?</li> <li>- Car clubs should be a VWHDC/OCC policy, not suitable for NDPs at village scale</li> </ul> <p>It was argued in rebuttal that sustainable development issues are required by</p>	

	<p>NPPF whether or not there was specific no community based evidence or support  <b>Resolution:</b> That developers should be required to contribute to an e-car club in Drayton  <b>Proposed:</b> Daniel Scharf <b>Seconded:</b> Laurence Zipson 2 for; 6 Against  <b>Not passed</b></p>	
Bus Services	<p>Observed that an X1 service was being introduced to Wallingford, 3 per hour (peak time?), interspersed between existing X2 &amp; X3 service. This would be a 30min service for Drayton</p> <p>Science Vale/VWHDC policy is for a service every 15 mins.</p>	
Work & Play	Agreed that these two sections should be separated	
WP1 & Preamble	<p>What kind of new facilities may/may not be provided?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Add Football Pitches</li> </ul> <p><b>Action:</b> Pat Athawes agreed to circulate the questionnaire comments and analysis to PC members</p>	Pat Athawes
ATM Cash Point	<p>Is this feasible/affordable?</p> <p>Should be inside to ensure security?</p>	
Smallholdings	<p>There was considerable discussion on this issue, which was not currently included in the DRAFT NDP.</p> <p>It was pointed out that 200 people had expressed interest in this idea in the Questionnaire, but that no one had signed up to form a small holding group at the October Chilli night.</p> <p>To find out if there was actual demand for smallholdings in the village, an advert has been placed in the December Chronicle, would be on the website and circulated to the 200+ email addresses held by the Clerk.</p> <p>A view was expressed that demand within the village now was not the issue: there could be current demand outside the village or future demand in the village as yet unknown. What was important is that the Drayton2020 NDP promoted carbon-reduction targets, and it was crucial in this regard that local food production was encouraged and people given access to land to train as farmers – the UK was facing a 1 million farmer shortage as current farmers aged, and farm land was too expensive to rent or buy for new entrants.</p> <p>There was some support for a community farm as an alternative to smallholdings.</p> <p><b>Resolution:</b> That smallholdings provision should be included in the Drayton2020 Neighbourhood Plan  <b>Proposed:</b> Daniel Scharf <b>Seconded:</b> Laurence Zipson 2 for; 6 Against  <b>Not passed</b></p> <p><b><u>Laurence Zipson left the meeting at 9.10pm</u></b></p>	
Chairman's Statement	<p>The Chairman asked to make a statement to the meeting:  He stated that certain issues are fundamental to Sustainability – such as carbon</p>	

	<p>reduction. There was a need to try out some policies, such as adaptable housing; car clubs; smallholdings etc. which were low cost but which met the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’. The NDP must, in his view, embrace these strategies and concepts. The current planning system was failing to address or promote these kinds of developments, and local planning was the opportunity to challenge these past planning mistakes.</p>	
Smallholdings cont’d	<p>Graham Webb commented that since the NDP was a 15 year plan, what was required were ‘loose-fit’ policies which were not over-prescriptive.</p> <p><b>Resolution:</b> That consideration of the smallholdings should be taken away for consideration by a small group  <b>Proposed:</b> Daniel Scharf <b>Seconded:</b> Janet Manning <b>Agreed Unanimously</b></p>	
Phasing	<p>It was suggested that a debate was required on this issue and that it must be specified in the Drayton2020 NDP.</p> <p>Developers should all be required by the NDP to provide a Housing Strategy document addressing Drayton issues such as transport, energy, natural environment etc. The Housing Strategy could address issues of household size and existing housing in 2011 Census, the SHMA, the housing needs in the village and VWHDC housing needs surveys, and the demand for the self-building and co-housing.</p> <p>The Upper Eden NDP, which has passed Examination and Referendum has a phasing policy. The VWHDC advice that phasing is not legal is incorrect</p> <p>Viability: need to know how much profit a development will produce in Drayton. Likely to be £800k-£1m per acre. This will assist in evaluating the s106 developer contribution level affordable on each development.</p> <p><b>Resolution:</b> That a discussion should take place on having a phasing policy in the Drayton2020 NDP  <b>Proposed:</b> Daniel Scharf <b>Seconded:</b> Richard Williams <b>Agreed Unanimously</b></p>	
Self Build	<p><b>Resolution:</b> A policy should be included in the Drayton2020 NDP to require that developers allocate 20% of their site to self build  <b>Proposed:</b> Daniel Scharf <b>Seconded:</b> No seconder  <b>Not passed</b></p> <p><b>Resolution:</b> That discussion on the self-build issue should end and the meeting move on to next business  <b>Proposed:</b> Richard Webber <b>Seconded:</b> Richard Williams <b>Agreed</b></p>	
Co-Housing	<p>No discussion took place on this issue  <b>Resolution:</b> That the meeting be brought to an immediate close  <b>Proposed:</b> Janet Manning <b>Seconded:</b> Richard Webber <b>Agreed</b></p> <p>The meeting concluded without completing the published Agenda.</p>	

**The meeting concluded at 10:25pm**

**Signed:**

**Date: 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2013**

**Name: Daniel Scharf**

**Role: Chairman, Drayton Parish Council**