

Minutes of the third Meeting of the Ewelme Neighbourhood Plan Working Party 6th March 2017

Chair: Geoff Watts

Secretary: Shirley Meyer

Present: Sue Cooper, Rev. Jonathan Meyer, David Cooper, David Solomon, Chris Jenkins, Sarah Maine, Andy Evans, Mary Taylor-Lane, Ellie Clements, Andy Green, Shirley Meyer, Gemma Benoliel, Jordan Watts, Peter Bluff

Apologies: Linda Chilcott, John Gardner, Neil Blake, Sue Gell, Martin Spence, Zoe Dewar, Sam Gillman, Roger Moore, Keith Fletcher

NB. For the sake of brevity, participants will be referred to by their initials in these minutes.

GW provided all present with a set of objectives and an agenda, via email.

1. **Welcome and introduction:** two new participants introduced themselves briefly and stated their interest in participating; these were Jordan Watts who is a data analyst and Peter Bluff from Cottesmore Lane.

GW stated that we are NOT starting from point zero but have information and opinions based on the 2007 and 2008 village action plans. He also showed us a book called "Glimpses of an Oxfordshire Village" about Ewelme published in 1999 which showed that, actually, not much has changed! It suggests that changes are more likely to be incremental, especially in an AONB.

2. **Minutes of the previous meeting** were not read out. No objections were made.
3. **Review of Brainstorming :** **GW** distributed the pie charts that he had assembled from the online brainstorming session. These are quite detailed and are attached to this document for your perusal. There were approximately 50 replies to the survey.

Summary of sheets:

- The importance of perceived issues can be seen in the Ewelme NP Overview: there were five main areas of concern. Some of the areas are overlapping and are covered on more than one chart, with transport and traffic being of highest concern.

Transport and traffic (please see chart 2). There was much discussion around this topic with parking being of the highest concern especially around the school/ pre-school. There was perceived to be a lack of space to walk freely and safely with young children and speeding was an important issue here too. Indeed this is an issue that appears to come up again and again, as is the need for a car park. however, **mt-l** pointed out that the np is concerned with land use and land use development, which is different from transport links. **GW** read out the following extract from guidelines: "Sometimes at the neighbourhood plan examination, proposed traffic and transport problems become unstuck and are removed or modified by the examiner primarily because they are not land use planning policies (i.e.

they cannot be delivered or achieved through planning). Examples include trying to introduce 20mph speed zones, one way systems and specific routes for HGVs. Non land use issues like these can be included in a NP as long as they are included as community aspirations/ projects in a separate section from the land use planning policies. Unlike the land use policies these will not carry any legal weight but having them all in one NP will help to focus the community's efforts."

- **SC** spoke about the Community Infrastructure Levy available from SODC which comes along with the NP, which could possibly be put towards research on speeding etc.

Housing (please see chart 3) Again, there was much discussion here centring around where housing development could take place and it appeared that defining land use areas within the village would be difficult and probably outside the remit of this NP, the issue of green field versus brown field sites came up:

- **PB** had heard that some farmers are planning to put up developments. It was mentioned that Philip Chamberlain had been to the last meeting to express his interest. It was agreed by those present that it is better to work with landowners than against them and that any with local interests should be encouraged to come to these meetings.
- **MT-L** expressed her strong opinion that virgin agricultural land should not be used and that infill or brownfield sites should be utilised first.
- **SM** mentioned the possible sale of land for development behind her house and her concern.
- **Rev. M.** outlined the possibilities of building on the Rectory land as and when the Oxford Diocese eventually sells it. The Oxford Diocese is keen to work with villages on NPs and frequently do so.

The possible style and nature of buildings was discussed and agreed to be important and **CJ** pointed out that as we are an AONB we would have quite a lot of say as long as ideas are expressed in the NP. There was concern over the possible size and especially affordability of even smaller houses.

AG made the point that development does not all have to be in private hands and that housing associations may be interested. This needs investigation.

Physical Village (please see chart 4): the main concern was that people wish Ewelme to remain without street lighting. There appears to a large degree of frustration and apathy, particularly around the sports pavilion, as this has been an ongoing project/ issue for many, many years and has still not reached resolution. Other indications on this sheet overlap with the previous two.

Sustainability and green (please see chart 5): people were particularly concerned with sustaining and supporting the distinct nature of this village e.g. the church and school, the shop and pub, the watercress beds. Open spaces, including farmland, need to be protected and appreciated many are concerned how the knock on effect when the new houses are built in Benson and Chalgrove, will impact on Ewelme.

Village Heritage (please see chart 6): there is great concern about the aging demographic and the vibrancy of the village going forward, but **GW** pointed out that there are quite a few new young families moving into the village. **SC** suggested consulting the 2011 census and current electoral roll for the actual facts. These are factors that may affect future housing.

There was some concern about groundwater. The question was raised about the possibility of Grundon and other local businesses planning further development and how this might be affect groundwater.

Key Areas and Overview:

EC suggested that we use the Longworth Plan as a model and was backed up by **SM**. This was agreed. Using this, we went on to define the necessary work groups as follows:

- Spatial Plan for the Parish
- Design of housing (Sarah Maine & Andy Green)
- Community facilities e.g.school/ pub/ halls (Sue and David Cooper)
- Local green spaces (Andy Evans and Mary Taylor-Lane)
- Non-land issues e.g.transport (Ellie Clements)

NB. The people in brackets volunteered to head these work groups

It was agreed that people within these groups should put together as set of relevant questions which could all then be collated to form the Ewelme questionnaire:

- see here for Longworth questionnaire example
<http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Longworth%20Neighbourhood%20Plan%20Village%20Questionnaire.pdf>)
- It was agreed that group leaders would have questionnaires prepared for the next meeting in two weeks time.

4. Projects and tasks that fall outside the remit of the NP

The implication for Land Use projects has been covered (above) but all agreed that the large number of non land use comment (mainly Travel and Transport) need to be followed up and will be covered by the working committee headed by **EC**

5. Outline timeline for the production of the NP

Setting the NP Designated area: **SC** had bought along a large map of the Parish. She advised that it would be wise to stick to the designated boundary otherwise we have to give reasons for the change which can lead to a six week approval process.

It was noted that there are approximately 130 houses within 11 streets, mostly containing families, on the RAF Benson base but within the Ewelme Parish boundary.

GW read out an email from Rachael Riach of SODC stating that "MOD land has strict controls so you would not be able to make any policies relating to their land." However, she thought it good practice to discuss plans with them.

A decision was made to accept the Parish Boundary as the Designated Area of the NP.

Understanding of the budget and funding were not really discussed due to lack of time, and no decision was reached as to a timeline for the plan, although nine months was suggested.

6. Terms of Reference have been drafted by **EC**. These need to be circulated to everyone including those on the Parish Council.

At this point **CJ** brought up the possibility of having a NP website, as there was going to be a lot of inter-communication needed and it would be a good way of keeping the village informed and receiving feedback. Some discussion followed and **CJ** agreed to set up this website. He did point out that a website is only effective if it is used with information being regularly updated.

Due to lack of time item 7 was not discussed, except to say that say that GW has been trying to set up a meeting with RR at SODC and the timeline must fit within the Local Plan.

The date of the next meeting was set for Monday 20th March at 8pm in the Watercress Centre.

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS/ HOMEWORK

- **All** to read Longworth Plan
- Prepare a draft vision for the plan
- Understand/research current SODC land development policy
- **Work group leaders** to devise a relevant set of questions for their area to go into a village questionnaire
- **CJ** to start to set up website
- All to start to speak to people about these issues and gauge opinion
- **SM** to book W/C centre