**Notes of the NDP meeting held Tuesday 20th March 2018 in the Memorial Hall commencing 14.00hrs**

Those attending :-

Barry Turner(BT) (Secretary and Chair), Dylan Griffiths(DG), Peter Everton (PE)(Financial, Alan Coles(AC) and Liz Beth (LB) LB PLanning

Apologies received from ;- Paul O'Connor (PO), Allan Knapp (AK) and Controller), Keith Sullivan(KS),

There were no declarations of interest made .

The notes of the 9th January and 2nd March meetings were agreed

There was no Public Forum

Liz Beth introduced herself to attending members and likewise.

**2018/64 Feedback from Public Engagement Event.** BT reminded the meeting that a draft summary of the responses had been circulated but the comments require further analysis. PE volunteered to do this . BT to provide the information . **Action PE and BT**

**2018/65 - Aecom draft Site Assessment Report .**At the 2nd January meeting a response to the first Aecom draft was discussed . Subsequently BT prepared a response which was circulated to members for comment. It was agreed as a true reflection of members views and e-mailed to Aecom.

Aecom replied with a revised draft which was circulated to members for comment. The main issue was the consideration Aecom were giving to the Green Belt ,this affects sites 7,8 and 9. It was agreed that whilst the Green Belt is important the NDP needed to reflect the need for development in this area of the village . Given the modest development being proposed it was felt that adjustments to the green belt boundary were feasible . This view had been reinforced during a recent meeting meeting with SGC where a way forward had been suggested and subsequent information that the revised NPPF out for consultation (section 13 para 135) was giving positive advice . It was agreed that the response to Aecom should reflect that our views on the green belt have not materially changed. LB offered to draft a response for BT to respond to Aecom. This will be sent asap and circulated to members. **Action LB/BT**

**See Appendix 1 for further detail**.

Post meeting note :- a response was sent(copied to Group members and LB ) 21st March 2018 to and acknowledged by Aecom who hope to have a final report to us by 31st March .

**2018/66 Deliverability of Sites .** It was agreed that on receipt of the Site Assessment Report the owners of the most suitable sites would be contacted to advise them of the findings and to establish whether or not they are amenable for them to be proposed for development . **Action BT**

**2018/67 Housing Needs Assessment** BT report that the Aecom Consultant had been provided with requested contact information and that the assessment was now in the early stages of work in progress.

The three basic questions they propose to answer are :-

- *What quantity of Housing in the Neighbourhood Plan Area (NA) is appropriate over the Plan period?*
- *What affordable housing (social housing, affordable rented, shared ownership, intermediate rented) and market tenures should be included in the housing mix?*
- *What type (terrace, semi, bungalows, flats and detached) and size (number of habitable rooms) of housing is appropriate?*

We now await their report.

**2018/68 Preparation of Draft Plan for SEA Scoping purposes** A recent meeting with SGC attended by BT .KS and LB had discussed the need for a SEA. The context of the discussion can be seen in appendix 1 of these notes . As it currently stands SGC have stated that an SEA will be required , however subject to them receiving a draft plan by the end of April which will give them a clear indication of the magnitude of what we are planning to achieve,it is possible that an SEA will not be required , this will depend on what they and the Statutory Consultation Bodies feel is appropriate . The draft plan will be drafted by LB with input from the group . **Action LB/Group**

A word of caution the assessment process that SGC has to undertake requires resource and they have said that this will have to be scheduled in to their work plan . As of now we are not certain as to the timescale for this work !.

**See Appendix 1 for further information**

**2018/69 Funding/ Grant Update** BT reported that it was likely that £218 would have to be returned to the granting authority in accordance with the grant terms and conditions terms. There had been some over and underspends against the budgeted amounts. This was largely due to less paid for meeting venues and printing costs (Dekkers printing services were used ) The end of grant report (end of grant period is 31st March) has to be prepared and returned to the granting authority by mid-April **Action BT.**

**See Appendix 2 for information**

BT advised that he had been contacted to confirm that the grant process , possibly slightly different to the current one was being extended for the period 2018-22. This is good news although the application requirements demand that we have a defendable time phased plan. Applications can be made commencing April 1st .

**2018/70 Ongoing Plan .** A draft list of policies prepared by LB and circulated to group members was discussed and some amendments made . LB will now review the objectives we have set and amend as required to make them more planning orientated and commence constructing policies which support the objectives . This will be a critical piece of work which requires input from all group members . **Action LB/All Group Members**

**2018/70 Local Character Assessment** This was briefly discussed and felt beneficial LB said she could provide some documentation for consideration. **Action LB**

**Appendix 1**

## Notes of the meeting with SGC

**Oldbury Neighbourhood Planning Meeting 22 February 2018 Minutes**

**Attendees**

**SGC:** Jane Wormald (JW)

**OOS PC**: Keith Sullivan (KS)

**NP Steering Group Members:** Barry Turner (BT)

**Consultants:** Liz Beth – LB Planning (LB)

**7. Introductions – 5 mins – All**

BT introduced Liz Beth from LB Planning to SGC as their new planning consultant whom is going to support them through the next stages of their plan preparation through to submission. JW expressed how welcomed this support to the group would be, particularly in connection with setting the scope of the plan and policy writing. Everyone else was well equated.

**2. Update on NP progress and outcome of recent events – 15mins BT**

BT updated the group on the January events which were very well attended by 102 visitors over 6 hours. As a result they had 58 responses to their consultation/engagement, which was primarily yes/no answers to set questions. Questions also focused on the site options and whether people agreed or not with these locations for growth. The NP steering group are still working through the free write text answers.

In other news, draft objectives have been written. The Parish Council have also been awarded full funding (15k) for the specialist areas of direct support they need for the evidence base in support of their plan. This means AECOM are providing direct support to the NP steering group and are currently working up further site selection information based on the final FRA. They are also going to be looking into the Local Housing Needs Assessment.

**3. Progress and preparation towards Reg 14 – Do you have a final scope of the NP agreed (still 14 dwellings and on how many sites?)**

BT informed SGC that the original 14 dwellings Oldbury were planning was based on the Core Strategy Plan period up until 2027 and therefore in bringing the NP into line with the new emerging Joint Spatial Plan for the West of England and the emerging new South Glos Local Plan 2018 – 2036, they feel anything up to 25 homes might be more appropriate to plan for.

It is clear from early engagement, that the community don't want all these homes on one site, but potentially over a number of sites. The site selection work AECOM are doing and future environmental assessments (to be discussed later) will assist in finalising where these might be.

Importantly, it was raised that no deliverability/viability work on potential sites has yet been done, but it was recognised that was needed prior to Reg 14 to ensure that come Examination, the Plan is well supported by the required evidence. BT advised that they have encouraged local people to submit call for sites through the council's new Local Plan process to assist in this. No Call for Sites has been done for the NP. LB suggested that AECOM could potentially approach landowners as part of their assessment work, or the group will need to do this as part of the consideration of the Site Selection. JW fully supported the need for deliverability of selected sites to be proven in support of the next stages, in particular the Examination of the Plan.

Furthermore, a lengthy discussion about the need for Green Belt release was had. LB clarified this was a strategic matter that could only be addressed by SGC, although the NP could be creative in suggesting it. JW has discussed the matter with Patrick Conroy, Strategic Planning and Specialist Advice Team Manager post the meeting on the 22 Feb 2018 and he agrees with JW, as discussed at the meeting. Given the time scales of the production of the new Local Plan for South Glos and the likelihood that the Oldbury on Severn NP to reach an advance stage of production prior to the new Local Plan and the fact that both the JSP and new Local Plan are looking at possible Green Belt release to accommodate growth in the WoE, a simply Memorandum of Agreement or similar could be drawn up between SGC and the Parish Council, as the Relevant Body for undertaking the NP. It would set out that future stages of the emerging new Local Plan and its adoption that the Green Belt release of parcel(s) of land, as necessary, would be amended to reflect the NP (proposed) housing allocation, on the condition that the evidence supports this Green Belt release. This would be submitted to the Examiner as part of the NP submission documentation. This can be arranged and drawn up once the evidence has been shared with all parties and we have a final draft of the Plan **prior** to Reg 14 (the Plan as proposed to be submitted at Reg 15/16). This approach to joint working would show best practice in terms of a LPA working proactively with its communities engaged in Neighbourhood Planning.

**Action: JW to review Planning Practice Guidance**

**4. HRA – JW (5 mins)**

JW confirmed that SGC would do the HRA of the NP, as the statutory body under these Regs, but we cannot do this until we had a first draft of the plan. See section under point 5 for further details.

**5. SEA Requirements – Scope – NP Group to do (Jane W/All)**

JW confirmed that SGC had already done a preliminary screening of the Neighbourhood Area and concluded that a SEA would be required for a Neighbourhood Plan in Oldbury due to the Flood Risk and local environmental assets.

LB agreed with JW that in order to take this assessment further it would be difficult to do this without at least an outline of the Plan's Scope. At the meeting it was suggested that SGC would carry out the Scope, however JW was unclear at the time as to whether this was the requirement of the council.

Post meeting, JW sought advice and whilst SGC are happy to assist as far as possible, the Government has not specified that the LPA carry this out (as prescribed under the Duty). However, SGC, are happy, upon receipt of the outline draft of the Plan which sets out the plans scope and general content, to complete a more comprehensive screening of the Plan to establish if it will have a likely significant effect (LSE) on any environmental asset. If it is concluded at that stage that it would <u>not</u> have LSE, then no further SEA would be required of the Plan.

However, it is most likely, given the Plan is going over and above provision set out in the current Development Plan for South Glos for further growth, that a Scoping and further assessment of the impacts will be needed. The more comprehensive screening from the council will set out what the Scope of the SEA / SA ought to be, however the SEA Scope itself and any further Environmental Assessment required of the Plan is the responsibility of the relevant body for the NP – Oldbury on Severn Parish Council, via their NP Steering Group. As LB suggested, the direct support you have obtained can assist you in this and SGC recommend that you factor this requirement into your Plan making process at an early opportunity. It is possible that the scoping report will conclude no LSE and at that point no further environmental assessment is needed. Just the Scoping Report needs to be submitted with the Plan. If LSE are identified then further environmental assessment will be necessary in the form an SEA or SA and an Environmental Statement will be the outcome.

As part of the process you will consult SGC on the final SEA/SA produced as part of Reg 14 (i.e. either the the scoping report or the full Environmental Statement) and we will make comment on whether the basic conditions have been met. However, in the interests of best practice, and given the councils first comprehensive opinion was made on an outline draft of the plan, we would encourage you to submit this to us prior to Reg 14 at the same time as we suggest you liaise with us for the Green Belt scenario discussed above. This will ensure that any issues highlighted can be addressed prior to Reg 14 and make for better place making and reduce delays at the more formal stages of the plans submission.

JW recognises that this can come across as a complex matter and stresses the above is a technical matter rather than a complex environmental assessment matter. As previously stated the evidence you are likely to need for the SEA/SA is already in place or underway, so stresses again not to be overly concerned. If anything changes in light of new information, as we all learn more from the SGC perspective on this topic, and from others experiences, we will update you.

**Action: NP Steering Group to submit an outline draft of Plan to SGC, expected End April 2018. Upon receipt, SGC have a reasonable period of time (5pprox.. 4 – 6 weeks) to provide a comprehensive Screening of the Plan for LSE.**

KS left the meeting

**6. Interaction with SGC (5mins) JW**

JW confirmed that the proposed Protocol for how SGC propose to meet the Duty to advice and support under the new regs is going before exec members in May 2018. This will be shared with Oldbury on Severn PC at the earliest opportunity following sign off.

JW mentioned that she was now involved in a learning group in London for NP and would seek to continue to bring what she learns from the group into working with Oldbury on their NP. It is hoped that the London NP Group will, over time, develop best practice guidelines which can be shared England wide.

**7. AOB** None.

| | **Amount** | **Spent to end Feb** | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Technical Reports Drafting policies etc for the Plan | £2,025 | | Invoice pending |
| Consultants Attending Working Group Meetings and advice | £1,001 | | Invoice pending |
| Room hire Working Group Meetings and Community Engagement Day | £205 | £65 | |
| Working Reports (consumables) | £50 | £82.64 | |
| Printing costs Presentation(Display Media) | £100 | £69.65 | |
| Printing costs Brochures | £200 | | |
| Website development Update Website | £100 | £150 | |
| Additional Display Equipment | £160 | £186 | |
| Travel | £0 | £43.60 | |
| | £0 | | |
| **Total** | **£3,841** | **596.89** | |

Anticipated spend for this phase **£3622.89** Balance to be returned **£218.11**