

## Joint St Helen Without and Wootton Neighbourhood Plan

### Minutes of the Steering Committee (SC) Meeting

held on Wednesday 26th April 2017 at 7.00pm Wootton & Dry Sandford Community Centre

**Present:** Carole Page (CP) (Chair), Janet Banfield (JB) (Vice Chair), Richard Bahu (RB), Phil Painting (PP), , Andrew Lane (AL), Cllr Mark Fysh (MF), Rose Osborne (RO), Cllr Geoff Fitzgerald (GF), Cllr. Ian Bristow (IB) and Kate Aydin (KA).

CP welcomed Priscilla Dudding, Chair of Radley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, who will talk about their experiences.

**Members of Public in Attendance:** Alan Osborne (AO), Vicky Talbot (VT) and N Cross (NC).

**1. Apologies for absence:** Janine Elliott (JE), John Ashton (JA), David Churchouse (DC) and Cllr. Madeleine Russell (MR).

#### **2. Declarations of Personal or Personal and Prejudicial Interests (PorPI)**

None in addition to those previously declared and noted in the minutes of the SC dated 29th March 2017.

#### **3. Minutes of Last Meeting**

Adopted.

Note: RO had requested that she receive hard copy of the minutes in addition to them being emailed. RB apologised that he had not managed to get these to her in time for the meeting but would ensure that they and future minutes were delivered once approved by CP. MF offered to assist RO by reading the minutes to her.

#### **4. Matters Arising from the Minutes**

- DC offered a draft timeline for the NP. NOTE: GF HAS DEMONSTRATED A PROJECT PLANNING TOOL CALLED MINDMANAGER WHICH HE USES AND WOULD APPEAR TO BE A VALUABLE RESOURCE FOR THE SC. IT COSTS AROUND £300. SEE ITEM 11 BELOW.
- CP said Priscilla Dudding, Chair Radley NP Working Group would attend our next meeting to talk about the Radley NP. SEE ITEM 6 BELOW.
- MF will look at the list of volunteers and how those from Wootton could be mobilised to be more active in taking roles for the NP. MF REPORTED THAT HE HAD IDENTIFIED 4 VERY ABLE VOLUNTEERS WITH A RANGE OF USEFUL SKILLS, ONE OF WHOM IS DISABLED. MF WOULD PROVIDE THEIR DETAILS TO RB. CP HIGHLIGHTED THAT SHE INTENDED TO INVITE ALL VOLUNTEERS TO THE NEXT MEETING OF THE SC ON 17 MAY.
- CP noted that there was a need for an initial high level consultation on the top 10 issues for the NP .GF will take the lead on this because of his market research expertise. He noted that this would requires us to develop a brief for the research, piloting etc. CONFIRMED.
- CP highlighted that we still needed a SC meeting minute taker. GF will ask the Dry Sandford school Clerk if they might take on this role. MF will raise the issue with JMC members. CONFIRMED THAT IT WILL BE RAISED AT NEXT JMC MEETING.

- RO will receive hard copy of the minutes in addition to them being emailed. MF will assist RO by reading the minutes to her. SEE ITEM 3 ABOVE.
- Both PCs will be asked to include on their next meetings agendas an item on further investigation of conservation areas and seek more details on the process for applying. IB CONFIRMED THAT THIS WOULD BE INCLUDED ON THE AGENDA AT WOOTTON'S NEXT MEETING ON 2 MAY. GF NOTED THAT IT WOULD NEED CONSULTATION FROM THE BROADER RESIDENTS THAT IT WAS SOMETHING THEY WANTED. CP HIGHLIGHTEDS THAT MR HAD OFFERED TO REVIEW THE PROCESS. GF EMPHASISED THAT SOME RESIDENTS MAY NOT AGREE AS THEY COULD BE UNHAPPY ABOUT THE RESTRICTIONS THAT A CONSERVATION AREA IMPOSED. CP CONFIRMED THAT IT WOULD BE THE PCS THAT WOULD NEED TO TAKE THIS FORWARD. RB NOTED THAT IT WAS THE ISSUES AROUND THE GREEN BELT THAT HAD PROMPTED THIS ITEM BEING DISCUSSED. CP HIGHLIGHTED THAT THERE MAY BE AREAS THAT THE COMMUNITY FELT SHOULD BE CONSERVED IN THE NP. IB STATED THAT THE PCS WOULD SEEK THE VIEWS OF THE COMMUNITY ON WHERE THEY SAW ANY POTENTIAL AREAS. RB HIGHLIGHTED THAT THE VWHDC MAPS SHOWED THE LOCATION OF THE LISTED BUILDINGS IN THE DESIGNATED AREA.
- Mr Will Sparling VWHDC will be invited to a future SC meeting. CP CONTACTED HIM TO ARRANGE A MEETING WITH SC AND ALSO TO OBTAIN ANY DATA ON BUSINESSES AND LAND OWNERS AS THEY ARE KEY STAKEHOLDERS FOR NP.
- CP will check with Mr Will Sparling on businesses and landowners data held by VWHDC.
- RB will create a Glossary. CONFIRMED.
- JA to draft a formal request to VWHDC on why they had expanded the area beyond the operational boundary of DB. JA WAS NOT ATTENDING SO COULD NOT BE CONFIRMED. GF MADE COMMENT FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE MONITORING COMMITTEE THAT THE VWHDC WAS CLEAR THAT WHEN PEOPLE MAKE DECLARATIONS THAT WHEN THAT COMES UP AT A SC THEY ARE NOT REALLY SUPPOSED TO GET INVOLVED IN CONFLICT OF INTEREST. CP NOTED THAT THIS WAS MR ASKING JA TO PROVIDE A DRAFT AND THAT HE HAD PROVIDED ADVICE ON KEY QUESTIONS FOR THE PRE-MEETING HELD WITH THE VWHDC. RB CLARIFIED THAT JA'S DRAFT WOULD BE FOR THE PCS TO DECIDE IF THEY WISHED TO PUT IT TO THE VWHDC.
- GF will use Facebook to alert Wootton residents about the LPP2 consultation meeting on 23rd April. CONFIRMED. GF NOTED THAT ONLY 2-3 RESIDENTS FROM WOOTTON ATTENDED BUT THAT THERE WAS VERY GOOD ATTENDENCE FROM SHIPPON AND WHITECROSS REFLECTING THE DIRECT LEAFLETING COVERAGE.
- MF will check how best to encourage Wootton residents to attend the 23rd April meeting. CONFIRMED.
- MF to check room availability at WADS community centre for future SC meeting dates. CONFIRMED.

JB NOTED THAT THE NP CANNOT REJECT VWHDC DEVELOPMENTS IN AN ADOPTED PLAN BUT CAN PROPOSE ADDITIONAL SITES - COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ORDERS IN COLLABORATION WITH LANDOWNERS. CP HIGHLIGHTED THAT THE SC MIGHT WISH TO PROPOSE NEGLECTED SITES FOR DEVELOPMENT.

## **5. Matters raised by Members of the Public**

None.

## 6. PRESENTATION BY PRISCILLA DUDDING - RADLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Unfortunately, PD could not give her PowerPoint presentation as there was no suitable link cable to the projector so she talked to them (see attached copy of her slides).

CP invited PD to say how Radley had started on their NP and how they might do it differently now that they are going through the process.

PD was elected to Radley PC in May 2015 and immediately became Chair of the NPSG. At that stage they had applied for the designated area but approval did not come through till July 2015. That is when their process kicked-off. They published a pre-submission draft NP just before Christmas 2016 which is quite far down the road. Hoped that by now would be submitting NP for further consultation, invite an independent inspector and finally have the referendum. However, the VWHDC, on the last day of their consultation, sent a written opinion that some of the policies in the NP required a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). This has put them back seriously as it is a major time-consuming process. They have engaged AECOM to undertake the SEA, which will be paid for by central government under the Localities programme. This is the current status of their NP.

KA queried why the SEA requirement had not come to light earlier and PD said that there were some challenges in working closely with the VWHDC. PD's experience was that the NP process was relatively new both generally and to the VWHDC planning department so to an extent everyone was feeling their way. Also, VWHDC had such limited resources that getting timely responses to queries could be difficult. RB asked if Radley PC had highlighted these difficulties to say the CEO of the VWHDC and publicised the issue? PD said that some efforts had been made to escalate the issues. MF highlighted that from his experience it was worth escalating issues that had become intractable to the most senior level and that publicising the issue could be effective in building additional support to achieve a solution.

How to start? - PD stated that it was important to have a clear view amongst yourselves of what you want to achieve through the Neighbourhood Plan. In Radley's case, the three main objectives as set out on PD's slide number 4 had been to: 1. Influence development at 3 strategic sites in Radley parish (900 dwellings) in LPP1 eg road access, playgrounds, infrastructure support and adequate sewerage system; 2. sort out problems of heavy lorries from temporary industrial activity around Radley Lakes area; and 3. Decide location for improved community facilities - village hall and playing fields. 1 was the biggest item for the PC and still is. 2 was an intractable planning issue which planning departments had failed to solve over many decades. 3. had been the subject of contention within the village since a controversial proposal was put forward in 2008.

In response to a query as to how Radley NPSG decided their objectives, PD noted that their original NPSG was made up of parish councillors with a good knowledge of what the major concerns in the parish were. AL asked if we should not seek a similar input from the PCs? AL added that he believed that the PCs felt that the residents should be allowed to say what they wanted first without such an input. PD's view was that you are likely to get a better sense of residents' views on issues if you provide some structure to provoke debate. GF responded that this overstated the position and that you sound very different. That no one had been voted in on the St Helen Without PC and all had been co-opted so we're all volunteers trying to do something for our community. That is something quite different from understanding the views of the community and we will know our local network of people and what they think but that's probably in our PC as far as I think I could go. KA asked if the PCs could act as consultants to whom we could present our vision and get their feedback? CP answered that she believed the PCs

would see the supporting document put forward for the designated area as containing their view on the focus for the NP based on what the parishes wanted so we have a bit of a steer. MF added that he believed the Wootton PC did not want to be seen as saying "we the PC think you need this!" it was rather about involving the community and making sure you are in touch with people not just those on the PC as that just doesn't work. Survey on 23rd April was very important as part of this engagement (see item 8 below).

PD said that Radley had organised a public meeting at which some ideas were presented and attendees divided up into groups to discuss various issues and report back to the full meeting. This led to the establishment of topic groups which explored the issues over the winter of 2015/16 and produced reports. These reports were pulled together into a document setting out draft policies for the neighbourhood plan. The NPSG also produced a household questionnaire which went to all 1000 households in the parish and got a 45% response rate which was good. The analysis enabled the Steering Group to modify the draft policies as required yielding the final pre-submission NP. PD also said that they had used one or two authors only to give coherence to their documents and recommended this approach. The pre-submission draft Plan was also professionally designed and laid out and she thought this was well worth doing.

On the question of where with hindsight they might have done things differently, PD said that they had underestimated the complexities and uncertainties of the underlying planning law and the major limitations on what can be achieved through NPs. She went through her slide number 6 which sets out the planning constraints. NPs must be about land-use planning which in planning jargon means policies that are delivered through the planning process. You cannot just deal with community concerns in isolation, such as potholes, bus services, noise controls and broadband speeds. NPs can allocate sites for development but only after there has been a process to consider alternative sites. They can designate areas as Local Green Space (LGS) again subject to certain quite stringent tests. They can also set down general conditions on which development may be allowed. But NP policies have to comply with a whole set of rules. They must support sustainable development (which means you can't set a policy which prohibits development). The policies must conform with national and Local Plan policies. You cannot say anything that goes against the Local Plan and the VWHDC line tends to be that you shouldn't duplicate anything already in it – a bit of a Catch 22! Finally, policies must be 'deliverable' which can create issues if, say, the land owner is not amenable to what is being proposed in the NP, or any one of the statutory authorities has a problem with what you are proposing.

In an aside, PD thought that the relationship between district level planning and the NP could be a big issue in planning for the Dalton Barracks area and suggested it might be helpful to have early discussions with VWHDC about how they saw the two processes fitting together. CP highlighted that this was very much part of the LPP2 consultation and that there had been a brilliant public meeting on the 23rd April which GF reported on under item 8 below.

PD then went on to talk about what they might have done differently with the benefit of hindsight, as covered in her slide number 7. First, she said they might try to get high quality professional advice on technical planning issues earlier in the process. The point at which expert planning advice could be most useful is when specific policies are first identified and there's a need to know how they might be viewed by a planning inspector. NPIERS (Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service <http://www.rics.org/uk/join/member-accreditations-list/dispute-resolution-service/drs-products/neighbourhood-planning-independent-examiner-referral-service-npiers/> ) have a panel of independent examiners who you can commission for a fee to review the pre-submission NP. KA queried

if they have in-depth or just generic knowledge as her experience of planning consultants had been a bit sketchy and she had to acquire the in-depth knowledge for herself? PD said NPIERS represented actual examiners of NPs so should have useful knowledge. She also mentioned AECOM who work alongside Localities, the central government grant body, on their technical support programmes.

CP asked about Radley's use of consultants and PD said they had used them for mapping, for advice on the scope to influence the type of housing provided through the NP process, for studies of the development potential of one particular site in their ownership and for the SEA. Westwaddy ADP (<http://www.westwaddy-adp.co.uk/>) had advised on what could be achieved on housing policies but this did not add greatly to what they already knew. Westwaddy had also co-ordinated advice on technical issues around developing a site in the PC's ownership and they had put together some maps, a task which is far less straightforward than might be expected. NOTE: John Ashton is a partner of the firm. AECOM are currently working on the SEA and appear to be doing a good job so far. All this work was paid for by grants from Localities. Radley benefitted from grant of around £9k which came in two stages. In addition, the AECOM work is being paid for direct by Localities under their technical support arrangements. Another package available under these arrangements is a 'health check' under which an inspector is commissioned to look at your draft policies.

IB highlighted that we could not apply and get grants until the designated area had been approved and RB noted that this may not be until June / July 2017 as responses to the consultation did not have to be in until 26 May 2017. NC queried if the designated area represented a coherent community as it was spread over quite an area? Was this an issue for Radley and did they look at doing a joint NP as we were? PD said part of Radley parish extended to the edge of Kennington village and there was a strategic housing site in that area. They recognised that people moving to that site would look to Kennington for schooling etc and had discussed their draft NP with Kennington PC. The designated area had been decided before she got involved but she felt that working across parishes would depend on how well they could work together which was not always easy. RB noted that we had wondered if it might be beneficial to hold a NP conference / meeting bringing together parishes in the VWH with NP at various stages and discuss how we work with adjoining parishes to ensure NPs were coherent. PD thought this was an excellent idea as we should be working together. AL highlighted that there was an Association of Oxfordshire Local Councils and see if they could do something.

Turning to the second of the things that they might have done differently, PD said that they should have pushed VWHDC officers harder for timely and unambiguous advice on Radley's proposed policies. The problem they experienced was that VWHDC highlighted problems and suggested deletions at quite a late stage of the process. Vale officers had not been prepared to engage with what Radley was trying to achieve and help find a way through. RO noted that the VWHDC must be upfront with their advice and that the first step is to get the policy right as we can put on conditions but cannot change their policies once they have been adopted as part of LPP2.

PD noted the final point on her last slide was "Decide against doing a NP - seriously!". She said that there was a real question about whether NPs were worth doing. In Radley's case, the PC's main concern was to influence the development of the 3 strategic sites (900 dwellings) in the parish as these would have a major impact on Radley's future. Following the adoption of LPP1 just before Christmas, planning applications for all 3 sites were now at an advanced stage of preparation and had overtaken progress on the NP. Wootton and St Helen Without also faced major development with the Dalton Barracks proposal and it was worth being very clear how the NP process would add to the influence of the local community on that.

IB asked about CIL. PD agreed that this was relevant but suggested caution in assuming it would happen. The rules could be changed so that sites became zero rated, or rated at something less than the full rate. Many of the strategic sites in the west of the Vale were being treated in this way. With the amounts of money at stake at DB (around £10k/£11k per dwelling at the full CIL rate), VWHDC might perhaps be tempted to change the rules to reduce the rate there. GF asked if that was the case that there are zero rated sites? PD confirmed that there were but said that the Abingdon and Radley sites remained scheduled for the full rate of CIL at present. GF noted that the rule might be changed for DB. RO stated that rule changes can be challenged.

PD was thanked for her presentation and left the meeting.

## **7. Feedback from meeting with Richard and Catherine Webber re Drayton NP**

RB said the minutes of the meeting on the 18 April 2017 had already been circulated to the SC. CW and RW had been very supportive and offered their continuing help as we progressed our NP. They had produced the Drayton NP before the VWHDC LPP1 had been adopted so they had been in a rather different position to us. They emphasised the need for a big enough group to work on the NP and gave a figure of some 20, so our approximately 30 volunteers was a good number. They highlighted the major contribution of their parish clerk, David Perrow. CP has set up a meeting with him on 3 May at 2pm at her house and all were welcome to attend. They emphasised the importance of visibility and promotion of the NP and had called it "Drayton 2020" and had banners etc all produced in a highly coordinated brand management with one individual who effectively was the brand policeman and everything had to be passed by him with their logo. At the end of the day they said that they had a 78% response to their consultation through door-to-door and face-to-face actions. They felt that you need to educate people about policies etc so people could make more informed comments. They highlighted that they had a major launch event that brought everyone in the parish together with the CEO of the VWHDC and Head of Planning at Oxfordshire CC. They had food and drinks so it was a very social event. They produced photographs of the village over the years going back to 1780 to show that development had been ongoing and used this to counter NIMBY views. which worked very well. We were encouraged by the idea of a major launch event and that the SC should consider organising one. Both offered to speak at such an event. The cost might be covered through seeking sponsorship from local businesses and landowners. This could cement relations with businesses and landowners. They liked the idea of a NP conference to bring NP groups together. and that SODC had organised something like this with Ed Vaizey in the Chair. RW emphasised that the VWHDC had a duty to cooperate with NP SCs and coordinate adjoining NPs. He noted that they had taken some 6 months from the time of the launch event where sub-groups formed around key topics for these groups to finalise their ideas and draft policies. this fed into their 4 page questionnaire. They used everyday language to help people engage with the topics, such as "work and play". They have a Damascus Youth Project in Drayton which they used to engage with young people. CP had suggested we might get Duke of Edinburgh students from our local schools involved. They asked to be on the circulation of our SC minutes.

At the end of the meeting GF demonstrated MindManager software which could be a very useful tool for project planning of activities in producing the NP and the SC should consider buying a copy at a cost of some £300.

MF and RO were concerned if we had sufficient time to produce the NP by our target date of late 2018. RB noted that we did have to look to accelerating activities and where possible undertake them in

parallel by doing as much preparatory work as possible between the major milestones of the NP. RW and CW felt that we were actually ahead of the game compared to other parishes. RB and GF noted that a project planning tool would help in stopping drift by highlighting how tasks were progressing etc. CP emphasised that if we maintain our initial momentum it should be achievable.

RO introduced AO who highlighted the forthcoming Air and Country show on the airfield on 14 May as an opportunity to promote the NP with a free stall. This was seen as a good idea but people were concerned if we could organise and design a display etc by then? CP would consider what we might be able to do for it but funding was going to be discussed under item 11 below.

### **8. Feedback from St Helen Without PC Public Consultation meeting 23/4/17**

GF reported that some 150 people attended between 12.00 and 19.00 with 121 completed responses. GF noted that the aim had been to get a quick snapshot of residents reactions to LPP2 such as housing needs, acceptability of development at DB, likely impact on residents in the local area, issues around village coalescence and acceptability of the green belt adjustments. Of the 121, 30-40% were from Whitecross, Dry Sandford, Gozzards Ford, even Abingdon, Peachcroft, Wootton and Boars Hill. It was broad representation but predominantly from Shippon and Whitecross. Two-thirds recognised that there was a housing need for the locality and that DB is a site suitable for development. 73% said some of the area proposed by the VWHDC for removal from the green belt across DB, Shippon and Whitecross was suitable for development but not all of it. Particularly, the brownfield parts of the DB site were seen as suitable for development. GF clarified that there were maps showing the extent of the proposed development and that people were talked through the detail, he was just presenting the quantitative analysis so far but that there also were a lot of qualitative comments on the forms which would be available. He had noted on a quick look through the comments that traffic issues were a major concern as well as infrastructure. KA queried where people had got their views on housing need was it because of media coverage? GF said this would be covered when we got down to the design of the detailed questionnaire. RO asked if there had been any developers attending but GF said as far as they knew there had been none. 45% thought it would have a really negative impact on the local area and a similar number thought it would have both positive and negative effects. Coalescence of villages of Shippon and Whitecross with the new entity was seen by some 6% as good whereas 88% saw it as a really bad idea for Shippon. GF noted that garden village principles state that it should be a separate entity so it shouldn't happen so it is not clear why the VWHDC is proposing to take areas of linkage between the villages and the new entity out of the green belt. Whitecross was even stronger with only one person out of 95 who thought it would be a good idea for coalescence. RB highlighted that Richard Webber had noted that in Sutton Courtney there had been strong opposition to coalescence and that had been quite divisive in the community and created some friction / tensions. People were largely against the proposed adjustments of the Oxford green belt - two-thirds thought none of the green belt should be coming out. However, about a third thought if it was in the right place eg brownfield sites this would be acceptable. Only 3% thought Shippon should be removed from the green belt and only one person in Whitecross. GF thought the anonymised comments could be shared but he would check with MR. GF confirmed that the St Helen Without PC's response to LPP2 would be partially guided by this consultation and that Wootton PC were also be using the data for Whitecross in their response. It was highlighted that the data could be taken to the LPP2 inspector, if necessary. IB noted that the VWHDC had not given any justification for their proposal to remove Shippon and Whitecross from the green belt. CP congratulated everyone involved in the consultation on its success. and that it would be of value to the NP. MF said the results could be summarised in the WADS newsletter as bullet points, KA requested

bar charts etc but it would depend on space available. RB suggested we could publicise it through an article in the Abingdon Herald.

CP asked how would all the evidence being gathered be available so it could be used in support of the NP with respect to look and feel? GF said it would be made available.

MF offered to contact local candidates standing for election to get their views and support for our response to LPP2 based on the public consultation.

PP was concerned that LPP1 and 2 contained catch-all paragraphs allowing for policy, housing numbers and green belt changes if circumstances change. RB noted that this was one of the reasons JA had highlighted that the Thame NP was seen as a one off but after they disbanded the Council made changes and they found it difficult to then respond. Therefore, a NP will require updating and the SC will need to be alert to any future changes from the VHWDC. CP noted that this is exactly what Drayton had done with an implementation team checking that policies are being adhered to.

## **9. Steering Committee Response to LPP2**

CP highlighted that JB had produced an excellent draft and that we were waiting to see what the PCs were responding to ensure that we were aligned. CP noted that Wootton PC had indicated that they would be responding along similar lines using some of JB's words and so there were no issues with the SC response. (SECRETARY'S NOTE: at the Wootton PC meeting on 2 May the SC response was fully approved for submission.) CP asked if the SC could now submit the response? GF said the StHW response was still being drafted so it would be premature but the main principles would not differ and that the PC was planning to meet on 28th to finalise their submission. JB stated she would not be submitting the SC until the morning of the 3rd May.

JB asked for feedback on whether her draft should refer to a much higher figure of the number of potential houses on the DB site than in the current LPP2 consultation? MF said we should keep the figure as low as possible to avoid the VHWDC thinking of higher numbers than already suggested. GF highlighted that 3000 was the number currently published.

JB noted a second comment about including issues of traffic, infrastructure, etc and whether this should be added as it might reduce the current focus of the key issues in the draft? MF and RO felt these were very important issues that should be addressed preceding any developments. GF noted that OCC has its own traffic models and that currently we do not have this data. JB wondered if this was going beyond the NP remit. PP suggested that it could include the requirement that housing development must go in-step with provision of infrastructure and overall the SC supported this being added.

There was some discussion of sustainable development and KA offered to produce our definition for the NP and research local authorities' definitions for comparison.

## **10. Draft SWOT analysis for discussion**

CP noted that her draft SWOT analysis could provide a useful starting point for a debate on the 17th May SC meeting at which volunteers would be present and consider the SWOT of both parishes. People could input what they saw as the strengths and positive features of their neighbourhood and what they value and would like to keep. As well as the negatives of the neighbourhood including things people

would like to get rid of or improve and things they'd like to see added. This could lead into identifying what sort of topic groups people would like to be involved in.

RO noted that we could utilise the Air and Country Show on 14th and CP said this could be further developed at the SC meeting on the 17th. PP suggested using a SWOT board at the 14 May Air and Country Show where people could add stickers with their views. CP asked who would be available for the 14th and she already had tickets? RO noted that two people were allowed free and then others half-price. AO said the contact was Brian Davis and passed his details to CP to contact. CP asked people to volunteer to man the stall by 5th May. JB highlighted that we should check on setup time, etc. (SECRETARY'S NOTE: no volunteers had come forward so it is not possible to participate in the event.)

## **11. Funding requests**

CP said we would like to request funding from the JMC for a laptop, screen, projector and project management tool plus getting information from the VWHDC on who the landowners are. CP had also explored on the VWHDC's website funding opportunities and highlighted that the JMC needs to plan for how we access them promptly. IB said that they already had a good handle on these but we could not apply until the designated area had been adopted.

CP expressed concern on how the body of evidence being gathered should be stored securely eg on a dedicated laptop but there would be a mixture of paper and electronic data / information. She noted that on other NPs the Parish Clerk had taken on that responsibility and she requested that the JMC consider how this could be managed. GF offered the use of his high speed scanner to convert paper documents into e-documents.

CP asked about our Terms of Reference and GF noted that a meeting was being planned for the JMC in the next two weeks. IB offered to be the point of contact and CP will email requests to him.

RB queried if there were any Data Protection issues with all the data etc we would be gathering? GF said this had not come up as they had not done this before. The data would be anonymised but going back to the original data could be tricky. There was also mention of the Freedom of Information Act. After some further discussion, it was agreed that we should ask the VWHDC for advice.

## **12. Communications and Media Strategy**

CP noted that we had a website and logo but given the advice from the Webbers we should have a brand. IB highlighted that he had someone who could develop the logo further. RB suggested running a competition for school children to design a logo. CP noted that she had put a brief article in WADS newsletter but that we a Communications strategy manager is required to get coverage on social media etc. CP highlighted that the Air & Country Show, WADSTOCK and other events could be used to raise awareness. KA highlighted that a branding could be just through a typeface and doesn't have to be a depiction of something. CP felt that a pop-up display could be valuable for us to use with our logo and iconic images. IB noted that the current logo was linked to the shortened website address. RB asked about updating the website and IB offered to upload material sent to him such as diary of events we are attending, minutes of meetings etc. CP emphasised that we still need someone to be responsible. CP asked what material etc we would want to display at the Air & Country Show? There was some discussion of and RB offered his display stand and pop-up gazebo and JB offered a table top display. At

the meeting on the 23rd posters provided by the VWHDC were used and we could have a PowerPoint presentation running on a laptop.

RO and AO left the meeting at this stage.

CP was concerned that it was too tight a timescale to organise something properly for the Air & Country Show and get volunteers. JB noted that we would need to prepare answers to any potential questions we would get. KA highlighted that we should see this as a brainstorming / early ideas input from the community. CP was concerned that people might get confused between the NP and LPP2. After further discussion it was agreed to focus on having a stand at WADSTOCK on 29 July. MF noted that there would be some 3000 people attending. IB thought the PCs would be happy to fund some banners, display boards for WADSTOCK. CP would seek a volunteer to organise our presence at WADSTOCK at the SC meeting on the 17th May. IB said he had someone who could do the graphics for any displays.

### **13. AOB**

None.

**14 Date of Next meeting - 7pm Wednesday 17 May at Shippon Church Hall, Barrow Rd, Shippon.**

### **15. Next Steps**

- RB would deliver hard copy of SC minutes to RO and MF will assist RO by reading her the minutes.
- CP will request funding from the JMC for the purchase of MindManager for project planning.
- MF will provide details of 4 volunteers he had identified to RB.
- CP to invite all volunteers to the SC meeting on 17 May.
- MF will raise the issue on SC minute taker at the next JMC meeting.
- CP is arranging a meeting with Will Sparling, VWHDC and seek data on business and landowners.
- Cp noted she was having a meeting with David Perrow on 3 May and all were welcome to attend.
- Richard & Catherine Webber would receive SC minutes.
- MF to contact local candidates to get their views and support for our response to LPP2.
- JB to submit SC response to LPP2 on morning of 3 May.
- KA will produce a definition of sustainable development for our NP.
- CP to contact Brian Davis re Air & Country Show.
- IB will be point of contact for funding requests.
- CP to ask VWHDC for advice on data protection for the NP.
- CP to seek volunteer at 17 May SC meeting to organise our presence at WADSTOCK.

NOTE: Dates of future Steering Committee meetings for 2017:

7<sup>th</sup> June, 28<sup>th</sup> June, 19<sup>th</sup> July, 9<sup>th</sup> August, 30<sup>th</sup> August, 20<sup>th</sup> September, 11<sup>th</sup> October, 1<sup>st</sup> November, 22<sup>nd</sup> November, 13<sup>th</sup> December.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.20 p.m.

Minutes produced by Richard Bahu