

TYSOE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN VOLUNTARY GROUP

MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 3rd May 2016, Venue: Tysoe Village Hall.

Present:	Freddy Brooks Wayne Cressman Jeremy Rivers-Fletcher	Shirley Cherry David Dawkins David Roache	Gary Cressman Alison Mallalieu Isobel Watson
----------	---	---	--

Apologies: Steve Millward

The meeting was called to hear a presentation from Michael Sanderson, author of the latest version of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP).

The importance of a Neighbourhood Plan is that it gives neighbourhoods some protection in law. It helps Parish Councils to have more control and influence over future planning in their areas. The objective of Tysoe's NP is to help guide sustainable development in preferred locations.

Mike set out his agenda as follows:

- Genus
- Process
- Important bits
- What's missing

Genus

When the original working group (WG) got together there were only 3 NPs in existence. The first of these was Thame, which has been passed by referendum. So as this was a tried and tested model, the Tysoe WG decided to use this as a template.

Mike went on to say that the Appendices were about the most important part. Also that any work on the NP needs to be aware of the Localism Act 2011, the NP Guidelines (on website) and the Parish Plan 2010. Fundamentally any NP is dominated by planning matters.

The Tysoe NP needs to be consistent with the Stratford District Council's (SDC) Strategic and Environmental Planning Directive.

A residents' survey was conducted and the survey results collated into a spreadsheet.

Evidence base approach

The WG developed an 'evidence based' model which amassed and assimilated information from Warwickshire County Council, the Habitat and Biodiversity Audit, Environmental agency and listed buildings . . . It included reference to the conservation areas in Upper and Middle Tysoe, together with flooding data from the Environment Agency. The WP was mindful that the NP needs to be a document which can be up-dated and serve the village through to 2031 and beyond. The bodies and authorities referenced all maintain and update their data which will help in future updates.

This information was fed into a 'map' base – providing a classification for each field in the Parish – red/amber/green. The WP aim was to arrive at a consistent framework which could then be used as a yardstick to judge planning issues. The WP did exactly what was set out in the planning guidelines and managed the consultation over a 6-week period. However, Mike was keen to point out that the work wasn't finished and that the intention was to add a

'weighting overlay', which would ask the Tysoe Residents' what they value uppermost i.e. what's important to them.

One of the points in the feedback from the first version of the NP was that it lacked a clear 'vision'* . So in putting together version two, the WP asked people what they thought – see Appendix F, (this also explains how the comments were dealt with.)

The WP's thinking was to make the plan an ongoing process a 'living document' with a built-in, 12-month review cycle. The group suggested that a 6th Former could be recruited to help up-date the evidence base.

Mike admitted that some mistakes were made as the WP rushed into print with the plan in an effort to oppose the Gladman planning application.

Critique of the NP: David Homes, a retired planner, had input into version two of the plan, as did [Derunion](#) (?) – a Planning Inspector who adjudicates on NPs.

Tysoe NP & SDC: Apparently there was some ambiguity over whether the Tysoe NP had been submitted to SDC. Either way it was rejected and reasons given i.e. missing an introductory statement, not comply with the strategic directive, not liaised with statutory bodies. Matthew Neal is the planner at SDC responsible for NPs – his comments have been shared with the new VP.

One of the things needed as part of the NP is to agree a 'Site Allocation' in conjunction with landowners and to come up with possible alternatives, as the owners might change their minds. Mike Sanderson said that previously the WP had relied upon an earlier survey of development land available in the village to save time. However, he stated that this would now be out of date.

(*Apparently Strutt and Parker, the estate agents have produced a paper on the 'Regeneration of Rural Villages' which was published recently in The Times. This purports to provide a *vision* for what's important.)

Discussion post presentation

The new VG thanked Mike for his presentation and all the extensive work that has clearly gone into the NP so far.

A lively discussion ensued about the Lower Service Village (LSV) amongst other things and reference was made to the current planning applications under consideration. The consensus of the meeting was that sensible way forward was to build on the work that has already been done. It was agreed that David Roache would set out some top-line thoughts about the next steps.

Meeting closed at 9.20pm.