

MINUTES OF AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF GORING ON THAMES PARISH COUNCIL
Main Hall, Goring Village Hall 7.30pm Wednesday 13th September 2017

Members Present:

Chairman	Kevin Bulmer (KB)
Members	Bryan Urbick (BU)
	Carmela Boff (CB)
	Lawrie Reavill (LR)
	Catherine Hall (CH)
	Matthew Brown (MBr)

Officers Present:

Clerk	Colin Ratcliff (CR)
-------	---------------------

Approx. 150 members of the public and press

The meeting was audio recorded by GENIE – <http://www.genienews.org/>

17/119 To receive apologies for absence.

Apologies for absence were received from John Wills (JW), David Brooker (DB), Emrhys Barrell (EB) and Mary Bulmer (MBu)

17/120 To receive any declarations of interests

None.

17/121 To receive chairman's report and announcements

KB thanked all for coming. He reminded that this is a formal GPC meeting and therefore all the usual rules of debate applied, he asked speakers to keep to a maximum of 3 minutes and avoid repetition. He hoped all would leave the meeting better informed. He thanked Hildreds and their team for putting the site forward but stated the process needs to comply with all legal requirements. He thanked Cllr's Urbick and Hall for all the hard work done and meetings attended.

17/122 Public Forum

Numerous comments were made – which included the following subjects (nb these are brief notes only – not a comprehensive record):

Guy Hildred – had been trying to get this progressed for some time but said the NPSG have refused to meet him. The numbers quoted by NP are scaremongering. GNP5 now seems controversial but was previously supported. Stated if better sites or alternatives available he would welcome them.

Sian Felwick – Need for school, poor state, too small. Unique opportunity, a proportional amount of new development would be acceptable to have a new school. Not apparent when the NP consulted. Further time needed, village better protected by delaying plan.
Kelly Taylor – School unfit for purpose, asbestos, poor toilets, temporary classrooms, will cost £1m as a minimum to repair.

Murray Symes – Asked what is special about GNP5.

Mr Guzman - South Stoke asked their village where best to develop and can't see why the same transparent process cannot be done in Goring. Asked how the NPSG reached their conclusions.

Sarah Jane Dexter – Thanked the NP team as they have done a great job and have gone through the needs of people in the village. The school came in as a secondary proposal to build on the edge of the village. Building on GNP5 will lift any protection for other sites and one reason why people like to live in Goring is the protection against development afforded by the AONB.

David Kennedy, South Stoke School Governor – supported Goring School and the need for improvements but asked that small schools in the area are taken into consideration with no adverse effect.

Signed:

K. Bulmer

Dated: 9 October 2017

Clare Slade – Said the school were asked by NP about numbers and the NP initiated meetings with the school. There was recognition initially from the NP of concerns about the building. Goring School is concerned about South Stoke and does not want any negative impact.

Planning Consultant for McAdden Homes said if the AONB is relaxed and consent given for GNP5 and GNP6 plus a land swap on the existing site then a school can be built at no cost. He agreed there were lots of legalities to be overcome. If the village was prepared to accept more housing then can have a new school, if not, then they would build on GNP6 alone.

Nick Smith – said £6.5m is a tangible benefit, asking what the NP offers as a tangible benefit.

Jules Hopkinson – asked about the target of 251 houses.

KB stated many of the questions raised would be explained in the presentations and moved on to the first.

17/123 Presentation about the Neighbourhood Plan

Cllr's Urbick and Hall gave a presentation (attached to the minutes)

Comments made during and after included the following:

Alison Clark – Said she had not once been consulted – BU advised looking at the Goring Plan website where all the dates and comments are recorded.

Comments were made about consultations with parties and developers, it was noted that SODC had provided confusing advice at times as a number of different planning officers had been appointed as advisors.

Tom Rothwell confirmed the NP is for 105 dwellings to comply with the current Local Plan, excluding infill. The emerging plan has been amended for numbers to be subject to capacity and constraints in the area such as the AONB or flood risk, and also includes infill.

Jerry Unsworth , saying that it may be semantics, disputed comments that a NP is planning law but would be policy. He agreed however that is has weight.

KB noted the NP process doesn't stop once in place. It starts again for another iteration within 5 years.

Lindsay Freeman – asked what can be done to make sure a new school is considered. She understood there is a detailed process but how best to do quickly.

U/K – asked if the NP are looking for recruits.

David Wilkins explained the previous process and current setup of the group.

U/K – asked if other developers also coming forward with similar proposals. (BU - next presentation would explain).

U/K – asked who was consulted in deciding the aim was to minimise development.

KB explained how the whole village and every household had been consulted.

Julie Wardle – said transparency meant minutes of NPSG meetings should be publicly available. KB said they are on the Goring Plan and GPC websites.

Sian Felwick asked what the School being in the plan as a strategic project means.

BU said it is a mechanism to help the school through the steps that have to be done in order to get a new school. The strategic project of a new school being one of three in the NP, the others being to improve the centre of the village and improve traffic management. CIL funding from developments would go towards supporting these projects.

U/K – commented on a slide stating the aim was to resist planning in the village. KB said the village consultation recommended minimising development.

David Wilkins commented that the village questionnaire and consultations had rejected any idea for the NP to approve more housing than that required by SODC. The NP have not based their procedures on numbers but on which sites were the most suitable. 15 sites were submitted, they have identified the four which have the least impact on the AONB which was also supported by the village.

17/124 Presentation about the School

Helen Scurr and Kerry Hughes gave a presentation (attached to the minutes)

They thanked GPC for holding this meeting and to the Councillors who visited the school last week.

Comments made during and after included the following:

U/K – asked how many out of catchment pupils are there now – Helen Scurr said 12%.

Jim Emerson – Said the school have said the £6.5m is at no cost to the community. Is that not money that would have come to the village via CIL?

KB noted that CIL may be spent on the school and would not be available elsewhere. He noted part of the school land is owned by OCC which was another complication.

A discussion took place on affordable housing figures and mix of developments proposed.

U/K – asked that if the school's proposals were accepted would the village be accepting more than currently in the plan – the answer was about double.

Jerry Unsworth said their proposal was for 136 homes across 3 sites. He didn't know numbers for the other sites.

BU said there are currently 46 in the plan for GNP6 so the difference is about 90.

17/125 Update on a meeting between representatives of South Oxfordshire District Council, Oxfordshire County Council, The Diocese, The School Governors, The NP Steering Group and Goring on Thames Parish Council

Cllr's Urbick and Hall gave a presentation (attached to the minutes)

The meeting earlier that day discussed what needs to happen before the school can consider a new school.

17/126 Question and Answer session

KB stated the word consultation has a legal meaning and is a process that has to be followed in a particular way and order.

Jerry Unsworth disputed it taking 6 months to do and that the risks are too high to take it outside the NP

Guy Hildred - said he was not going to fight – “do you want it or not”?

U/K – said that sounds like blackmail.

Guy Hildred - said it's a free gift.

Sian Felwick asked if GPC agreed that comment made it more difficult for proposals to succeed if the NP goes ahead.

KB thought outside the NP is easier.

CH said there was still a lot of work to be done by the school. Today's meeting reiterated that the school have to legally look at all options; they cannot just take the one on offer.

None have been explored in sufficient depth at this stage but that could be started tomorrow. She reminded that the NP is not finite, it is continually developed.

KB stated that the school is a strategic Project in the NP; if the work is then done outside the NP it can feed back into the next iteration of the Plan. If the work is not done, the current proposal would fail on legal grounds.

BU said he believed it may end up being an exceptional decision and therefore doesn't need to be in the NP. If outside any decision might be faster.

Tom Rothwell commented that 3-6 months was quoted at the meeting today for the school to work on their proposal. He said other NP issues would then need to be repeated and the NP would have to go back quite a way in the process.

Mr Wood – Asked that if a new school is in the NP as a strategic project, could it be refined to be incorporated as a minor modification to the NP. Could it include the 4 options that need to be considered?

Sara Benbow said if a form of words could be suggested it would be considered as part of the NP consultation.

Tom Rothwell stated that the next stage of the NP is a consultation – very few people have read the draft yet. He suggested people read it and the back-up documents and then comment as part of the consultation.

U/K asked if the size of development on GNP5 was the concern

KB said two separate independent reports have said any development would be extensive harm to the AONB.

Angela Wheatcroft (School Head Teacher) – Asked that when GPC take their vote they

think about the children, the process is all about hurdles, which are not insurmountable. She understands the process and what the NP has had to go through but said things can change.

KB said he hoped that by now the public get the idea GPC understand about the children and the school's issues. The council also has to think about the whole village and that is why so much time and effort is being spent.

17/127 To consider motions put forward by councillors:

- 1 **That the council agree to support the school to work through the process to get the best school facilities for Goring.**
- 2 **To consider, should the first motion be passed, whether that support would depend on the work being done outside the NP process, or to request that it be within the NP process**

BU proposed an amendment to motion 1 - that the council agree to support the school to work through the process to get the best school facilities for Goring, and to provide a link councillor and a standing agenda item to monitor progress.

Resolved That the amended motion be approved

BU proposed an amended motion 2 - that the council deal with the school's proposals as a strategic project in the Neighbourhood Plan but to not delay the current Neighbourhood Plan process.

Resolved That the amended motion be approved

CB was appointed as link councillor with assistance to be provided by BU.

17/128 Matters for future discussion

KB said there was lots of work to be done to move from the current situation to one where hopefully the village gets a new or better school.

Helen Scurr agreed to be the initial link to get all relevant parties together in a working group.

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 2202 hrs.

Abbreviations:

AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy
GENIE	Gap Electronic News and Information Exchange
GNP	Goring Neighbourhood Plan
GPC	Goring on Thames Parish Council
NP	Neighbourhood Plan
NPSG	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
OCC	Oxfordshire County Council
SODC	South Oxfordshire District Council
U/K	Unknown Member of the Public