

GREAT AYCLIFFE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN



Notes of a joint meeting of the Great Aycliffe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Thematic Groups, held on Thursday 7 January 2016

Present: Cllr B Hall – Great Aycliffe Town Council
 Cllr M A Dalton – Great Aycliffe Town Council
 Cllr I Gray – Great Aycliffe Town Council
 Cllr C A Wheeler – Great Aycliffe Town Council
 Cllr J Atkinson – Great Aycliffe Town Council
 Mr B Riley – GAMP
 Mr I Wiggett – Public Representative
 Mr D Sutton-Lloyd – Public Representative
 Mrs K Clark – Business Representative

Cllr A M Chandran – Thematic Groups
 Cllr J P Hillary – Thematic Groups
 Cllr P Kjenstad – Thematic Groups
 Cllr W M Blenkinsopp – Thematic Groups
 Mr C Peacock – Thematic Groups
 Mrs S Cooke – Thematic Groups
 Mrs K Woodhams – Thematic Groups
 Mr J Snowball – Thematic Groups
 Mrs C Benson – Thematic Groups

Officers Mrs C A Walton – Corporate and Policy Officer
 Mr S Cooper – Works and Environment Manager
 Miss A Donald – Town Clerk's PA

Ms C Dillon – Durham County Council Planning Department

| Item No | Discussion | Action |
|---------|--|--------|
| 1. | Apologies for Absence Apologies for absence were received from Cllr R S Fleming, Cllr W P Hillary, Cllr M Dixon | |
| 2. | Congratulations The Chairman and all present noted congratulations to Syd Howarth on his recent award of the MBE. | |
| 3. | Declarations of Interest There were no declarations of interest. | |
| 4. | Notes of the Previous Meeting John Snowball wished to make some amendments to the notes of the previous meeting, as follows: i) He felt that he had been misunderstood in his comments regarding the allocated housing site at Copelaw under Agenda Item 5 and wished the notes to be changed to reflect that he asked that his | |



| | | |
|-----------|---|--|
| | <p>objection to the inclusion in the GANP of any expressions of support for a very large development at Copelaw be minuted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) The initials BF, referring to Cllr Bob Fleming, be amended to RF throughout for consistency with the attendance list. iii) In the final paragraph on page 2, the word 'suitable' should be inserted to read 'only 5 people had indicated Copelaw as a suitable housing site'. iv) In the penultimate paragraph on page 2, the figure in the County Durham Plan for new home allocation is 2,000, not 1,000 as stated by MD as part of national policy. <p>The notes were then accepted as a correct record.</p> | |
| <p>5.</p> | <p>Matters Arising</p> <p>The Chairman advised that since John Snowball had raised a number of objections, he would be allotted five minutes to expand on these and allow his views to be minuted. JS explained as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) It should be noted that Copelaw is not a predominantly brownfield site. Only the area around the former school is brown field, the rest is green field, according to current NPPF definitions. (This was acknowledged by the group as correct). ii) It is the draft County Plan, rather than national policy which has allocated 2,000 homes to be built on a number of sites around Aycliffe, including 342 at Eldon Whins which is outside of the parish boundary. iii) It should not be assumed that because the majority of people who responded to the consultation did not specifically object to the allocation of new housing at Copelaw and in other parts of the parish, they were actually in support of it. There is concern that residents will think the consultation was not meaningful or even a sham as they were not asked whether or not any development was wanted. The Neighbourhood Plan should therefore avoid specifically endorsing any large scale developments, leaving this instead to the County Plan. <p>Comments were then sought from the rest of the group. It was acknowledged that although the group agreed that Copelaw is only a partial brownfield site his views were not the view of the majority, JS's comments and concerns would be noted.</p> <p>It was repeated that the Neighbourhood Plan must be in general conformity with the County Plan and in line with</p> | |



| | | |
|-----------|--|--|
| | <p>national guidelines requiring support of growth and development. Furthermore, the Steering Group had given careful and detailed consideration to ensure that all stages of consultation had been as robust and inclusive as possible and it was emphasised that the public response had been excellent and indeed considerably better than that given to the County Plan consultations. The group therefore did not feel that the numerous NP consultations undertaken to date could be regarded as a sham or flawed.</p> | |
| <p>6.</p> | <p>Draft Consultation Statement</p> <p>This had been circulated in advance to allow sufficient time for the document to be read. Chrissy Walton highlighted a number of areas where amendments and additions had been made to wording or formatting. Carole Dillon stated that she was impressed with the level of consultation undertaken and the structure of the document. She also asked if the group was confident that all issues raised had been addressed, so that the consultations had shaped the Plan.</p> <p>It was felt that the progression from consultation to draft Plan was clearly evidenced by a number of documents within the supporting appendices, although it was agreed that a paragraph would be added on p14 to explain this process further.</p> | |
| <p>7.</p> | <p>Neighbourhood Planning Policies</p> <p>A number of draft policies had been drawn up CW noted that these would likely not be the final wording of the policy but would be close enough to be able to make sure we have delivered the residents priorities. The group then worked together to check them against the Vision and Themes document (which was completed following the consultation) to ensure that these corresponded to and would help to deliver the aims identified under each theme.</p> <p>With regard to the Business Park, it was agreed that it should be clarified that a business section was not included in the interests of avoiding duplication, since the business community was already working on its Shaping the Future project, which was the subject of ongoing review. It was also agreed that some of the objectives identified by the Shaping the Future have been included in the NP consultation evidence.</p> <p>It was agreed that a policy relating specifically to solar farms would not be required as this could be incorporated</p> | |



| | | |
|-----------|--|--|
| | <p>into a general policy on renewable energy.</p> <p>It was noted that a number of issues relating to transport and access were beyond the remit of the NP and had been passed to DCC as part of its responsibility.</p> <p>The CIL policy would include footpath and cycle route improvements.</p> <p>JS noted that the County Plan encourages inward migration for jobs and it would therefore seem that a policy specifying local jobs would go against this. The consultation had demonstrated considerable public support for such a policy. KC pointed out that the majority of local businesses have a local jobs policy which shows their 'intent' to employ local people but that, in practice, the need for employees with the appropriate skills would take precedence.</p> <p>There were still some policies yet to be written or finalised, in addition to a conditions statement. One considerable task still outstanding was the mapping of the green spaces to be protected or otherwise. Drafts of the relevant documents would be circulated to the group for discussion and comment when completed.</p> | |
| <p>8.</p> | <p>Date of Next Meeting The next meeting would be held on Thursday 18 February 2016 in the Council Offices.</p> | |