

Q&A at SNP Public Meeting 19 June 2023

1. 62% responded. What about the 38% who didn't respond: what socio-economic group is therefore not represented? How do we meet their needs?
 - a. Difficult to address because we didn't get any data from them. However, the percentages given here are only indicative, they are not infallible. The plan can be voted against at the Referendum stage by people who do not agree with its content. We put a paper copy of the survey through every door, so everyone had an opportunity to answer.
2. Can the character assessments be done so as to reflect all the aspects of village activity? The Sports and Social Club doesn't seem to get a mention
 - a. The character assessment looks at bricks and mortar, buildings, not people. But the survey had qqs across all aspects of the village. There were actually lots of comments on the SSSC and sports in general, so we have some data and quotes to use in the Plan. We haven't been able to show you all the data in tonight's presentation. This NP is a planning document, so sporting activity would not be core to the NP. The Steering Group is using a standard template (the Oxford Character Assessment which is nationally recognised) for the character assessments; it isn't something we have made up ourselves.
3. The 38% who didn't respond could be the parents in the school. We don't want to lose our school. What can be done about this?
 - a. They are stressed and time-poor. May not have wanted to do the survey
 - b. The NP is a town and country planning document which has to have town and country planning policies. Those policies have to comply with national policy and with the Local Plan. It's teeth are mainly in relation to the requirement for development. We can say we want a thriving school, or buses every hour to everywhere. The Local Plan (the Local Authority) can't make these happen. We've seen lots of big houses built here which perhaps now contain families who don't send their children to the village school; so if there were more affordable houses, there might be more families here who would use the school. But that's all we can say. The teeth of the NP lie in the policies it expresses on planning matters.
 - c. OCC hold the money given by developers under s106; they haven't allocated it yet, apart from one grant to the school for repairs * see footnote.
 - d. We could find there are areas on which we need more information, and we might have to conduct further inquiries.
 - e. The recent developments on Farley Lane and William Buckland Way were predicted to produce 19 children for the school; in fact it only produced 3.
4. Where did the funding come from?
 - a. A government organisation called "Locality", who make grants available for all NPs especially for employing independent consultants.
5. Do you know the sort of things that examiners have found at fault with other NPs?
 - a. No. However, we did have some evidence on Charlbury: not all their choices of Green Spaces were approved by the examiner.
6. Is it likely that an examiner would quarrel with the fact that we want ALL our surrounding land to be a Green Space?

- a. We only specified spaces which are contiguous with the village, so as to conform with national planning policy. However, it may be that the examiner might take exception to a policy protecting them all - we hope not!
7. Once the NP is accepted, the WODC have to “take it into account”: how credible is this?
 - a. The NP becomes part of WODC’s Development Plan. So they have to have regard to what’s in the NP. If they don’t, they risk judicial review. NB: Currently the Parish Council has a purely advisory role when it responds to planning applications
8. Conservation Area and AONB: are these above or below the village’s NP in terms of protection?
 - a. We are in the AONB, and this helps us eg to protect our Dark Skies, which are national AONB policy
 - b. SSSI status (which we have for Stonesfield Common, Bottoms and Banks) is an existing level of protection above our NP
9. Vote of thanks from SPC.

**Question 3c Further to the question raised about s106 contributions, we would like to add the following: s106 developer contributions would normally be raised via the primary planning authority (in our case that is WODC), and they would take responsibility for them (eg s106 moneys paid for the affordable housing operated by SOHA on Charity Farm). The County Council can also request contributions on major developments where they need to mitigate additional costs for services they operate (eg highways and education).*