

Heslington Neighbourhood Plan

Minutes of the Working Group meeting held on 27th April 2016 at the Heslington Village Meeting room

Present: - David Blacketer [DB], Bill McClean [BM], Nick Allen [NA], Richard Frost [RF], John Lawton [JL], Tony Loffill [TL], Niall McTurk [NM].

In attendance: Dave Chetwyn – Urban Vision Enterprise CIC .

Apologies were received from Andrew Collingwood and Ifan Williams.

1. DB welcomed all attendees.
2. The minutes of the Working Group [WG] meeting held on 23rd March 2016 were approved with one alteration to Paragraph 4.
3. Current application. It was noted that the application for a Neighbourhood Plan [NP] area made in February had been withdrawn to further consider how to proceed following consultation responses.
4. Dave Chetwyn [DC] introduced himself. He had been invited by the Working Group to give advice and support on the neighbourhood planning process including, initially, the identification and justification of the neighbourhood area. He had been taken on a guided tour of the parish by DB and BM and was aware of the stakeholder interests.
 - DC stated that the Draft local Plan was expected to be out in June. This might indicate the proposed extent of the Green Belt and would also make strategic site allocations. With clarity on these issues the WG could then take the opportunity to speak to stakeholders and in particular the University of York and Halifax Estates. Heslington Parish is a unique area for neighbourhood planning because it includes most of the university which is the biggest employer and the greatest growth prospect for the city. The CYC in its draft local plan [LP] is not going to propose restricting the University plans and risk an objection from such a major employer. The parish may also include the largest new housing site in the LP.
 - People outside the NP area may still have a vote in the final referendum if they are affected by the plan. Thus it would make sense to engage with the University who could bring their students to support the NP.
 - The University may want to join in and work with the Parish Council [PC]. The NP would be a powerful enabler for the UofY and the University should see this as a unique opportunity to give statutory status to an updated master-plan. In that case the PC, as the qualifying body, would remain in overall charge of the NP but the UofY could have its own working group with a PC representative which would deal solely with the university campus areas. The NP is an enabling vehicle for planning developments and must be pro-growth. There would need to clear terms of reference for this WG
 - The NP would give the UofY a forum to further develop its ideas working with residents. A robust NP would give residents more power over housing design

and standards including highlighting infrastructure deficiencies and to set out matters to be taken into account in any development including placing standard requirements on any development.

- DC's recommendation is to wait until the LP draft is out and then consider whether to meet with stakeholders and open a dialogue for a cooperative approach. It will be easier to agree proposals with residents if everyone knows what is in the LP draft. This was unanimously agreed after discussion.
- If we put the whole parish area into the NP, CYC still has the power to amend the area following objections but if the whole parish area is designated then the landowner and developers will wish to negotiate.
- Key issues are likely to come out in community engagement and the evidence base.
- The foundations of a good neighbourhood plan are robust community engagement and a proportionate evidence base. The neighbourhood plan would need to meet the basic conditions, and these would be tested by the independent examination process.

5. Grant application. Agreed that the PC would apply for a grant of £4000 to cover six months work as detailed in DC's proposal.

[BM]

6. Questionnaire. DC commented on the draft - RF to revise. This will not go out until we know the area. The campus areas, if included, would have a similar questionnaire and the students union might help possibly using social media or on-line surveys.

7. After analysing the initial responses we would need socio-economic and environmental data with more detailed evidence. Much of this could be provided by CYC. After the questionnaire there would be a village meeting to share – "This is what we have found out – solutions – discuss and begin to build an evidence base for NP policies". Following this DC would draft policies and check that all is included. There would have to be a policy mapping session, issue by issue.

[RF]

8. Terms of reference. DC would comment on the draft Terms of Reference for the WP and all WP members were asked to respond on this to DB soon and before 14th May so that it could go to the PC for approval at their next meeting. Agreed that the WP could not take key decisions unless they were specifically delegated powers by the PC

[All +DB]

9. Next meeting date - to be fixed when the date for the LP draft is known.

[BM]