# OAKLEY PARISH COUNCIL 16.10.19. 1.

Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 1st October 2019 at the Village Hall

**PRESENT:**J. Walker (Chairman), S Fardon, M. Frampton, P. Jones, S Nicholas, P Olney, G Sansom, the Clerk, Mrs. Paice & 0 members of the public

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1.** | **Public Open Session:** none |
|  |  |
| **2.** | **Apologies:** J Abbott (business), P Phillips (personal), R Saunders (business), P White (business) |
|  |   |
| **3.** | **Declarations of Interest:** none  |
|  |  |  |
| **4.** | **Response to the Neighbourhood Plan Examiner’s Fact Check Report** | Action |
|  | Clerk had tabled a draft response to the Examiner based on the comments from the NDP Group. Bedford BC had already responded and Council supported their comments. NDP Group had suggested all the annexes, especially 3 and 4, contained information which supported the development of the policies and should have been examined and reported on. Annex 3 contained the Oakley Village Landscape Character Assessment an important document which was referred to throughout the Neighbourhood Plan. |  |
|  | NDP Group had further suggested that removal of Local Green Spaces 9 (Church Lane) and 10 (Millennium Wood) should be reconsidered, as the sites were local in character and met the requirements of the NPPF. |  |
|  | Paragraph 4.36 incorrectly stated that the permissive access along the river at the southern end of site 9 was owned by Council and therefore in public ownership. However, the land was leased from the landowner who owned site 9. Council agreed to clarify that the path was the area designated M1 on the Allocations & Designations Plan The site was an important landscape area with views across the listed twin bridges to Stevington Windmill and was the principal reason the SPA boundary runs along the northern boundary of the site. This site was also rating highest in terms of importance to local people. Cllr. Olney commented that representations on the draft NDP had referred to other Neighbourhood Plans where green spaces of 2.5 – 5 ha had been rejected by their Examiners. Council discussed whether this should be referenced in the response and agreed to include a statement that Gladman Developments had made representations which included the definitions of extensive tracts of land in other Neighbourhood Plans. However, Council’s planning consultants, Urban Vision, had indicated that 10ha was the industry definition and therefore site 9 could be designated as Local Green Space.The Examiner had stated that site 10 was separated from the village by the railway line and the A6 trunk road. However, the railway and A6 did not provide any physical barrier to accessing the site as Highfield Road bridged both and Council agreed to add this clarification. Browns Wood and the Millennium Wood could be accessed by foot from the village and were important to local residents.References to the “Inspector” were changed to the “Examiner “for accuracy. Proposed by Cllr. Frampton, seconded by Cllr. Fardon that the draft response be approved**Resolved** Clerk to forward to ExaminerCouncil thanked the Clerk for her work on the NDP. | Clerk |
|  |  |  |
| **5.** | **Date of Next Meeting** – 5th November 2019 |  |
|  |  |  |