

**MINUTES OF THE PARISH MEETING OF CLIFTON HAMPDEN
VILLAGE HALL**

Thursday 7th March 2024

Present: Glenn Pereira (In the Chair)
Apologies Sam Casey Rerhaye (SODC)

Also Present R Rios (SODC)
R Bennett (OCC)
46 residents of Clifton Hampden

1. The Chairman explained the process and introduced the officer from SODC.
2. Explanation of the process.
Ricardo Rios from SODC outlined the Neighbourhood Development Plan and Neighbourhood Development Order. He explained that there were 3 possible outcomes:
 - a) They proceed to referendum, either together or separately without modification
 - b) They proceed to referendum with modifications
 - c) Not to proceed at all.
3. The chairman handed over the chair of the meeting to Cllr Bennett for a discussion on the NDO and expected outcomes.
4. Presentation by chair of the NDO Steering group , who explained the process followed by the parish Council/Steering Group to arrive at the current position. In doing so he presented the developer and the Land Owner's Agent to the meeting.
5. Following the presentation there were questions from the floor, including:-
 - a) Were the Parish Council concerns based on questions raised by the Examiner or the residents? - yes, see Examiner clarification notice for further information.
 - b) Did the Parish Council object to the provision of affordable housing? – the Council's was not objecting to the affordably housing, but it raised concern was that this could not be limited to the village community
 - c) How did the number of affordable units come to be included in the Plan? – This was based on need for the Plan to be viable. If it wasn't for the other community benefits the scheme would have to provide 6 affordable houses, instead of the 4 currently planned.
 - d) Is it possible to look at the costs and viability calculations? – No figures were given in the meeting, but references were made to the SODC website ([Stage 3 Viability Assessment](#)).
 - e) Have the housing proposals been discussed with the Developer? -yes. The proposed mix of development is only likely to be changed if the inspector requests it.
 - f) The Parish Council is holding up the process by looking into new concerns - SODC representative stated that the Examiner is working with the Parish Council, and the parish Council is responding to the Examiner's request to comment on objections.
 - g) How Long will the process be? -It is hoped that all requested documents will be completed by the end of March.
 - h) Have members of the Parish Council disclosed their interests? – Yes – and the process has been discussed with both the Clerk and SODC.
 - i) Can the NDP proceed independently of the NDO, and, if so, what is the timescale?- yes, the process for the NDP is less contentious and should proceed without complication. The Examiner is likely to move to request a hearing for the NDO in some 2-3 weeks after completion of the initial process. Examiner will decide who will be invited to speak at the hearing. If someone requested a public hearing,

they are likely to be invited to sit around that table to discuss. Anyone will be able to attend and hear the discussion.

j) Why are there holes in the allotment site? -archaeology

k) Why is the Developer so willing to proceed with the plan with only a declared profit margin of £48K? Why is valuation of the surgery based on income, and not on the value of the property, as with the shop, being in 18 years if the Developer sells, it will be worth the market value? - The Developer explained how the valuation process worked. He also responded to the low profit by referring to his family's philanthropic heritage. If surgery doesn't want to continue with the lease he will find another use for the building and try and get a better rent.

l) Has the Parish Council carried out due diligence on the need for a surgery, given a hightech surgery is planned as part of the Culham development? - Strategy for delivering primary care is the responsibility of the ICB, but no direct answer was provided for the question.

m) Why did the process include extra sites, when SODC only supported 2, and why was the advice given contradictory? – There was a need to assess sites against the “openness test” before the formal application was made. There was also formal pre application advice once the plans were formulated. The team leader gave advice based on development in a general sense. It wasn't until SODC received the full pre-application advice and that the significant buildings proposed clearly did not meet the openness test, and therefore very special circumstances needed to be demonstrated.

Other questions were submitted on behalf of residents who were not able to be present at the meeting, the responses to these questions had already been answered during the meeting.

The Chairman confirmed that it was expected that all the Examiner's outstanding queries would be responded to by the end of March 2024.

There being no further questions, thanks were given to the visiting representatives of SODC, the developer and the Agent for the land Owner, together with Cllr Robin Bennett, who had chaired the discussion.

The meeting closed at 9.30pm.