

SHERFIELD ON LODDON PARISH COUNCIL



NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY

Minutes of NPWP meeting held on 7th July 2016 in Breach Lane Chapel

Present – John Darker, Bryan Jenkins

In attendance - Pamela Darker, Jacqui Skillett, Ian Wilson and Natalie Larner (Minutes)

1. Election of Chair

JD was elected unanimously. Having thanked the committee, he proposed that a vote of thanks be sent to Alan Ball for his hard work as the outgoing chairman. Action NL

2. Approved membership

JD outlined the system of membership.

- a. Those in attendance were invited to become 'Approved Members' of the NP Working Party. An 'Approved Member' needs to provide a signature to indicate that s/he has read and understood the PC Code of Conduct and Standing Orders. Names will then be taken forward for approval by the PC Planning Committee tbf Wednesday 13th July.
- b. NPWP meetings are open to all. Anyone in attendance is welcome to speak at the discretion of the Chairman.

3. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Anna Scott and Venetia Rowland. Jane Jordan has offered her help on a task basis.

4. Minutes of previous meeting: 15/04/2016

Draft Minutes of the meeting held on 15th April were approved for accuracy.

5. Matters arising from the Minutes & Review of Actions

There were no matters arising, as it was felt that the new committee would be addressing all matters during the forthcoming meetings.

6. Updates from previous committee members on status quo (Bryan Jenkins, Natalie Larner and Anna Scott)

BJ tabled and spoke to a summary of updates (attached) which formed the body of the information-sharing, and prompted productive discussions throughout the meeting. The main questions and points made from around the table, during BJ's summary, follow.

(1) Our Plan - Status

- a. Question: IW asked *How does the present NP differ from the original approach proposed near the start of the process?*

Answer:

- i. *NPs can be site-led: the plan, agreed by the PC and community, allocates specific sites for development eg. Oakley's NP. This method could lead to increased resistance to the Plan and would involve significant extra work and expense.*
- ii. *Or NPs can be policy-led: no sites are allocated in the plan but detailed policies act as conditions in the eventuality that development is proposed from outside.*

SHERFIELD ON LODDON PARISH COUNCIL



- iii. *The current version of SoL's Neighbourhood Plan is policy-led.*
 - iv. *Once a NP is made, BDBC own it, so when it is tested, it has to align with the Borough's Local Plan and National Policy Framework. This is what gives a NP its weight in law. Without the Borough's Local Plan (LP) in place, communities are open to developers.*
 - v. *BDBC LP was adopted on 26th May 2016. It is subject to a period of six weeks when it could be challenged. Ed Rehill reported on 5th July that no challenge had currently been made.*
 - vi. *The 6 week period closes on 7th July.*
- b. JD suggested that 1a. (read through policies) and 1i (strengthen policies) could be approached concurrently. Agreed.
 - c. JS pointed out that, as some people think pictorially, diagrams to show aspects of the NP process would be a useful addition.

(2) Character Assessment (and property analysis)

- a. AS is adding the property analysis to the Character Assessment.
- b. Question: IW asked, *How does the CA fit into the NP?*
- c. Answer *It will stand alone as a separate document but be part of the package.*
 - i. *In the beginning, we added all supporting documents as appendices, but our consultant Mick Downs removed them. They made the NP too unwieldy.*
 - ii. *The same applies to so-called 'projects' eg. Traffic issues. As part of the package, recommendations can be made for the PC to follow up as projects for the benefit of the parish.*

(3) Last Meeting (held on 15th April)

- a. *"Make best use of CA and other recognised design criteria and include more photos."*
 - i. BDBC had introduced BJ to some earlier local Design Statements. NL referred to the Design Statements which PD and she had used when she began forming the team to produce the Character Assessment. BJ wants to query the use of the term Design Statement of Character Assessment with BDBC.
 - ii. Question: JS asked, *What photos are held and where are they at present?*
Answer: *There are numerous photos, taken for the CA. Anna Scott has posted them electronically. She will be asked about access and they can be referred to during the read-through in subsequent meetings.*
- b. *"10 dwelling requirement within or adjacent to the Settlement Policy Boundary"*
 - i. BJ has suggested a new draft policy (or Policy amendment) to address the 10 dwellings requirement and is in discussion with Ed Rehill of BDBC.
 - ii. The 10 dwellings can be open market stock, but if a site comprises 11 dwellings or more, then 40% must be affordable housing (on-site).
 - iii. Members were referred to the circulated email from Emma Betteridge (BDBC) which included an attachment defining Affordable Housing.
 - iv. PD requested an electronic copy of the SoL Settlement Policy Boundary map.

SHERFIELD ON LODDON PARISH COUNCIL



(4) Public Meetings

“a need to emphasise the policies”

- a. BJ – the NPWP needs more successfully to communicate to the public that policies are at the heart of a NP. NP policies must be in line with, but not repeat, the policies in the borough’s Local Plan or those in national policy documents.
- b. During discussion, the point was made that our NP needs to be worded such that it meets with the constraints of the professional planners and yet can be clearly understood by lay residents.
- c. JS summed up the discussion by concluding that the immediate task of the new committee is to scrutinise our policies to ensure that this difficulty is addressed to the best of our ability.
- d. JS also suggested the inclusion of a diagram to show that relevant policies located in the Borough’s Local Plan, although not written into SoL’s NP, would automatically apply.
- e. JS – At future public meetings, both the public and the committee might find it useful to allocate some time to formal presentations. NL agreed and pointed out that this suggestion had been rejected on previous occasions.
- f. It was agreed that more public meetings should be held to engage with residents.

(5) SEA Complete questionnaire: Strategic Environmental Assessment screening for SoL NP

Action JD

(6) Archive of questionnaires

It was agreed that the issue of secure storage/accessibility, raised here by BJ and NL and by email by the Parish Clerk and AS, stretches to all resources both hard and soft. NL will contact all parties and update the current resources list for discussion.

Action NL

7. Report back from BDBC Neighbourhood Planning Round Table meeting, held on 6th June (BJ)

As time was pressing, BJ made just one point before it was agreed that the previously distributed documents gave sufficient information from the NP Round Table meeting.

- i. BJ drew our attention to the Oakley NP presentation. Their team of 11 advised that it was vital to recruit members with the relevant skills in planning, marketing etc. We have done very well to have made so much progress with so small a team would still welcome further skilled help from amongst the community.
- ii. BJ had distributed his own notes from the meeting
- iii. BJ had forwarded the Oakley PowerPoint file sent by Robyn Kelly of BDBC

8. Report back from meeting between Sherfield NPWP and Ed Rehill (Principal Planning Officer BDBC) held on 5th July [Emma Betteridge (Planning Officer BDBC) also kindly attended

NL had distributed notes from the meeting of 5th July in time for this meeting and these were thought to be sufficient.

9. Discussion of next steps, incl. website ownership & updating, and Forum group email list.

BJ ran through the next steps listed in his document.

SHERFIELD ON LODDON PARISH COUNCIL



To those were added:

- a. NP Website and Forum email list
 - i. NPWP need to be able to communicate through a website. It was agreed that this should continue to be through the PC website. JD will seek information from the PC and discuss future running of the NPWP pages. Action JD
 - ii. IW suggested that a FAQs section would be useful – agreed to extend as appropriate, as AS has already placed FAQs on the website. Action AS
 - iii. A new Forum would need to be established and members would need to re-subscribe.
 - iv. PD offered her experience with electronic surveys.
- b. Project Plan: AS will be asked to reinstate the Project Plan and update it. Action BJ/AS
- c. Funding: more funding will be needed eg. consultancy fees, administrative help, document printing, publicity costs.
- d. Question: JD asked, *Will more help from consultants be needed with policy writing?*
Answer: *No. BJ and NL each believed that the NPWP should take this up themselves. Consultants have given considerable help with the technical aspects but NPWP have first-hand knowledge of the SoL evidence base. Therefore, they are in the best position to use it to strengthen the policies to meet the specific wishes of the community.*
- e. JD will look into funding streams, in particular Locality. Action JD

10. Sum up of agreed actions

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| Send a Letter of Thanks to Alan Ball | <u>Action NL</u> |
| Complete questionnaire: Strategic Environmental Assessment screening for SoL NP (SEA) | <u>Action JD</u> |
| Complete a current stock list, to include what, where and with whom | <u>Action NL</u> |
| Speak with PC and AS about plans for the NP/PC website | <u>Action JD</u> |
| Ask AS to reinstate Project Plan and update | <u>Action BJ/AS</u> |
| Look into funding streams: in particular Locality | <u>Action JD</u> |
| Send current version of Draft NP (Version 5) to all members and attendees | <u>Action BJ</u> |
| Read/study current Draft NP in preparation for next meeting's group scrutiny | <u>Action All</u> |

11. Date(s) of next meeting(s)

- Mon 18th July 9.30-11.30 Breach lane Chapel
Mon 25th July 9.30-11.30 Breach Lane Chapel
Mon 15th August 7.00 – 9.00 Breach Lane Chapel

12. AOB

IW requested a reading/website list to enable him to familiarise himself with the current position. He'd also like to receive pertinent documents that have been produced internally.

Meeting closed at: 12.30