

Minutes of Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Steering Group meeting, 16th June 2015

Meeting Number 17

Present: Nikki Wilson (chair), Rob Hewlett, Jane Brentor, Helen Willcox, Margaret Tribe, Dave Mace, Adam Hayward, Pete Favier

Apologies: Hilary Mace, Ian Draper, Alan Foster, Graham Humphries, Sally Lacey, Susan Barnhurst-Davies, Mike Norman, Lucy Norman, Richard Ford, Ian Campbell, John Elliot, Christopher Bird.

		Actions
1.	<u>Registration and conflicts of interest</u> Rob Hewlett agreed not to take part in any vote where his property development interests would conflict	
2.	<u>Minutes of the last Meeting</u> These were accepted with no matters arising not covered below.	
3.	<u>Update from Pre submission consultation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There has been a very limited response to the draft plan both by means of on line and paper cards (approximately 25 cards and 17+ online). All are positive but with some suggestions Responses from John Glen, Trafalgar school, Longford Estate, Charles Church. Agreed to write a holding letter to John Glen re his offer of writing a forward to the plan, to formally acknowledge Longford's response (with offer of discussion re SHLAA site north of the village) and to arrange a visit to Charles Church. Wiltshire Council's outline of stakeholder contacts suggests that we should arrange visits to the known potential developers. JB to arrange Engagement group to visit Rob Rowe, Rob Hewlett, Taylor Wimpey and possibly the Newlands Farm. Some of the formal agencies such as Wessex Water and the Environment Agency have sent holding responses and have been chased. 	JB JB
4.	<u>Steering Group's view on identifying site preferences</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Despite some past views being expressed that the identification of sites may indicate options for further development beyond the 190, the group were generally in favour of accepting Wiltshire Council's view that site preferences will help to prevent acceptance of applications for building on sites that would not be the NP's preference, should there be a requirement for more housing at some stage in the future. Dave pointed out that the limitations of the school placements, traffic impacts etc will place restrictions anyway on the total housing possible (see later notes re response to DPD consultation). The question 'do we accept that the NP should identify site preferences subject to the caveats that these are about future proofing the plan rather than indicating agreement to building beyond the Core Strategy requirements and also depending on the response from WC re their already identified refined sites?' received unanimous agreement. (Rob H did not vote). The sites to be included in analysis of preferences are all those identified as SHLAA sites including site S3442 (Scott's House which was not identified with a SHLAA number of WC's map) and not just those refined as preferences by WC. Nikki will ask Simon and Christopher whether they will work with Helen and ?Jane to a) develop the assessment criteria using WC's guidelines plus the survey findings, b) undertake the scoring and c) suggest and apply weighting dependent on WC and PC views. 	NW
5.	<u>Steering Group's view on whether the DPD response was representative of the NP</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All agreed that Question 1 wrongly indicates that the response was submitted as representing the views of the Parish Council and the NP Steering Group. It was clarified that the Steering Group had not formally agreed the response at that time. Nikki will confirm this with WC together with comments below. After reviewing each of the questions the Steering Group agreed that the following 	NW

	<p>point will be made: 'Although the response made on the 31st March was reasonable at the time, we had asked for information in Q 5 about why SHLAA site S3442 had been excluded. We are still awaiting that information. Downton Neighbourhood Plan are now progressing a process of identifying site preferences and the identification of these may impact on our response, particularly to Question 7.'</p>	NW
6.	<p><u>Holding a further engagement event with residents</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because the site identification could be seen as representing a significant change to the NP, all agreed that a public meeting should be held, well publicised through wide distribution networks and inviting external stakeholders including developers, to present the site preferences and the reasoning for these. • This will be held no later than mid August and, to recognise the holiday period, the changes will be outlined on the website for those unable to attend the public meeting. 	Eng Gp
7.	<p><u>Project timescale</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was agreed that the changes required following the consultation and the site preference exercise is likely to take six weeks as a minimum. This will change the project plan, meaning that the plan will not be submitted to WC until late August and their inspection and consultation will then need to take place, making a referendum in late Autumn unlikely. Jane to inform Alan. 	JB
8.	<p><u>Any other business</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nikki pointed out that the outcome of the current consultation about the school may affect the wording of the NP • Dave asked for clarification about how the outcome of the industrial estate will be included. It was agreed that this will be part of the pre-submission changes. • An honorarium of £100 will be paid to the website designer for his voluntary work on the site. Nikki will ask Bev to raise a cheque. 	NW
	<p><u>Next meeting</u> Tuesday 7th July 2015, 7.30 pm at the White Horse</p>	