## Minutes of Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Steering Group meeting, 26<sup>th</sup> May 2015

## Meeting Number 16

Present: Nikki Wilson (chair), Rob Hewlett, Jane Brentor, Helen Willcox, Margaret Tribe, Lucy Norman

Apologies: Hilary Mace, Ian Draper, Alan Foster, Graham Humphries, Sally Lacey, Susan Barnhurst-Davies, Mike Norman, Peter Favier, Adam Hayward, Dave Mace, Richard Ford, Ian Campbell, John Elliott

		Actions
1.	It was noted that this meeting was not quorate because there were no councillors present	
	and very low numbers. However, the meeting went ahead with the agreement that any	
	decisions would be made via email circulation and personal discussions (however, see	
	later).	
2.	Minutes of the last Meeting	
	Rob Hewlett made the point that the minutes did not reflect the discussion held at the last	
	meeting in relation to the response to the DPD (Development Plan Document)	
	consultation. This had been made in the name of the Parish Council and the NP Steering	
	Group but had not been the result of agreement by members and should not be said to	
	represent Steering Group views. Nikki accepted that timing deadlines had prevented full	<b>N</b> 11.47
	discussion and that Rob's view had some justification. She would contact the PC and	NW
3.	Wiltshire Council to clarify the issue.	
3.	Update from meeting with Wiltshire Council	
	<ul> <li>Notes of the meeting with WC will be circulated with these minutes and were shared at the meeting. NB For these minutes to be relevant it is important that</li> </ul>	JB
	they are read in conjunction with the attached WC meeting notes.	10
	<ul> <li>Some discussion took place around point 1, mostly regarding the opportunity for</li> </ul>	
	developers to work together to achieve a combined access point to the A338 via	
	the roundabout at Batten Road. (The steering group heard that although the strip	
	of land to the West of the roundabout was privately owned, Taylor Wimpey have a	
	first option on the land making it possible to use this as an access point). It was	
	suggested that the NP could make the views of the Parish residents clearer rather	
	than simply accepting the current planning applications in the hands of the	
	developers and Wiltshire Council. For instance, a different and stronger	
	statement could be made about limiting the size of individual developer's	
	applications and working together to develop a strip development with a road	
	onto the Batten Road roundabout.	
	• Further discussion on point 3 resulted in those present being inclined to identify	
	site preferences in the Plan, especially with the reassurance from Wiltshire Council	
	that this would not be a 'green light' to increased development beyond the current	
	allocation and would be more likely to protect Downton from ad hoc development	
	if and when numbers greater than the 190 houses are required. The NP could make some clear stipulations that could offer some protection rather than leaving	
	open ended opportunities in the longer term future if the Core Strategy were	
	revised or if housing need or land availability changed. A checklist provided by WC	
	would aid analysis of site preferences. This checklist is also being circulated with	JB
	the minutes.	
	<ul> <li>In relation to point 8, it was noted that greater clarity and rewording of the</li> </ul>	
	policies and proposals is needed with surety of justification on each point. This will	
	require some intensive work on the policies and proposals but would increase the	
	purpose and usefulness of the NP as a whole. Those present agreed that the	
	meeting with WC had widened our options and, although there was regret that we	
	did not have this clarity in the past, it was felt that we should maximise this	
	opportunity now.	
	<ul> <li>It was agreed that the above discussion represented quite a different approach to</li> </ul>	
	that taken to date and, as such, would need ratification by a quorate Steering	

	Group at the next meeting. However, Nikki will have some discussions in the meantime and some work may be able to be progressed on this basis. Nikki also	NW
	pointed out that Wiltshire Council's work on the DPD and their application of criteria to produce preferences may already preclude some preferences we might	
	come to in an exercise to analyse sites. Similarly, work undertaken by the Parish Council may not sit well with the approach suggested at this meeting and	
	cautioned too much optimism.	
	<ul> <li>Nikki asked for any further questions for WC to be sent to her please.</li> </ul>	All
4.	Update from Pre-submission Consultation	
	Jane thanked all those who helped deliver leaflets and supported the Cuckoo Fair	
	launch which went well.	
	<ul> <li>Very few comments or responses have been received but it is hoped that external stakeholders will respond.</li> </ul>	
5.	Review of actions of Editorial Group	
Э.	• A meeting was held on the 12 <sup>th</sup> May at which the Plan was reviewed in the light of	
	the few comments	
	• The policies and proposals were reviewed to tighten them, reduce duplication or	
	unjustified policies and Jane coordinated changes from group members to produce	
	a revised list over the following week. This is also to be sent with the minutes but,	JB
	in the light of the above discussion, is likely to be subject to further change.	
	<ul> <li>Margaret had proof read the initial pages up to the beginning of the individual</li> </ul>	
	policy sections. This led to agreement that a glossary and list of definitions would	
	be helpful (Jane to draft) in order to have an agreed way of referring to various	
	bodies and documents consistently throughout the Plan. It was agreed that	NAT
	Margaret should not undertake further proof reading until after the next draft	MT
	which would be likely to be around the beginning of July.	
<u> </u>	It was suggested that a fold out map would be a useful appendix to the Plan	
6.	<ul> <li>Actions needed from Steering Group members</li> <li>All Steering group members are asked to read and comment on the Plan.</li> </ul>	All
	<ul> <li>The suggested change of approach discussed at this meeting will need</li> </ul>	
	ratification or challenge by a quorate meeting.	St Gp
7.	Project timescale	
	Due to the more intensive work required from a) making policies and proposals	
	tighter and b) undertaking site preference and/or new site options it was agreed	
	that the end of June is not achievable. As WC has established that they will	
	that the end of June is not achievable. As WC has established that they will continue to respond over the summer, and the plan needs to be revised as above	
	that the end of June is not achievable. As WC has established that they will continue to respond over the summer, and the plan needs to be revised as above and go to a Parish Council meeting before submission, it was suggested that mid-	
	that the end of June is not achievable. As WC has established that they will continue to respond over the summer, and the plan needs to be revised as above and go to a Parish Council meeting before submission, it was suggested that midend July is more realistic. With the possibility of a further public meeting (see	
	that the end of June is not achievable. As WC has established that they will continue to respond over the summer, and the plan needs to be revised as above and go to a Parish Council meeting before submission, it was suggested that mid- end July is more realistic. With the possibility of a further public meeting (see AOB) this may require still further extension. Changes to the project plan will be	
	that the end of June is not achievable. As WC has established that they will continue to respond over the summer, and the plan needs to be revised as above and go to a Parish Council meeting before submission, it was suggested that mid- end July is more realistic. With the possibility of a further public meeting (see AOB) this may require still further extension. Changes to the project plan will be conveyed to Alan when clarity is achieved	
8.	<ul> <li>that the end of June is not achievable. As WC has established that they will continue to respond over the summer, and the plan needs to be revised as above and go to a Parish Council meeting before submission, it was suggested that midend July is more realistic. With the possibility of a further public meeting (see AOB) this may require still further extension. Changes to the project plan will be conveyed to Alan when clarity is achieved</li> <li><u>Any other business</u></li> </ul>	
8.	<ul> <li>that the end of June is not achievable. As WC has established that they will continue to respond over the summer, and the plan needs to be revised as above and go to a Parish Council meeting before submission, it was suggested that midend July is more realistic. With the possibility of a further public meeting (see AOB) this may require still further extension. Changes to the project plan will be conveyed to Alan when clarity is achieved</li> <li>Any other business</li> <li>Developers have not been consulted as stakeholders and this was discussed but</li> </ul>	
8.	<ul> <li>that the end of June is not achievable. As WC has established that they will continue to respond over the summer, and the plan needs to be revised as above and go to a Parish Council meeting before submission, it was suggested that midend July is more realistic. With the possibility of a further public meeting (see AOB) this may require still further extension. Changes to the project plan will be conveyed to Alan when clarity is achieved</li> <li>Any other business</li> <li>Developers have not been consulted as stakeholders and this was discussed but without conclusion as it is not clear whether only those with existing applications</li> </ul>	
8.	<ul> <li>that the end of June is not achievable. As WC has established that they will continue to respond over the summer, and the plan needs to be revised as above and go to a Parish Council meeting before submission, it was suggested that midend July is more realistic. With the possibility of a further public meeting (see AOB) this may require still further extension. Changes to the project plan will be conveyed to Alan when clarity is achieved</li> <li>Any other business</li> <li>Developers have not been consulted as stakeholders and this was discussed but without conclusion as it is not clear whether only those with existing applications would be considered as stakeholders but this would potentially show preferential</li> </ul>	
8.	<ul> <li>that the end of June is not achievable. As WC has established that they will continue to respond over the summer, and the plan needs to be revised as above and go to a Parish Council meeting before submission, it was suggested that midend July is more realistic. With the possibility of a further public meeting (see AOB) this may require still further extension. Changes to the project plan will be conveyed to Alan when clarity is achieved</li> <li>Any other business</li> <li>Developers have not been consulted as stakeholders and this was discussed but without conclusion as it is not clear whether only those with existing applications would be considered as stakeholders but this would potentially show preferential treatment. However, if site preferences are to be included then land owners of</li> </ul>	?Eng G
8.	<ul> <li>that the end of June is not achievable. As WC has established that they will continue to respond over the summer, and the plan needs to be revised as above and go to a Parish Council meeting before submission, it was suggested that midend July is more realistic. With the possibility of a further public meeting (see AOB) this may require still further extension. Changes to the project plan will be conveyed to Alan when clarity is achieved</li> <li>Any other business</li> <li>Developers have not been consulted as stakeholders and this was discussed but without conclusion as it is not clear whether only those with existing applications would be considered as stakeholders but this would potentially show preferential treatment. However, if site preferences are to be included then land owners of preferred sites would need to be considered as stakeholders.</li> </ul>	?Eng G
8.	<ul> <li>that the end of June is not achievable. As WC has established that they will continue to respond over the summer, and the plan needs to be revised as above and go to a Parish Council meeting before submission, it was suggested that midend July is more realistic. With the possibility of a further public meeting (see AOB) this may require still further extension. Changes to the project plan will be conveyed to Alan when clarity is achieved</li> <li>Any other business</li> <li>Developers have not been consulted as stakeholders and this was discussed but without conclusion as it is not clear whether only those with existing applications would be considered as stakeholders but this would potentially show preferential treatment. However, if site preferences are to be included then land owners of preferred sites would need to be considered as stakeholders.</li> <li>Although it was felt that the evidence already obtained from Parish surveys would</li> </ul>	?Eng G
8.	<ul> <li>that the end of June is not achievable. As WC has established that they will continue to respond over the summer, and the plan needs to be revised as above and go to a Parish Council meeting before submission, it was suggested that midend July is more realistic. With the possibility of a further public meeting (see AOB) this may require still further extension. Changes to the project plan will be conveyed to Alan when clarity is achieved</li> <li>Any other business</li> <li>Developers have not been consulted as stakeholders and this was discussed but without conclusion as it is not clear whether only those with existing applications would be considered as stakeholders but this would potentially show preferential treatment. However, if site preferences are to be included then land owners of preferred sites would need to be considered as stakeholders.</li> <li>Although it was felt that the evidence already obtained from Parish surveys would probably be sufficient to inform site preferences and/or other site options, it was</li> </ul>	?Eng G ?Eng G
8.	<ul> <li>that the end of June is not achievable. As WC has established that they will continue to respond over the summer, and the plan needs to be revised as above and go to a Parish Council meeting before submission, it was suggested that midend July is more realistic. With the possibility of a further public meeting (see AOB) this may require still further extension. Changes to the project plan will be conveyed to Alan when clarity is achieved</li> <li>Any other business</li> <li>Developers have not been consulted as stakeholders and this was discussed but without conclusion as it is not clear whether only those with existing applications would be considered as stakeholders but this would potentially show preferential treatment. However, if site preferences are to be included then land owners of preferred sites would need to be considered as stakeholders.</li> <li>Although it was felt that the evidence already obtained from Parish surveys would probably be sufficient to inform site preferences and/or other site options, it was suggested that a public meeting/presentation should be held in July to establish</li> </ul>	
8.	<ul> <li>that the end of June is not achievable. As WC has established that they will continue to respond over the summer, and the plan needs to be revised as above and go to a Parish Council meeting before submission, it was suggested that midend July is more realistic. With the possibility of a further public meeting (see AOB) this may require still further extension. Changes to the project plan will be conveyed to Alan when clarity is achieved</li> <li>Any other business</li> <li>Developers have not been consulted as stakeholders and this was discussed but without conclusion as it is not clear whether only those with existing applications would be considered as stakeholders but this would potentially show preferential treatment. However, if site preferences are to be included then land owners of preferred sites would need to be considered as stakeholders.</li> <li>Although it was felt that the evidence already obtained from Parish surveys would probably be sufficient to inform site preferences and/or other site options, it was</li> </ul>	
8.	<ul> <li>that the end of June is not achievable. As WC has established that they will continue to respond over the summer, and the plan needs to be revised as above and go to a Parish Council meeting before submission, it was suggested that midend July is more realistic. With the possibility of a further public meeting (see AOB) this may require still further extension. Changes to the project plan will be conveyed to Alan when clarity is achieved</li> <li>Any other business</li> <li>Developers have not been consulted as stakeholders and this was discussed but without conclusion as it is not clear whether only those with existing applications would be considered as stakeholders but this would potentially show preferential treatment. However, if site preferences are to be included then land owners of preferred sites would need to be considered as stakeholders.</li> <li>Although it was felt that the evidence already obtained from Parish surveys would probably be sufficient to inform site preferences and/or other site options, it was suggested that a public meeting/presentation should be held in July to establish support and re-enthuse residents once options have been analysed.</li> </ul>	