

Minutes of Extraordinary Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Steering Group Meeting, 12 August 2015, No.20

Present

N Wilson (Chair), J Brentor, D Mace, C Bird, R Hewlett, S Lacey, R Ford (left early), A Hayward (left early), M Tribe, S Barnhurst-Davies, H Mace, I Campbell (from 8.45pm)

1. **Apologies:** G Humphreys, H Wilcox, A Foster

2. Chairman's Report

Nikki thanked everyone for coming at such short notice.

She explained the purpose of the meeting:

- a. To endorse the criteria for site preference selection process,
- b. To decide whether to score all the SHLAA sites or WC refined option sites only,
- c. To endorse the weighting system,
- d. To appoint a small working group to undertake the scoring process.

Nikki gave the current timetable as follows:

Wed 12 August (ie this evening) – as above,

By Friday 14 – endorsed revised criteria sent to SG and PC,

Mon 17 Aug – criteria and weighting to be discussed and hopefully ratified by PC,

Tues, Wed or Thurs – working group to meet to score the SHLAA sites,

Fri 21 Aug – results of scoring to be sent simultaneously to SG, PC, WC and developers,

Sat 22 Aug – open day when wider public will see result of site preference analysis

Early Sept – SG and PC to endorse completed Plan (all),

Mid Sept – Completed Plan to WC.

Nikki said that questions had been raised about whether the Steering group processes were fully objective. She stated that she had been through all past minutes and matched decisions to the SG Terms of Reference, and had come to the decision that the SG had tried to encompass a full range of opinions and interests, and had allowed everyone's views to be heard. Those declaring an interest had not taken part in any working groups (members of which had been appointed by the SG) and that Parish Councillors had been scrupulous in not exerting undue pressure. Jane confirmed that she had also looked through the Minutes and that all engagement with stakeholders and residents had been carried out by at least 2 people. Rob H stated that he felt there was an anti-developer feeling within the group. However, in response to the proposal, 'Do we think the process in producing the NPlan has been objective?' (proposed by Sally) – all agreed.

3. Assessment Criteria

Jane explained that all criteria relating to the design of the sites had been removed so developers yet to submit plans, were not disadvantaged. Each criterion was discussed and amended as necessary. (All were reminded that at this stage we were not talking about specific sites):

C1 No change

C2 No change

C3 West of village =6 points and East/ Other=3 points (this 2:1 ratio as a result of further analysis undertaken to take into account overlap between answers on Q10). A weighting of X3 was agreed later in the meeting when weightings discussed.

C4 Interpreted as being the access road to the site and access from the site and will be changed accordingly.

C5-C13 Distances to be calculated using google walking app (using the default setting for average walking speed).

C5 Centre is the Borough Cross.

C9 To include all stores where basic food items can be bought, eg Esso Garage.

C11 Leisure centre and meeting facility to be changed to "community facility".

C14 No change

C15 No change

C16 Following much discussion, it was decided to remove this item. Although traffic is a major concern of the village, it was agreed that all sites would impact on traffic congestion and it is difficult to objectively measure. Site size and walking distances criteria go some way to measure this issue.

C17 Change wording possibly to 'In identified flood risk area as defined by Environment Agency'. Dave to check correct wording and zone numbers

C18 To be removed Identified access obstruction difficult to assess prior to planning. C4 now reflects access issues.

C19 No change except for removal of the phrase "or conservation" as this point is covered under another criteria.

C20 Expected that all of the sites to be evaluated would have the same score and they are all sufficiently close to the New Forest to attract visits from these sites and not so close as to deter people from using their cars to get there. Proximity to be defined eg x miles.

C21 To be removed (as measurement may be too subjective) but considered important criterion so SG members given until 11am next morning to propose acceptable wording.

C22 To be removed as measurement is too subjective.

C23 No change. Definition of brownfield site to be used will be as given in the Wiltshire Core Strategy and site preference guidance.

C24 No change

The criteria with the above amendments were ratified by all present.

4. **SHLAA Sites**

It was agreed that all 12 sites should be scored. S3026 should read Mazda Garage not Headlands.

5. **Scoring Analysis**

It was agreed that Christopher would be one member of this working party plus 2 others not previously involved with setting the criteria. Nikki will approach other suggested persons (John Elliot, Ian Draper, Alan Foster, Richard Nash - not present) for their availability (NB Post meeting note - Alan Foster since confirmed as second member). Jane will also be present but in a purely advisory capacity on the process and meaning of the criteria. She will not take any part in the

scoring.

6. Weighting of criteria

After much discussion of various methods it was decided to adopt the method proposed by the working group as follows:

- a.** Criteria that directly relate to questions in the survey will be weighted according to their average response score. Averages of 3.7, 3.8 and 3.9 will have a weighting of 3. Averages of 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6 will have a weighting of 2. Lower than 3.4 the weighting will be 1.
- b.** Criteria that do not relate directly to questions in the survey will have a weighting of 1.

This weighting was agreed by all (Dave as Chairman of PC abstained from vote).

7. AOB

a. Christopher expressed concerns that he and others in the scoring group will be held responsible for the results. It was explained that the SG has collective responsibility and the criteria and weighting, as agreed this evening and then by the PC on 17 August, will determine the outcome of the scoring process. It is important that the rest of the SG, WC, PC and developers all receive the results at the same time.

b. Dave emphasised that those scoring must be allowed to carry this out without lobbying or pressure from anyone else.

c. Nikki thanked Jane for all her hard work in getting the site preferences work to this stage.

d. Nikki read out a thank you letter from Phill Brentor, who designed the website, for his honorarium.

- 8. Next meeting:** Tuesday 1 September or Wednesday 2 September (tbc as depends on possible PC Housing Committee meeting on the 1 Sept), 7.30pm in White Horse.