

Present:

Allan Gibson
Roland Cundy

Roger Marshallsay
David Cornish

Graham Jukes
Andy Pearce

Pauline Grainger

AGENDA

1. Minutes of last meeting
2. Review of meeting with WBC before Christmas, feedback from Liz Alexander and the current status report that I circulated thereafter (but reattached FYI)
3. Project Plan update
4. Budget review
5. Ideas for content structure of the Plan. (I'll bring some examples with me to the meeting as to pre-circulate would require some lengthy explanations.)
6. Working structure (meetings etc) for the next six months.
7. Items for PMG

1. Minutes

Minutes of meeting 10/12/19 accepted and signed as a true record of meeting. A signed copy to be given to Parish Clerk for filing.

Actions still outstanding:

- i. **AG** draw together responses to engagement questions from working groups and pass to Comms for a coordinated plan of visits with outside groups.
- ii. **DC** ask WBC who pays for exhibition ahead of referendum at meeting on 19th December
- iii. **GJ** provide Housing with greenways map

2. Review meeting etc

DC referred to minutes of that meeting , **attached as appendix 1.**

The points referred to were:

There is no certainty for delivery date (1921-22?) for new WBC local plan.

If we produce FNDP before WBC it will take precedence in planning appeals ahead as the most recent is used, however once WBC produce theirs it would then take precedence over the FNDP. The impression from the meeting however was there is not likely to be a great divergence between the two plans.

WBC call for sites should be published shortly and if there is a site in Finchampstead Parish (highly likely as about 10% of the housing delivery is not on SDLs) we would need to include this in the FNDP.

AP suggested we include the additional homes being provided in the Gorse Ride development and RC suggested the 4 homes in the Village (Housing Assoc re-applying for planning permission) be included in our plan alongside the L&G homes.

The decision has been made that no housing number is required in the plan, the sites are the key determinant. Agreed to adhere to our own schedule for producing the plan and not amend due to WBC delays.

3. Project Plan update

No update as uncertainty as to whether DC or JA responsible for this. DC thought JA was. Question for JA at PMG meeting.

4. Budget review

AG/RM requested £380 for 100 printed copies of questionnaire report. Copies to be given to stakeholders and placed in drop off points. RC saw no point in drop off points apart from strategic ones like library, FBC. Funds are

available for this exercise. PMG to make final decision if printed reports required and RM will order in next couple of days.

5. Plan Structure

The SG, having considered the hard copy summary (attached as appendix ii) thought the FNDP could have the layout of the Woodcote plan but with the more easy going/user friendly terminology of the Barkham & Arborfield plan

AG raised the issue of “engagement” with three concerns;

- a. 2nd questionnaire
 - b. who will look at traffic, a major theme in questionnaire
 - c. what is the process for policy formulation
- a) After discussion the SG felt the decision over a second questionnaire lay with the PMG but their advice would be to wait and see what information comes from stakeholder/ group meetings before going ahead. It might be these meetings address the issue of the age groups under represented and fill in any other gaps.
- b) RC suggested Steve Bromley would have the knowledge and expertise to help in this area. He has hard data on traffic in Finchampstead going back about ten years and he could suggest how this might be used in relation to comments on questionnaire
GJ thought that as traffic was mainly strategic possibly the Parish Council could/should provide narrative for the plan.
AG thought we should make the most of “small fixes” currently under discussion (eg work at Memorial junction and California Crossroads) in the plan as these address comments made in questionnaire
- c) There were various thoughts on formulating policies and it was felt groups should now develop ideas as the policies are the key to the NDP:
- one liner policies as a starting point
 - looking at issues from different perspectives
 - filtering comments from questionnaire
 - guidelines from the Parish planning group
 - consider eco-friendly building requirements

It was noted that PP is working on the housing needs number and BS was meeting someone from Hogwood Industrial Area today to talk about the commercial requirements for the area, having already met with a representative of the Nine Mile Ride Industrial area.

It was also noted that the NDP needed to meet with parish planning committee to determine/agree a rate for infill ie 1 for 1, 2 for 1 or even up to 4 for 1. At the moment there are differing views.

As the outcome of the WBC call for sites for residential housing is soon to be available it was felt best not to arrange any meetings between the housing group and the Parish Planning committee prior to this.

6. Working Structure

DC was concerned over overlap/crossover between SG and PMG and wondered if meetings should be amalgamated.

AG thought the fault lay in the SG trying to take on too much of the work which went against the premise of the group which is, it's a team of volunteers.

RC was concerned if SG didn't take the lead would the other members of the group step up.

RM felt the SG should be about management and the PMG about content and policy.

As the parish council members of the PMG group would not be at the PMG meeting on 7-1-20 AG was asked to discuss the feelings of the PMG on the issue.

It was agreed meetings of the SG would remain fortnightly until end of March and then be reviewed.

8.AOB

Katy Dagnall and Liz Alexander both confirmed the volunteer group is liable under Freedom of Information Act as the plan is the ultimate responsibility of the Parish Council so the group needs to be aware.

Date of next meetings: Tuesday 21st January 9.30am FBC
Tuesday 4th, 18th February
Tuesday 3rd, 17th, 31st March

Actions

1. Ask JA if he is updating Project Plan
2. AG seek decision from PMG re printing 100 copies of questionnaire report
3. RC talk to S Bromley about helping with traffic issues and in what, if any, capacity he felt he could help
4. DC revisit original notes re volunteers to see if there is an expert within group with traffic knowledge
5. Advise Housing not to meet with Parish Planning committee until after release of WBC "call for sites"
6. **Arrange meeting between NDP and Parish Planning to determine acceptable infill numbers**
7. AG discuss with PMG the crossover between SG and PMG and its effects

Meeting closed 10.40 am

Signed as a true record of the meeting:

Date:.....