

Present:

David Cornish
Roland CundyAllan Gibson
Andy PearcePauline Grainger
Graham Jukes

Roger Marshallsay

AGENDA

1. Mins / Actions from last meeting, 31-3-20
2. Draft Plan update and agreement on future work required
3. Options for getting feedback from Stakeholders via Virtual meetings
4. Finance update / payment back to Locality
5. Prep for PMG Meeting, 14-4-20

1. Minutes

Minutes of meeting 31/03/20 accepted. An electronic copy will be sent to Parish Clerk for the website and the hard copy will be retained for signature at a future date.

Actions

1. RM contact Locality over situation with funding. Agenda item, CLOSED
2. DC provide updated draft plan document for discussion at next meeting. Agenda item, CLOSED
3. DC arrange next meeting in two weeks. CLOSED

2. Draft Plan

DC, GJ, JA and BS have had virtual meetings and phone discussions over the last two weeks to get the draft plan to the stage presented at this meeting. DC invited comment from those present; some had already been involved in the discussions and others only saw the plan for the first time yesterday.

All agreed it was a good framework and would work for the purpose of delivering the FNDP. It was a broad picture and the basics were there to develop.

Specific comments:

PLG The cut and pasting in section 7 needed some revision

AP Wondered what the designation on map1 Finchampstead CP referred to

RC A good foundation for final document

RM Pleasantly surprised by how much has been done to date & how much material has been gathered

DC Sustainability and Sustainable Development are two different elements and when refining/ reviewing plan will need to decide if either or both add anything

GJ Sustainability should run throughout report and not be a section in its own right

DC Design should be revisited as there are elements of the area which follow patterns but the parish as a whole is not defined by a single design feature; different feature in different areas/ settlements

DC More work and evidence is required in relation to the brown spaces policies but he felt this was a result of different working processes (green group v brown group) and the information is there, just needs pulling out

AP Brown spaces are having regular meetings and policies are emerging. AP took the Parish Planning Committee guidelines and expanded these, taking into account comments from the FNDP October 2019 survey, as potential for policies and they are being circulated for additional comments and further expansion from all members of the brown group. AP is hoping for this back by end of this week.

GJ The brown group have looked at the green spaces policies/work and have identified some green gaps and work is now required on defining them. Reading NDP examiners' reports is very helpful in respect of examiners ways of thinking around definitions and posing questions we should be asking ourselves of our own narrative. Links to brown spaces work and how you identify evidence base.

DC More work required in business area and to include farming and this needs to be taken to PMG meeting to take forward.

RM was asked about the recent appeal decisions and if there was commonality. He felt the conclusions were similar in all appeals – Nine Mile Ride, Sand Martins and Johnson Drive. Previous policies were considered even though they were out of date but mainly decisions were based on sustainability. He felt these decisions should be utilised and related to our FNDP. He also commented that he felt Jovike (the designated WBC development site in the parish) was not, on the basis of the appeals, sustainable. The over-riding feature was the ability to walk to schools and shops

AP commented that on this basis the fields behind the doctors surgery (which are a target for speculative development) were sustainable

AG He took from the appeals that terminology and definitions are of utmost importance. A clear definition of “separation” is required

RM Housing supply figures are very important. The latest inspector (Nine Mile Ride appeal) looked at these thoroughly and even took virus into account in reducing land supply years

RC questioned WBC figures in relation to land supply and wondered how accurate they are. The end result is it all rests on delivery of homes on the SDL’s

DC was concerned construction could be seen as a good quick start for the economy after the end of the virus lockdown and wondered if speculators would believe they could build anywhere

GJ He is working on separation with BS and they are looking at specific sites given to them by GM/CM.

GJ/BS feel they have a reasonably good definition and where green gaps should be but know these have to be “meaningful”. They are concerned about drawing physical lines (as people will build up to lines) so needs to be conceptual. They will refer their findings back to Vision group to consider.

AG concerned people on survey stated they lived in Finchampstead, not a particular area of the parish and it would be hard to prevent building alongside existing settlements.

GJ pointed out there was no reference to particular settlements in survey and examiners’ reports acknowledged the need for separation between settlements to preserve character of settlements.

Existing maps show the pockets of urbanisation. Also reports varied substantially but all placed emphasis on definitions of words particularly in the policy text.

DC asked RM if he could look at our emerging draft NDP based on his knowledge of the appeal decisions. Would it stand up to inspection? Is it looking robust?

AP also wondered if RM had noticed a commonality between inspectors?

GJ advised RM that the East Hagbourne examiner report is worth looking at as it’s a good illustration of the questions posed

DC summed up - the known content to date has been amassed now it’s important to ensure it makes sense

3. Stakeholder meetings

DC is keen for virtual meetings / phone discussions to go ahead with stakeholders to collect further data and comments on the October survey as envisaged in stage 2 of our engagement.

Tim Nabbs (brown) has agreed to speak to six Estate Agents; already spoken to Michael Hardy; is speaking to Prospect this week and has four further estate agents lined up in the following 10 days. He has a common set of questions.

RC and DC will follow up with further farmers having already spoken with Alan Bishop

4. Locality Funding

RM advised Locality accepted his report and all paperwork was sent to Parish Council so he assumes surplus funds were returned. RC will check with Katy Dagnall. Locality open for applications for this financial year on 20th April and DC would like application in asap thereafter. RM can only do this if he has a list of specified items.

DC suggested items for costing:

- Publishing of plan
- Bell-Cornwell consultancy
- Reg 14 consult
- Referendum
- Digitalisation of maps

It was felt some of these will fall in financial year 2021/2022. DC will look at timetabling new dates in the light of virus but it was likely the referendum could not be held before May 2021 at earliest and AG reminded members that Aborfield and Barkham had a gap of nearly 4 months between Reg 14 consult and Final Plan consult. Each consult is for a six week period and examiner only looks at NDP after both consults completed.

There was a short discussion about the £3k additional funding available on the back of the 4 houses in the village and /or a design statement but AG was concerned at what might be involved to support this additional funding. DC felt we should apply on the basis of the affordable home is the village.

Current requests for funding of which AP is aware:

- Brown spaces £1050 for meetings with LA
- Green spaces £2k digitalisation
- Comms and Admin, no request for funds

RM asked for clarification on digitalisation; GJ explained it was the process required to put the hand drawn maps currently in the draft into a professional format – it would involve mapping software, and the knowledge to overlay onto existing maps.

5.Preparation PMG meeting

AG was happy that the agenda for the meeting later today would follow largely this SG meeting . He would add a budget item.

Next meeting Tuesday 28th April 9.30am

Actions

1. PG arrange next meeting
2. GJ, BS carry on work on gaps and take forward with DF and vison group
3. RM look at emerging plan in the light of his knowledge of Appeal decisions for comments at next meeting
4. RC check Locality funds returned
5. DC look at schedule of revised plan dates due to virus
6. RM prepare application for Locality funding as soon as he has line items

Signed as a true record of the meeting:

Date:.....