

Present:

David Cornish
Roland CundyAllan Gibson
Andy PearcePauline Grainger
Graham Jukes

Roger Marshallsay

AGENDA

1. Mins / Actions from last meeting, 31-3-20
2. Gaps and Settlements
3. Stakeholders Virtual meetings
4. Budget
5. Referendum date

1. Minutes

Minutes of meeting 14/04/20 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. PG arrange next meeting. Arranged. CLOSED
2. GJ, BS carry on work on gaps and take forward with DF and vision group. Agenda item. CLOSED
3. RM look at emerging plan in the light of his knowledge of Appeal decisions for comments at next meeting. Background reading done but nothing yet on paper. Charles Margetts mentioned that a common thread throughout appeals was the topic of "sustainable development". The meeting felt we should ensure that in the plan we clearly define our understanding of "sustainable development". AG advised that in the National Policy Planning Framework there is a definition but DC felt it was the interpretation of that definition which was relevant. AP/GJ felt it was imperative we have a glossary in our NDP of our understanding of terms we use. RM advised the only definition he had seen was one which referred to walking distance but even this was open to interpretation by inspectors. Quality of walk being an example. RM will continue to look at this topic. ONGOING
4. RC check Locality funds returned. Money returned. CLOSED
5. DC look at schedule of revised plan dates due to virus. DC advised that the current plan date would mean the referendum would fall on the same day as council and parish elections in May 2021 and discussion followed over whether or not it was felt this was a good idea, assuming we are ready to proceed at that point.

Pros

- Good turnout; an election turnout is approx 36% of population where as a NDP referendum turnout is quoted as being around 10% of population.
- Everything is in place for a referendum therefore cost effective

Cons

- NDP message confused with political messages; the FNDP v development in general AP wondered if WBC might have a comment bearing in mind it would make three elections on one date:- Council, parish, FNDP.

DC asked the SG to consider and come back to meeting with a decision in a month. ONGOING

6. RM prepare application for Locality funding as soon as he has line items. RM has registered for access which once granted will open a two week window in which to apply. AG advised he has asked PMG for their budget requirements so these should be available following tonight's meeting. RM has advised in application that we have allocated housing and he might need additional information about this. If this is not currently available he agreed we can go back later in the year for the additional funding for this. ONGOING

2. Gaps and Settlements

AG advised the Vision group had looked at this and DF provided a document for discussion at PMG meeting this evening. Also whilst the inspector in the NMR appeal had stated this proposed development was in the countryside, this was not a major reason for rejecting the appeal as the development was not actually in contravention of WBC's definition of countryside.

The WBC plan has designated green spaces and gaps are protected by their definition of "countryside". AG feels our ideas on gaps/settlements should complement WBC's definition of countryside rather than trying to replace it.

DF's document has based the 5 settlements on a sense of community and place and uses the concept of a map to define the settlements and the important critical gaps as given by the survey results.

DC has prepared a draft section for the FNDP on "Gaps and Settlements", based on information and documents produced so far and there was discussion as to where this might go and the "feel" of the draft. DC will tweak in relation to feel and thinks it can be reviewed at a later date as to where it fits best in the plan.

AG thinks there is still work to be done on what we mean by settlements and how we physically define them – is it lines on a map or is it co-ordinates of particular points or is it more fluid allowing a degree of discretion. We also have to consider "ribbon developments" in our definition as the low density single line of homes (along NMR for example) are in the country side. DC felt we can restrict depth of build in this instance and GJ felt green spaces (even with houses within) can be defined with thought.

AP/GJ felt a professional cartographer would be able to clearly define an area given the right information whether this be from walking the area to ensure the map matches the ground or from satellite images.

DC feels the plan is taking shape and whilst there is more content to do we could now be adding detail to existing content. Recommends we share the draft with LA for comment, - eg do the policies deliver our aspirations; are we trying to achieve impossible; are we acting outside the remit.

3. Stakeholder Meetings

AP advised the brown group are finding it exceedingly difficult to arrange the "meetings" with the Estate Agents; RC also said that meeting with the farmers/equine community "virtually" was not easy and felt we would be better to have an action plan in place for speaking to all the stakeholders as soon as lockdown is lifted.

4. Housing Needs

PP has produced a document on Housing Needs which AG has circulated for discussion at tonight's PMG meeting. He commented that it was extremely well written and the content was very readable and GJ endorsed these views. The document will be attached to PMG minutes as an appendix.

5. Climate Change

Several members of the SG signed up for a Climate Change (in relation to NDP's) webinar. RC summed up – whilst there were many commendable suggestions for energy saving processes within the house building business you cannot force builders to add measures to a development which puts a significant cost onto the build. However it is in the builder's remit to do the best they can in terms of energy saving and moving forward they are expected to offer best practise in terms of both materials and methods. Typically all possible energy saving devices in a home would add £7k to the price of a house.

RC suggested reducing CIL payments if builders provide all possible energy saving devices and GJ thought this was a good idea but wondered how it could be enforced. RC – building control. RC, alternatively offer householders directly, from CIL payments, the £7k to add the energy saving devices to their homes.

AG thought it should be addressed in the FNDP, but at an appropriate level.

DC thought if it's in the plan it opens discussion and perhaps there was an opportunity to make energy saving requirements for infill.

AG felt suggestions on footpaths and cycling could be addressed in plan but not strategic traffic suggestions.

6. Budget

No discussion; on agenda for PMG this evening

Meeting closed 10.20am

Next meeting Tuesday 12th May, 9.30am

Actions

1. PG arrange next meeting
2. RM look at emerging plan in the light of his knowledge of Appeal decisions
3. SG review decision (26th May meeting) on date for FNDP referendum in 2021
4. RM proceed with application for Locality funding
5. PG add PP Housing Needs document to PMG minutes as an appendix
6. AG/DC share draft plan with Liz Alexander and see if she can help with cartographer
7. SG - find a cartographer or someone with mapping skills

Signed as a true record of the meeting:

Date:.....