

Present:

David Cornish  
Andy Pearce

Allan Gibson  
Roger Marshallsay

Roland Cundy  
Graham Jukes

Pauline Grainger

AGENDA

1. Matter arising – including cartography update
2. Local Green spaces
3. Update on Locality submissions
4. Update on call with WBC Planning team
5. Update on Brown group
6. Prep for PMG

Minutes

Minutes of meeting 26/05/20 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.

1. Matters Arising

1. GJ discuss cartography with WBC. Agenda item. CLOSED
2. GJ provide RM with estimate from WBC for “mapping” costs. GJ felt as he had now conquered the mapping software the expected cost would reduce, but there would still be a cost as whilst he could produce the drafts, it required WBC (at a cost) to provide the final maps for the FNDP. This couldn't be estimated until he knew how many maps were required. CLOSED
3. RM submit Locality grant once registration complete. RM has submitted application and should receive a reply within 10 days. He put in an estimate of £500 for mapping as he did not have enough detail to request more. Even at the level provided he is unsure if it will be acceptable. GJ thinks this is underestimated. RM also advised he had applied only for basic Grant and not additional grant for allocated housing. CLOSED
4. DC advise AG re status of “brown policies” etc Agenda item. CLOSED
5. DC/AG aim to provide LA completed “first draft” of plan by end June. Agenda item. CLOSED
6. PG send GJ Gorse redevelopment plans. Actioned, CLOSED

Cartography update: DC/GJ had a good discussion with WBC planners over cartography and the options and all were clear on the principles behind the mapping and practically it could be broken down into two:

1. NDP cartography
2. Local green space cartography

WBC only require sketches to work on; it needs someone to go through draft plan to decide which maps are required before 18<sup>th</sup> June, the date of the end of the consultation over WBC Local green Spaces.

JM advised they would form part of the LPU discussions but that the LPU has focused on urban green spaces as opposed to rural ones.

2. Local Green Spaces

GJ has completed 9 (of 19) maps and these are very detailed; it requires knowing where you draw the line (who says where?) and how does this equate to the lines on the ground? California Crossroads and Gorse Ride are particularly challenging.

GJ asked who would sign off the mapping and DC advised this was down to Simon Weeks and Sylvia McDonald from the Parish Council and he did not think they would have a problem.

3. Locality Update

Discussed in point 3 Matters Arising

#### 4. WBC Planning Meeting

DC and GJ met with 3 members of WBC planning dept. (included James McCabe JM) and also GM, CM from brown group. The meeting was open, accommodating and friendly and covered various topics.

WBC congratulated GM/CM on trying to define G&T sites and it was agreed the Brown group should use WBC's work from 2017 where appropriate. Finchampstead Parish has a significant number of the total pitches/ homes for the G&T population in the Borough coming second to the Twyford area.

It was noted that Park/Mobile homes are not the same as G&T sites and Brown Group are working on a policy not to expand G&T sites into Mobile Home Parks. WBC has no such policy. All mobile homes count towards overall housing numbers. It was felt it would be useful to contain additional mobile homes to existing sites as this would be counted as brownfield development.

AP commented this "issue" would remain within the brown group remit.

RM commented that in the appeal on land opposite "Warren Lodge" for a G&T site the inspector found there were enough of these sites in the area.

WBC commented that "settlement boundaries" and "development boundaries" were one and the same. There was discussion as to whether or not we could tweak, change or add new boundaries and the outcome was that as long as there is a reasoned argument boundaries could be tweaked.

Wick Hill was specifically discussed as it came within a settlement boundary change by WBC in 2011. It has been taken off the "call for Sites" list as one of the landowners no longer wishes to participate but it will stay within the settlement boundary. The FNDP could suggest it be changed back but there would need to be a reason but more significantly it might hinder acceptance of the plan. DC Suggested the parish is asked to look at this point. AP asked if there could be a trade-off Johnson Drive v Wick Hill but there was no conclusion merely a comment that Wick Hill is a more "sustainable" site.

RC wondered if the boundary in the village could be tweaked to include the land suggested for affordable home as this would then give them the go-ahead. Agreed this was a good idea.

It was also noted:

- that you can create new settlements but this was a risky strategy and could increase development risk. AG asked to discuss at PMG meeting.
- Arborfield & Barkham tried to protect iconic views in their plan and whilst WBC accepted this the inspector didn't.

AG asked if there was any more info on the time line for the WBC LPU and DC said they were working to end 2021.

WBC are still in negotiation over Grazely infrastructure with government but weren't able to give any information other than if it doesn't go ahead 4000 homes will have to be found but no indication of numbers in Finchampstead.

WBC would like to continue to talk regularly with FNDP team and AG asked to be included in future meetings. AP suggested DC write to WBC with a list of statements /points he understood came out of the meeting and to suggest future regular meetings. DC agreed to give WBC early sight of draft plan; suggested at same time as plan sent to LA.

#### 5. Update Brown group

DC has received many documents from brown group and he is confident these cover the majority of work needed to fill in the "brown" sections in the draft plan. However they require a lot of editing and the policies need developing further to match the style and content of the green spaces policies.

AP advised B Smith, T. Nabbs and P. Phillips have done a lot of work but lacked direction so have not followed the “green” style.

AG would like to see further work on the policies in terms of development and evidence before putting them in the draft plan. He asked have we gone from vision objectives to the best policies we can derive? He is concerned that the drafting is now driving the plan in order to get a product rather than concentrating on the building of the sections. He said whilst today’s agenda was based on the brown group work he felt there was too much for one meeting and although 3 people have offered their apologies (GJ, BS, CM) he doesn’t want to put it back. There would be the need for more than 1 meeting for all the policies etc. He

DC felt it was a matter of getting the balance right – he didn’t want to force fit the draft but was more concerned about finding out what was missing and how things fitted together.

GJ felt the “draft” was part of the evolution of the plan and was not driving it but part of the process.

There was discussion as to which group should be the first to scrutinise the draft plan - SG or PMG – and that this should happen in a dedicated meeting. AG thought in the first instance it should be someone independent of those involved, probably in the same field as GM/CM. Aside from scrutinising GJ felt the SG should look at the draft plan in terms of - this is where we started, this is what we’ve got, what have we missed, is it the quality of work we wanted. DC felt the SG should have a meeting in early July specifically to discuss the draft plan. GJ asked DC if whilst working on the plan he could provide a list of photos/maps required as the latter will need to be drawn.

RM asked if it was still intended to get a professional writer to tidy up the document. DC informed that was still the intention for the narrative but not policies and this would be funded out of parish funds, although a volunteer would be ideal. There was a suggestion to ask on parish website. RC suggested Celia May, if interested.

## 6. PMG preparation

AG thinks the Brown group work to date is not sophisticated enough and style is relying on LPU. He would like to see the policies more permissive and RC added that is what inspectors are looking for.

PG asked if B.Staintons comments on brown work would be discussed at PMG meeting as she endorsed his email comment no1 specifically “reference to a LPU Policy means that whenever WBA makes a change, we are compelled by reference to follow”. DC and RC felt this was necessary as the plan was an ongoing/evolving and we have to follow to a certain extent and can’t diverge but GJ felt the FNDP was looking at the local environment so was not fully tied into WBC. GJ thought the planning structures within the parish need to discuss how they work with it.

AG would like to see more notice paid to the Locality framework for writing the document.

Meeting closed 10.48am

**Next meeting Tuesday 23rd June, 9.30am**

### **Actions**

1. DC ask Parish planning committee to look at Wick Hill boundary
2. GJ Look at tweaking boundary in village
3. AG discuss new settlements at PMG meeting
4. DC write to WBC re meeting and to suggest future meetings
5. DC provide WBC with draft plan at appropriate time
6. DC provide GJ with list of photos/maps required for plan
7. DC Advertise on parish website for professional writer for plan – preferably volunteer

Signed as a true record of the meeting: .....

Date:.....