

Present:

David Cornish
Andy Pearce

Allan Gibson
Roger Marshallsay

Roland Cundy
Graham Jukes

Pauline Grainger

AGENDA

1. Actions/Matters arising
2. Where we are with the draft plan?
3. The issue of the 'Green Spaces' between the surgery and the war memorial. The wider Green Spaces document has been seen and discussed by all in this meeting (although not the PMG) and I don't think we need to go through it again at this point?
4. Prep for PMG Meeting.
5. Where are we with comms to the wider group?
6. Updating the Parish Council
7. Stakeholder engagement

Minutes

Minutes of meeting 09/06/20 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. Actions

1. DC ask Parish planning committee to look at Wick Hill boundary. Planning Committee meeting tomorrow. OPEN
2. GJ Look at tweaking boundary in village. Discussion in matters arising. CLOSED
3. AG discuss new settlements at PMG meeting. This has been covered by mapping produced by GJ. It includes the 3 defined settlements and the emerging settlement of Finchwood Park but not the areas around Tally Ho and St James Church. WBC defines these as countryside and the disadvantage to defining them as "settlements" is that it could permit additional development within it. AG concerned it would be open to a challenge therefore not advantageous. The SG agreed not to define them as settlements. CLOSED
4. DC write to WBC re meeting and to suggest future meetings. Awaiting a draft to send to WBC. OPEN
5. DC provide WBC with draft plan at appropriate time. Discussion in matters arising. CLOSED
6. DC provide GJ with list of photos/maps required for plan. Actioned and CLOSED
7. DC Advertise on parish website for professional writer for plan – preferably volunteer. A request on "Finchampstead Future" and "Finchampstead and Barkham" facebook groups has brought forward a volunteer who DC is contacting. DC also wrote to Celia May to see if she would be interested in editing final document. Awaiting reply. CLOSED

Matters Arising

Action 2:

There was a lengthy discussion as to how we deal with the settlement boundaries. Although narrative has suggested these are "local" GJ pointed out we are actually using the WBC LPU boundaries.

AP pointed out WBC recommended we stick to their boundaries but DC felt these were only a starting point.

AP felt we were changing boundaries to suit our current needs and that this could lead to challenges at a later date particularly in the area around the Village where the rationale behind a change was to accommodate the 4 affordable homes.

RM pointed out there was no need to change for the affordable homes as this will be covered by rural exception. Various other areas were considered and DC suggested at the PMG meeting later today a small group is set up to look at the boundaries :

Why and for what purpose do we want to change them

Do we agree with the WBC boundaries

What is the planning rationale behind variations to WBC boundaries

AG said that any change from WBC boundaries would need to be resolved with them and they would expect the planning rationale behind the requested change or failing that could ask the inspector for a decision. RC and GJ volunteered to be part of this group.

Action 5:

There was concern particularly from GJ that the Draft Plan was not yet ready for critical appraisal by WBC. Whilst he was in agreement for advice now from LA (our advisor) he thought we should have a clearer draft with more detail before forwarding to WBC.

AG felt we should see WBC as sympathetic supporters/advisors and as long as a covering letter set out clearly our know and identified weaknesses, areas of missing information, gaps etc he felt it would be beneficial.

RM, RC and AP all felt James McCabe at WBC was very helpful and supportive and as long as it was pointed out this was currently a confidential document and we were looking for support and would value comments they would support it going to WBC now.

GJ agreed to support the decision but would like the rest of the week to finish off what he's currently working on. DC agreed to send to LA asap and to WBC next Monday.

2. Draft Plan

DC raised the question of how we would set about reviewing the draft.

GJ felt the arguments to support the policies were not there yet and there is no fluidity to the document. He felt DF's matrix was the right framework but it needs a single person to check that the arguments lead to the policy.

AG felt the policies are looking good but need more evidence.

DC felt the policies still needed rewording to fit the narrative

RM was concerned that if members of the SG rewrite chunks of the document it is no longer "owned" by the volunteer group but by the Parish Council which was not the original aim which was for a "Resident's" plan as opposed to a "Council" plan.

AG commented that the substance was and is derived from the volunteers and their contributions and the residents survey, it is merely the presentation which is being refined.

GJ stressed the aim is to increase the arguments and evidence and not to rewrite or amend the original.

PG commented that as a lay person she found the draft lacked clarity and went round in circles with a lot of repetition.

AG felt this was a result of too many individuals contributing making the document clumsy.

AG also felt as a result of Covid-19 there is a real lack of evidence for policies, which were not offered for opinion from the residents in the survey, as the plan was to hold either a second survey or engage stakeholders to provide evidence for policies.

There was a short discussion on some sections which are missing detail or information:

Sustainability

Building standards

Park homes

G&T's

AP felt this discussion on the draft plan should be held by the PMG as opposed to the SG who were venturing into too much detail. It was for the PMT to decide what was in the plan. He advised he had spoken to a member of the Resident's Assoc of Robinson Crusoe Park and California Park. It was felt this should be recorded as engagement.

4. PMG preparation

Two areas in particular for the PMG to consider later today –

Draft

Issue of gaps, in particular the fields around the doctor's surgery. The unanimous decision is that we must try and protect these fields and it was important to understand the best way to do this. The brown group believe the two fields immediately behind the surgery are defensible but they don't feel the fields all the way to the War Memorial are, in terms of terminology. RM felt LA could give a steer on this.

5. Communications with wider group

It was felt it was important to update the wider group of volunteers and a written update and zoom meeting were considered. AG thought a written update was preferable as a zoom meeting would likely only be joined by some rather than all.

6. Updating Parish Council

PG suggested sending the Parish councillors the written update for volunteers.
GJ suggested taking sections of the draft to the relevant sub-committees and getting their approval as we go along and it was agreed that DC, GJ and RC all to take “bite size chunks” to committee meetings for precise and meaningful discussion with minuted decisions. RM thought as long as the councillors were kept updated and sub-committee’s gave approval for sections as we go along the council as a whole will approve the plan.
DC said we need to confirm a date for when the Council’s approval of the draft plan is required to enable moving forward to regulatory consultations.

7. Stakeholder engagement

DC is hoping to have a discussion with Ramblers today.
Scrutiny of the draft will bring out groups where there has not been any engagement which will need rectifying.
RC acknowledged there was still more work required with farmers.

Meeting closed 10.52am

Next meeting Tuesday 7th July, 9.30am

ACTIONS

1. DC advise result of discussion over Wick Hill boundary at Parish Planning meeting
2. DC seek future meetings with WBC
3. AG send draft plan to LA as soon as possible with suitable covering letter
4. DC/AG ask LA specifically about best way to protect fields around surgery
5. AG send draft plan to WBC (once GJ’s suggested comments have been covered) with suitable covering letter
6. DC Follow up “professional writer” contact and Celia May response
7. AG set up group at PMG meeting to look at desired settlement boundaries
8. AP report to Lyn Barrow re his engagement with Caravan Park Residents’ Associations.
9. AG consider update for wider volunteer group

Signed as a true record of the meeting:

Date:.....