**FNDP Steering Group** Minutes of meeting via video link 10-11-20, 9.15am

Present:

David Cornish (chair) Roland Cundy Allan Gibson Pauline Grainger

Andy Pearce Roger Marshallsay Graham Jukes

Invited attendees: Simon Weeks (SW), Chair Parish Council and Katy Dagnall (KD), Clerk to the Parish Council

Note: GJ had problems with his internet connection so was unable to hear/comment for most of the meeting.

Minutes

Minutes of meeting 27/10/20 accepted as a true record. 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. DC schedule meeting with Slavchev to include SW and RC. Agenda. CLOSED
  2. GJ liaise with Adrian Draffin re roadshow event in Crowthorne. GJ awaiting reply to email; unlikely for foreseeable future due to lockdown. CLOSED
  3. AG send out PMG documents on remaining Reg 14 actions to those members of SG not on PMG team. Actioned. CLOSED
  4. AP/RM look at budget for 20/21 for plan, to date and going forward for remainder of year. AP sent out copy of budget to date. CLOSED
  5. RM investigate cost of mailing out Draft Lite to RG40. Agenda. CLOSED
  6. AG ask Comms team to consider and decide on distribution method for “draft lite”. Comms held meeting and will be reporting back in full to PMG later today. AG advised that the Comms team felt it should be a postal service and not rely on volunteers. CLOSED

AGENDA

* + 1. Discussion on format for responding to comments on FNDP
    2. Update on FNDP and FNDP Lite
    3. Mailing FNDP “Lite”
    4. AOB
       1. Responses to FNDP

DC summarised where the FNDP team had got to for the benefit of SW and KD:-

The team are about to start the Reg 14 communications and Consultation and the main FNDP will be on the group’s website and the “Lite”, a short summary version, will be distributed to all residents of the parish around the beginning of December.

The question for DC is how do we respond to comments from interested parties who do not make their comments using the designated channels. He was thinking in particular of the landowners whose land is being designated as a green open space who might go straight to the councillors known to them.

SW summed up the channels comments could be fed through:

* The borough, WBC
* Councillors who are known to be connected with Finchampstead
* Parish Council
* Finchampstead Future team

He felt there should be one single point of contact and logically this should be KD as clerk.

AP suggested that an email was sent to all Parish and Borough councillors asking them to forward any comments they might receive to KD.

This was agreed and DC/SW/KD were asked to prepare a standard response with forwarding information to a single member of the FNDP team.

KD thought this was right and the response would refer the originator of any comment to an “official” channel.

DC also posed the question how do we respond to a challenge from a significantly interested party.

AG thought the nature of the challenge would be significant but we don’t want different t routes for challenges, comments and/or feedback.

AG questioned if a challenge to the plan was legitimate at this stage and SW advised it was not but was probably inevitable. He also felt there might not be a torrent of objections but there might equally be comments from non-landowners supporting the plan on the open green spaces.

AG was asked to ask LA if objectors could send a legal letter and what the response should be.

SW advised that James McCabe (WBC) should be able to advise on the evaluation of comments.

AG outlined the process for evaluation of feedback and stressed it needed to be in writing to enable Lyn Barrow to keep a record and manage it. He thought there was no reason why people couldn’t use an agent to represent their views.

There was further discussion around landowners and the discussions held to date with Nicola Greenwood, Gina Newman and Allan Bishop in particular about alternative use of land – there is currently no reference to alternative uses in the plan.

Comments made were:

Plan more valid if we do make this reference

Plan can be as broad or narrow as we wish

The inclusion would provide a balance

The plan is for influencing development and not what happens on land not for development

We should not be preventing alternative land use

DC questioned if we should allow more time to discuss with landowners but overall this was not felt to be a route to follow and SW felt if anything we should be explain to landowners what we are doing in the plan rather than asking them for input to the plan.

RM wondered if a definition of “open green space” would help as this would add clarity

AG summed up that there are many things not covered in the plan and basically “whatever is not forbidden is allowed” so it was agreed by all to stay with what we’ve got.

SW was keen to point out that KD in her response to comments should make it clear that the FNDP is not a Parish project but run by an independent group despite it ultimately, once adopted, being owned by the Parish

S Weeks and K Dagnall were thanked for their input and left the meeting.

1. FNDP’s update

DC has been working with SR on the FNDP Final and it went back to her yesterday evening for a few minor changes/additions. It is virtually ready to be sent to LA and WBC and he wondered how we respond to comments from WBC in particular, referring to changes they recommended which have not been included.

SR started the “Lite” document from scratch with no structure to work to and DC felt there is still a lot of work to be done on this document. The editorial team will now look at it.

AP liked the structure and content but felt the policy numbering did not flow. AG had already picked up on this and suggested no numbering in Lite document.

PG commented that the “Lite” should be what it says and stay free from technical jargon.

AG will review the FNDP Final V2 and forward to LA and WBC for comment.

AG thought there would be some time slippage as FNDP “Lite” needs to be almost finished to enable questions for Survey Monkey

1. “Lite” Mailing

RM updated the group on the mailing situation:

Snag - Royal Mail does not cover the whole area because people can opt out of receiving bulk mail and Royal Mail could not supply percentage of people who do not receive; Cost for delivery of 5000 £335

Approximate cost of private delivery of 5000, £450. This is for a single item to whole parish; not constrained by post code and as far as RM is aware not dependent on environment; it was based on a price per house.

AG reported the Comms team is not happy to rely on volunteers for delivery although he (AG) felt if necessary there would be some volunteers who would agree to deliver if required.

There was some discussion about the benefits of each as no one system is perfect and it was agreed to use a private delivery company but with caution as do not want them to end up in a skip or similar.

1. AOB

DC announced that Suzi Rackley had just emailed him to say she had to step down from team. She is inundated with work because of Brexit and has to look after her mother so she no longer has the time to work on the FNDP documents.

DC said Suzi has done an outstanding job and he will pass on the thanks of all the team for the work she has done to date. She will be asked to remain a member of the team of volunteers so we can keep her updated on progress. AG was asked to organise a bouquet of flowers and PG said she would send him Suzi’s address.

DC concluded that the FNDP final version is almost finished and he feels it will be a relatively straightforward task for the editorial team to finish this document but the FNDP Lite requires a lot more work.

Meeting closed 10.05 am **Next meeting Tuesday 24th November, 9.30am**

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

Date:……………………………….

**Actions**

1. PG provide AG with SR address
2. AG send bouquet to Suzi Rackley
3. DC/SW/KD prepare a standard response for comments on the “FNDP final”, which arrive through un-designated channels.
4. AG seek advice from LA regarding any legal challenge to the FNDP
5. Editorial team rework FNDP Lite where required
6. AG advise PMG that SG happy to agree to the use of a private delivery company for FNDP Lite