

## Present:

David Cornish (chair)  
Andy PearceRoland Cundy  
Roger MarshallsayAllan Gibson  
Graham Jukes

Pauline Grainger

Minutes

Minutes of meeting 10/11/20 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. PG provide AG with SR address. Actioned, CLOSED
2. AG send bouquet to Suzi Rackley. Actioned, CLOSED
3. DC/SW/KD prepare a standard response for comments on the "FNDP final", which arrive through un-designated channels. Put back to later date. OUT-STANDING
4. AG seek advice from LA regarding any legal challenge to the FNDP. Agenda, CLOSED
5. Editorial team rework FNDP Lite where required. Agenda, CLOSED
6. AG advise PMG that SG happy to agree to the use of a private delivery company for FNDP Lite. Actioned, CLOSED

Responses to FNDP from WBC and Liz Alexander

DC advised the meeting he and AG had with WBC and LA was constructive and informative. LA did not have too many comments other than there was some repetition but generally it was OK. However WBC gave a lot of feedback which he felt could come under four categories:

1. Consistency of terminology
2. Some "words" were badly chosen and needed replacing
3. Emotional use of words, but this was subjective
4. More evidence was required for policies; mainly the "gap policies"

In respect of category 4, DC thought this was good advice as they knew from experience with other NDP's what it needed to look like/contain to pass external inspection. He believes we have the evidence (as WBC said it did not necessarily require talking with more people) in the form of comments in appeal reports, comments from various parish group meetings eg Rights of way committees etc but it will need work to find it.

AG provided notes from the meeting which he went through with the group. These can be found in appendix i attached and should be read in conjunction with the minutes. Comments on these notes are as follows:

3.WBC advised they were willing to help with this and it was felt we should provide the maps for them to work on asap

7. DC said that the design section had been a last minute addition without reference to others but reflecting on Parish planning guidelines. Initially it was felt "design" was largely irrelevant as there were no large scale development plans for Finchampstead but WBC pointed out our FNDP can still influence parts of the Finchwood Park development that have still not had planning approved.

16. AP asked if this was because of Covid or the White Paper? DC felt it was a result of the White Paper and withdrawal of some of the funding for the Grazeley infrastructure. The impact of this on the development of the garden village is unknown.

RM advised that there is a strong feeling from local MP's that the algorithm will not be used for housing numbers particularly in areas like ours.

GJ asked

- how are we going to translate feedback into the document

- how do we identify what is needed in terms of mapping
- it will be a challenge to get the full list of iconic, now referred to as “outstanding” views, we want as he noted Barkham and Arborfield had to reduce theirs by about half

DC’s response was that we had to deal with the full list of amendments in small chunks and call on people outside the current team to look at small specific areas. In respect of maps he felt the team had to produce maps for the gaps along the lines of those already produced for the green spaces and then WBC will make them more precise in order to facilitate the overlays and produce the map they’re looking for. The iconic views will be an arc as opposed to a boundary and these are almost there.

DC felt moving forward it would be important to have the right people looking in the right place for the right information and asked:

- AP, and he will ask Sylvia McDonald as well, to look at the phraseology and fine detail of the text for errors/comments
- RM if he could see what evidence he could pick up from appeals and inspectors reports which will add to areas of plan in need of evidence

There was further discussion about the definition of iconic (now to be called “outstanding” views) as we have to accept our list could be halved by inspector if we cannot justify its presence on the list.

- AG shouldn’t be too prescriptive
- RM if we are seen to include too many this in itself could be seen as obstructing development
- DC what is acceptable within a view – eg poly-tunnel as opposed to a tower block

GJ said we should revisit list looking at views from the strategically placed benches the Parish Council have provided. This in itself supports residents’ enjoyment of these views. We should take photos from these points as opposed to the drone photos. AP pointed out a drone photo shows much more than a photo from ground level as views are often obscured by hedges etc.

Whilst looking at views AP suggested care with over use of “War Memorial” as it is unlikely to still be there during the duration of the plan.

Discussion then focused on what could be used as evidence in support of policies:

- DC suggests use a citation from report if using a comment by an inspectors in appeal hearing –
- AG need basis behind decision in these reports, not the decision itself
- GJ inspectors are only looking at one particular site so evidence must only been used for specific site and not all

RM questioned if we have yet identified the policies which are lacking? DC advised it was mostly green policies lacking evidence and brown policies relying too heavily on WBC policies

AG /DC would like to aim for completion by Christmas. AG thought the burden fell on the editorial group to discuss with others, spelling out the specific tasks and required process. As a starting point discussion needed with:

green group

brown group

Brian Smith – retail

Rat runs

DC felt it was important the feedback is seen as helpful in order to make the FNDP more robust and ensure it doesn’t fail on inspection

GJ asked if there was the opportunity to ask SR to tidy up the presentation of the document once all amendments and everything discussed had been achieved. He felt her skill set was better able to do this in a timely fashion than the editorial team.

It was agreed the Reg 14 consultation would be pushed back to January and AG would advise PMG.

FNDP ‘Lite’ update

DC said the "Lite" was virtually finished and AG said it is at the point that it can't be fundamentally changed. However DC suggested a further 4 pages be added (making the document 12 pages plus a cover) to enable space to spread the text and incorporate pictures to lighten feel of summary. RM thought there would not be a significant increase in cost. No more work will be done on the summary until the full plan is in place.

AOB

There was a concern that the roadshows would be forgotten by the time the Consultation documents are distributed but GJ hoped the "estate agent" style boards would rekindle awareness.

Meeting closed 10.38 am

**Next meeting, Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> December, 9.30am**

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

Date:.....

Actions

1. DC/SW/KD prepare a standard response for comments on the "FNDP final", which arrive through un-designated channels.
2. DC ask Sylvia McDonald to review plan
3. When FNDP is final in terms of amendments, consistency of words/terminology and pictures DC/AG to contact SR and see if she would be prepared to tidy it up in presentation only. No expectation for her to incorporate any additional comments etc.
4. AG advise PMG Reg 14 pushed back to January