

**FNDP Steering Group**  
9.30am

Minutes of meeting via video link

08-12-20,

Present:

David Cornish (chair)  
Grainger

Roland Cundy

Allan Gibson

Pauline

Andy Pearce

Roger Marshallsay

Graham Jukes

### Minutes

Minutes of meeting 24/11/20 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. DC/SW/KD prepare a standard response for comments on the "FNDP final", which arrive through un-designated channels. Outstanding
2. DC ask Sylvia McDonald to review plan. AP and RC would also help with the "proof" reading. Outstanding
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. Outstanding
4. AG advise PMG Reg 14 pushed back to January. Actioned and CLOSED

### Drafting Amendments

There were three main areas of work to be revisited, re-evidencing policies for

- Core gaps. DC had taken this on board and it is quite challenging. He felt not all gaps will survive the rigorous analysis
- Green spaces. GJ and BS had taken this on and were close to completion. GJ informed that BS had done extensive analysis of the documentation and their challenge lay in the mapping
- Brown group. DC has received extensive comments from GM and CM but he has not yet had the opportunity to look at the work.

Another area which needed work was the common definitions which needed amending for consistency. This work is complete and has been agreed by WBC

DC believed the final area which was surrounding the editorial needed resolving and this would require debate. There was discussion about how to tackle this and the main points which came out of the discussion were:

DC was concerned at pushing our point of view excessively with WBC and felt if there was not a major disagreement we should accept their comments and just focus on areas of substance.

GJ disputed this and felt in areas where we felt passionately we should push our view at this stage and only withdraw at a later date if necessary. RC agreed with this view and DC accepted that if there were good grounds to argue a case then it should be done.

AG felt we should recognise that WBC has the final say and we need to pick issues carefully that we wished to take to the wire.

RM asked if there were areas we were diametrically opposed to WBC and DC replied not in essence. Two “red” cards were shown – inclusion of traffic (as it was not in our remit within an NDP) and a word in relation to gypsy and traveller sites and he was happy to amend this. DC said the rest of the WBC comments he took as “advisory” to ensure a safe passage through external inspection so it was important for the team to decide which of the comments should be acknowledged and acted upon.

Discussion followed on the core gaps as DC felt some were looking very tenuous and he was struggling to find evidence to support.

RM has looked at Appeal rulings on sites within the parish and is unable to find much of value. He thought the Warren lane appeal might be useful and would send link to DC.

AP found a useful link on “green wedges” which he would forward to DC as again the area around the doctors surgery needed more “evidence”. The brown team used the phrase “green wedge” for this area as it has a similar effect as green space but is a better definition for this space. DC advised that WBC were supportive of this “green wedge”.

GJ informed that the “Landscape Assessment” form supports green gaps but the problem is delineating the space when it runs across private properties.

DC mentioned that other NDP’s , where a green gap was not possible, had insisted on specific verge widths to make the area seem more rural.

AG was concerned about the effect these amendments would have on the timing of the plan. In respect of the Plan DC still hoped to finish the amendments this side of Christmas and work on the NDP Lite should be minimal in terms of text and the re-formatting to use the additional 4 pages and include photos should not be difficult. He would be sending revisions back to WBC piecemeal to try and speed up the process and nail down as much as possible at this point rather than later in the process. DC felt he would be able to give a better assessment of timing next week. AG stated that the Reg 14 consult is under our control and feels we should be saying to WBC, as soon as we’re ready, that we’ve noted their comments and now we are good to go. He suggested one further full draft to WBC asking if there is anything that raises a “red card”.

DC advised mapping documents had not yet gone to WBC to produce overlays and GJ said this was required for appendix to Plan as opposed to inclusion in Lite document. GJ said we needed to be precise in what we require from WBC and DC/GJ agreed to meet and discuss requirement.

GJ felt we should press ahead when we feel the document is ready and not worry about WBC’s further reaction as he feels there are no more than a couple of issues which could be seen as contentious.

AG mentioned that similarly changes to the Survey Monkey survey would also be minimal as this was in line with the lite document.

AG advised if this was achieved the Lite could go to the printer after the PMG meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> December .

Other points AG raised:

- List of mandatory consultees from WBC was 105 contacts and he felt most would show no interest.
- Notice boards were on hold at the moment.
- Lite cannot be circulated until Plan is ready for website

RM had looked into printing and delivery times. Printing would take about a week but they might need additional days to put in envelopes so he felt we should allow 10 days for this process. Leaflets Direct wanted one week to make the full delivery so for distribution in January ideally printing need to be organised as near Christmas as possible.

It was agreed the aim would be to get the Lite version to printers on 22<sup>nd</sup> December with delivery 1<sup>st</sup> week of January.

The next meeting of the SG would be brought forward a week but the PMG meeting remain on 22<sup>nd</sup> December.

Meeting closed 10.23 am  
**9.30am**

**Next meeting, Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> December,**

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 AP, RC and 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, possibly between Christmas and new Year
4. RM send relevant information from Warren lane appeal to DC
5. AP forward link on “green wedge”
6. DC/GJ agreed to meet and discuss mapping requirement
7. DC forward “evidence document”, reviewed by WBC, to PG for attaching as appendix to last PMG minutes
8. DC speak to SR once plan is fully amended to see if she would have time between Christmas and New Year to professionally format document.