

Present: David Cornish (chair)      Graham Jukes  
          Andy Pearce                    Roger Marshallsay  
          Allan Gibson                   Pauline Grainger

### AGENDA

Course of action for group following the Indicative Housing number from WBC.

### APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Roland Cundy

### MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING

PG circulated, ahead of the meeting, minutes from SG meetings of 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 26<sup>th</sup> March, 14<sup>th</sup> April for approval together with a summary of actions from these meetings.

The minutes were approved and it was agreed all actions had been completed so these were closed.

### DISCUSSION

DC referred to his email of 11/05/21 (appendix i) which was sent to the SG and PMG and a conversation AG had with JM (WBC) following JM's email. It was made clear by JM that if we don't change the Draft Plan it will not get through and we have to identify sites and numbers.

DC reported the decision made at the meeting of 14<sup>th</sup> April to the Parish Council who understood the situation. They requested sight of the amended plan with housing numbers and any specified sites ahead of re-submitting to WBC.

AG stated his conversation with JM was helpful, objective and fair in his opinion. JM had given FNDP a pro rata figure for a housing number which did not take into account historic factors, emerging sites, actions which may or may not increase housing stock but he thought the actual figure would be nearer the lower end of the scale. The housing needs of Finchampstead were not taken into account it was a Borough need based on a national requirement from the government.

Although 3500 dwellings was a figure mentioned for WBC's share of the abandoned Grazeley development it was agreed this figure should be substantiated ahead of any communication with residents.

The meeting was in agreement that we should not offer up more than the lower end of the scale and test the water with a lower figure but that we should go forward positively. It was felt there will be increasing pressure over the years for dwellings but we can't speculate on numbers and need to move on with what we know now. RC had asked AG in his absence to inform the meeting that he felt we should take note of the information from WBC and put sites in the plan. It was agreed that we had to look at where and how many houses ensuring that we protect our key objectives. Further, the sites should be considered against our objectives and policies making any call impartial and independent.

DC was thanked for his draft of a letter to the residents of the Parish and there were a few comments. The decision was to pass to the PMG and comms team with DC having a final look at any letter before it was circulated. The letter needs to serve the community but at the same time not alienate the authority.

AG suggested the next step was to quickly identify sites, keep the number low and be firm about where development is placed. There was talk about one large site or several smaller developments but no decision was reached.

DC felt the next steps forward were:

- amend NDP
- tweak policies

- gather more evidence on green gaps
- rewrite parts where necessary
- redefine some of the “definitions”

GJ felt it was not our role to identify actual sites but more to identify, through policies and our position on gaps, wedges and spaces, areas for development as it is highly likely WBC will widen the development limits. DC advised other plans did specify sites.

DC felt a lot of work had already been done in the area of site by the brown group but it has not been reviewed by the steering or project management groups as it was previously not required. AP confirmed this was done based on documents from WBC but was unsure about the process and considered it necessary to start again. DC thought there would be value in the work already done and it could be retested against our policies but it would need someone to lead on this. AG reminded the group that there had already been a meeting with members of the Parish Planning committee and LA and others to look at the process adopted and that there were minutes of that meeting.

The discussion moved on as to who would drive this forward as GM and CM, the experienced members of the team in this field, both had other commitments and whilst they could be turned to for advice it was felt they did not have time to lead. The suggestion was to ask RC, with advice from the “experts” when and where required. DC said his focus would be on re-drafting the plan.

Meeting closed 10.30am

Date of next meeting: 1<sup>st</sup> June 9.30am

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

Date:.....

### **Actions**

1. SG agreed to include a housing allocation in plan
2. Ask RC to lead group revisiting housing call for sites and the work done by brown group
3. Ask PMG and comms team to review DC letter and pass back to DC for final editing