

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

MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING

The minutes of the meeting held on 18th May 2021 were approved. A hard copy will be filed and an electronic version sent to the parish clerk for inclusion on the FNDP webpage.

1. SG agreed to include a housing allocation in plan. Agenda item. CLOSED
2. Ask RC to lead group revisiting housing call for sites and the work done by brown group. RC has agreed to lead the team and is arranging a preliminary meeting with S Weeks and A Pearce to review the original sites agreed between Parish Council and WBC and subsequently agreed by brown group who determined the sites based on HELAA principles. CLOSED
3. Ask PMG and comms team to review DC letter and pass back to DC for final editing. AG has reviewed and amended the letter where appropriate and it has been shown to WBC prior to distribution this week to all residents held on email lists by the team and the parish clerk. CLOSED

AGENDA

DC reported on his and AG's discussion with James McCabe and the WBC team as summarised in his email of (appendix i)

Main points to note:

- FNDP team can nominate preferred sites and rationale should be written up in a topic paper
- For sites adjacent to development limits the limits could be changed. There would need to be a discussion as to who would change the limits
- If necessary the team could speak to a developer for a particular site
- FNDP can draw from existing proposals
- WBC will assist with detailed mapping of sites
- Once FNDP proposed sites are agreed these will form part of WBC LPU

DC suggested once we have agreed the sited we wish to put forward it is forwarded to WBC and signed off at the highest level ahead of the focused consultation with residents, (ie Reg 14 part 2). He felt the way forward was to concentrate on two areas

1. RC and his team press ahead with looking at sites; GM, CM, B Smith and TN should be involved
2. Rest of the team focus on finishing the amendments to existing plan

DISCUSSION**Housing allocation**

AG pointed out that it is vital that all meetings about proposed sites are minuted as these form part of our submission and it is critical that it is transparent as to how decisions over the preferred sites are reached.

AP is not sure the early meetings of the brown group when they looked at the original WBC "call for sites" were minuted and RC confirmed he has received papers from the brown team and there are no minutes. However AG stated there is an A3 sheet which lists all the sites, whether or not they meet the criteria and the reasons why, which he felt was adequate. A further sheet using this as an example with notes on

- Assessment
- Adherence to policy
- Rank as preferred and why

would be suitable.

Comments made were as follows:

- DC & GJ would be prepared to help with Topic paper. Need to look at other NDP's which have included housing allocation. Suggested – Woodcote, Stratfield Mortimer, Liss
- AG re-iterated the topic paper needs to be fully transparent and rigorously defend the choice of preferred sites. He questioned how quickly we could get to the point that a document could go to residents setting out the changes we've made and pointing them to the redrafted plan and topic paper.
- The need to have a further consult was questioned as WBC did not consult prior to putting SDL's in the LPU but AG informed our process required, as advised by Liz Alexander, a further "focused consultation".
- HELAA work is technical but our policies will influence final decision.
- In respect of Johnson Drive which fulfils HELAA criteria and inspector deemed the site was not sustainable.
- Sites will require detailed mapping and allocated number of dwellings
- Any communication to residents needed to be in the style already set out. Suggestions were a further "lite" style document which incorporated a reflection on the good we have achieved, policies which are unaltered and the addition of the housing site allocation.
- Discussion surrounded the value of asking residents for comments as it was generally felt the addition of a housing allocation will cause a negative "we don't want more houses" reaction, but we have to put the allocation in, so will effectively be ignoring feedback. AG advised it was part of the process and residents ultimately have the final say at the referendum. DC felt there could be a few comments which gave us another viewpoint or food for thought and AG stated it would be important what we asked in the consult and how. We will have limited options to present as it has to happen for WBC to pass the plan and move forward to the next stage.
- In respect of speaking to developers there was varied opinion. Generally it was felt if it was necessary it had to be done very carefully so we didn't seem to be supporting a particular developer. It was thought the plan was a document against which to test a planning application as opposed to approving an application so discussion with developers was not required or wise. However if it came to speaking to a developer it would be solely for the purpose of getting an idea of the number of houses on a particular location as JM (WBC) advised against specifying numbers on specific sites. And developers should only be contacted, for the sole purpose of finalising what goes into the plan, after all final decisions are made on the preferred sites. Design should be covered by the plan itself.
- With regards to the indicative housing number it was generally felt we should be aiming at the lower end of the figures given to us by WBC although not that low as to result in yet a further consultation because we got it wrong! It is important to get sites and numbers signed off officially by chief exec at WBC before going ahead with focused consultation. DC thought it would be useful to have a final briefing with Borough planning councillors before getting it signed off.
-

Reg 14 and Amendments

GJ has passed his work on the Reg 14 feedback to DC who will now incorporate these last comments into the draft FNDP by the end of the week. Any actual amendments will not be included at the present time (hopefully by the end of June) but there will be reference to the areas which are to be amended. As requested by WBC he also has to assign comments to individuals by name.

DC felt there will not be a need to rewrite policies but some areas need more evidencing (photos of green wedges/gaps) and there needs to be some re-phrasing and tightening of definitions.

Meeting closed 10.35am

Date of next meeting: 15th June 9.30am

Signed as a true record of the meeting:

Date:.....

Actions

1. DC produce amended draft FNDP by end of week incorporating all feedback and send to all members of SG
2. DC send amended draft to JA for him to finalise
3. DC produce amended draft FNDP by end June incorporating agreed amendments
4. RC to produce required housing allocation for plan by end of July at latest
5. AG consider format of a document for a parish wide mail drop
6. Prepare revised draft FNDP and topic paper following completion of work on sites for a focused second Reg 14 consultation, possibly by August/September