

Present: David Cornish (chair)
Andrew Pearce

Graham Jukes
Roger Marshallsay

Allan Gibson
Pauline Grainger

APOLOGIES

Roland Cundy

MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING

DC welcomed everyone back to the meeting in person at the FBC - a significant moment, as the last "in person" meeting was 3 March 2020.

The minutes of the meeting held on 10th August 2021 were approved. A hard copy will be filed and an electronic version sent to the parish clerk for inclusion on the FNDP webpage. The actions 1-5 led to the agenda for the meeting and as a result are all closed.

ACTIONS

- 1 DC prepare application for remaining Locality Grant and additional Allocated Housing grant
- 2 DC speak to SW for latest information on LPU
- 3 DC relay decision on allocated sites to Borough Councillors
- 4 AG relay decision on allocated sites to JM (WBC)
- 5 DC finalise Housing Topic paper and amended Draft FNDP
- 6 AP Book FBC library with KD for next meeting, 31st August. Actioned, closed.

AGENDA

1. DC has spoken with RM and received all the information he needs to take this forward. He will prepare application shortly and RM will provide any help with information/process if DC requires.

2. DC spoke to SW about the status of the LPU and there was not much help he could give. DC expressed his disappointment at the recent reluctance of the planning team to engage further with the FNDP team and as a result a further phone call has been arranged for DC/AG with JM this afternoon.

3 & 4. AG sent the copy of the Consultant Report to JM and the team at WBC and they responded with a two page email which was quite negative. They refuted some of the phraseology which has been used (and accepted) to date and queried some of the evidence and whether or not some of the policies met their criteria. There was comment that our arguments were not strong enough and there was concern for future planning. There was a definite change in tone since previous meetings/communications. GJ's concern was that WBC felt our arguments and evidence would be too weak on which to base an appeal. DC commented that "winning an appeal" was not an exact science as different criteria affect different appeals.

AG challenged JM regarding the latest communication which appeared to indicate there would be no further dialogue between the FNDP and WBC and whilst he didn't feel he got very far JM did agree to the phone call today.

SW suggested we should not be overly concerned at the change in tone as wheels were in motion at WBC to get the LPU ready for consultation and this was their main focus at the present time.

DC advised that WBC were focusing on 4 SDL's:

- An area surrounding Charvil – but this is green belt
- Additional houses on an area near Gray's farm in place of a SANG
- Housing at Hall Farm area – but this is a flood plain
- Barkham Square, although this appeared to be off the radar at the moment
- JM advised that whilst they were keeping an eye on Ravenswood it was not currently featuring in their plans

The feeling of the meeting was that if WBC were not going to support our amended FNDP we should not be offering to help them further. Also we should not be handing them any more information about our suggested sites which we would support for potential development. It was thought without the support of WBC the FNDP would be difficult to bring to the community and ultimately the examiner.

AP suggested it was now time to go above the head of JM and speak to more senior members of the planning team. It should be made clear to them that in not supporting the FNDP (to which changes have been made to accommodate their comments) they are not supporting the will of the residents of the Parish.

However in order to achieve what we are now setting out in the Housing Topic Paper we required WBC to tweak the boundary surrounding 31-33 Barkham Ride and to designate the area on the Reading Road as a “development area” rather than “countryside”. DC felt this could be achieved by setting the boundary around the existing dwellings, their curtilages and the four plots we are supporting as having development potential. DC commented SW is nervous about this change. AP wondered also if this might carry its own risk regarding other sites. AG pointed out we needed these actions to happen in order for us to move forward with the plan; without these agreed changes the Housing Topic paper cannot go out to consultation.

AG summarised the changes the team have made to the FNDP by reading out a section from his Consultation Statement:

Principal Changes to the Draft FNDP pursuant to the Reg 14 Consultation

A fuller description of the changes made to the Regulation 14 draft of the FNDP is set out in ‘*Finchamstead Neighbourhood Development Plan: Report on Public Consultation carried out January-February 2021*’ ([add link](#)). The more substantive changes are detailed below.

- Nomination of 8 sites as ‘acceptable for development’ within the plan to deliver in the region of 175 additional units of housing
- Change of designation of area at SW end of Reading Road from ‘area of habitation’ to ‘development site’ to facilitate additional housing
- Policy ADH3 Green Space and Landscaping adapted for major applications for development to include a survey of local rights of way
- Policy GS1 Key Gaps Between Settlements: Number of Key Gaps reduced from 5 to 4; purpose of Key Gaps amended to remove any ambiguity as to purpose; clear explanation provided as to hierarchy of planning priorities
- Policy IRS1 Protection and Enhancement of Local Green Spaces: Number reduced from 20 to 14

DC thanked AG for a very thorough summary and all agreed moving forward with the plan was dependant on the result of this afternoon’s discussion on the phone (DC/AG/JM). An assurance from JM that WBC would not oppose our plan was effectively required and it was generally accepted that the FNDP had given enough ground to WBC.

5. DC advised the first draft of the Housing Topic paper had received good feedback from those who have had sight of it (predominantly the members of the SG and PMG) and he would soon have the revised version ready to go.

AOB

AG advised that JA was getting frustrated that the Consultation Report was not yet on the website. JA was not happy that JM (WBC) was having too much opportunity to comment on the report and as this was an FNDP document he felt it should already be on the website. Whilst the meeting agreed with the sentiment AG is concerned that putting it on the website ahead of an assurance from WBC opens it up to everyone ahead of an assurance from WBC that they will support it.

DC advised it was crucial for everyone to get their plans approved asap as housing supply was diminishing and that is the best method for fighting speculative development. He also pointed out that larger houses are not shifting and developers are applying to change development in some cases to 1-2 bedroomed units.

Meeting closed 10.20am

Date of next meeting: 14th September 9.30am, **FBC library**

Signed as a true record of the meeting:

Date:.....

Actions

DC/AG report feedback on phone call with JM (WBC) to PMG meeting of 31-8-21