

Present: David Cornish (chair)
Andrew Pearce

Graham Jukes
Roger Marshallsay

Roland Cundy
Pauline Grainger

AGENDA

To discuss:

- Consultation Feedback
- Ian Bellinger (WBC) email to D Cornish

Apologies: A Gibson

Minutes and Matters Arising

The minutes of meetings held on 5th October 2021 and 11th November 2021 were approved as a true record of the meetings. Electronic copies will be passed to the Parish Clerk for uploading to website and hard copies retained for DC to sign.

All actions, apart from a housekeeping action from 5th October, have been completed and are closed.

Consultation feedback

RM advised there had been 3 meetings of the group discussing and analysing the feedback from the 2nd focused consultation. All feedback had been divided into one of three categories

1. No comment
2. Noted
3. Response required

JA is to provide a list of all the comments in category 3 and they will be assigned to an individual for a response. DC offered to reply to the professional responses as he felt these didn't differ significantly to their responses from the 1st consultation.

RM felt the professionals/developers were positioning themselves to ask inspection to reject the plan on the basis there was no clarity on why some sites were supported by FNDP and others not. He wondered if we needed to supply a site by site analysis.

There were varying views on this:

- do we need to respond, it's a consultation so we can accept or ignore
- it's the decision of the FNDP team to change or not to change following consideration of feedback
- we should reply as it's an opportunity to rebuff and hone arguments
- we should be prepared for the professionals and can use the words from the LPU as we have aligned with them on the proposed sites

RM advised the "feedback" team has identified areas of the plan to be amended taking into account feedback but most are typos or minor adjustments.

Three sites have attracted the most feedback and discussion followed how to respond to these.

1. The site in the Village (2 units)
2. The site off Heath Ride (2 units)
3. Greenacres

1 and 2. DC/AG and the "feedback" team felt we should engage with the small groups opposing these sites. It was felt this was an opportunity to point out the bigger picture behind the decision to include the sites in 1 and 2.

3. It was thought most of the objections would be neutralised if the proposal was to only build on the brownfield part of the site and keep the green filed area as a SANG. AP asked if a SANG depended on number of units being developed but RM pointed out that the size of a SANG is defined by the required length of continuous walking path.

After discussion it was agreed by all that we couldn't commit to something beyond our control but we should put a policy or statement in the plan addressing this point. We should also get the Parish Council to commit to this policy/statement for when they consider the planning application when submitted. DC will consider how to word such a statement.

DC advised that the "green spaces" work by GJ/BS on appealing against the reduced number of spaces was a separate issue as it was not part of the focused Reg 14 consultation. GJ advised that they were not appealing against two locations – Sand Martins and the Allotments but had good grounds for appealing on four – St James Church area, Gorse Ride Woods play area, Moor green Lakes, Finchampstead Ridges and Simons Wood which they were proposing were split into two separate entities. The crux of the appeal is that there is no consistency in WBC LPU in determining which sites will be designated.

Ian Bellinger email

DC had shared the email ahead of the meeting and comments were invited on his drafted reply.

AG had already advised DC on a couple of issues he felt should be included in the response and DC was incorporating them and would resend the amended version in due course.

All agreed the drafted response was excellent and WBC should be called to account. RM suggested the deletion of "political" as it added nothing and could be mis-interpreted. He also suggested DC hold onto the reply until after the Parish Council meeting tomorrow as the email was on the Parish agenda.

RC pointed out that often members of councils know information that they are not allowed to share and that there have been rumours about Rook's Nest Farm and development for a long time. However this did not excuse the responses DC/AG got from WBC on several occasions. Further the size of the proposal was out of order as it was the largest non SDL in the WBC plan and Greenacre was the second largest.

AOB

DC said during a recent delivery he had spoken to some residents and there was unrest both in the split of new development vis a vis North/South Finchampstead and North/South M4 within WBC LPU

GJ asked if we had completed all the tasks in preparation for handing Reg 14 to WBC. DC advised he and AG were working on finalising the Condition (DC) and Consultation (AG) statements.

DC thought we need to give consideration early in the New Year about falling into step with LPU or going our own way. He is concerned if we run concurrently but independently there might be another Rook's Nest Farm lurking to trip us up.

AP stated that once all the papers had been submitted to WBC for Reg 14 it was in their hands and we were no longer in control.

Meeting closed 10.20am

Dates of next meetings:

21st November 4.00pm (with PMG)
DC to advise dates for New Year

Signed as a true record of the meeting:

Date:.....

Actions

- 1 DC, AG, PG meet for housekeeping exercise – amalgamate/centralise documents
- 2 DC prepare statement for FNDP regarding use of land at Greenacre – part build, part SANG