

Unconfirmed minutes - to be approved at the next meeting of the Steering Group

**Findon Parish Council**

**Minutes of Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meeting held 13 May 2015  
at 7.30pm, The Gun PH**

**Present:** Cllrs Kirk (Chair), Goldsworthy & Mackerell

**In Attendance:** Richard Bell, Jacqui Greaney (Minutes Secretary), Karen Roberts (soon-to-be Cllr), Tarquin Taylor & Ed Wain.

Item No		<u>Action By</u>
15.20	<b><u>Apologies for Absence</u></b>	
	Apologies received from Maureen Chaffe (Consultant), Cllr Havenhand, Steve Flitton, Nick Gore & Ruth Taylor. PK welcomed Karen Roberts onto the committee.	
15.21	<b><u>Approval of the Minutes 11 March 2015</u></b>	
	The minutes were approved, with a slight amendment to 15.18 and a proposal to add Rural Lanes to tonight's Agenda.	
15.22	<b><u>Matters Arising</u></b>	
	None.	
15.23	<b><u>Updates</u></b>	

	<p><u>Liason with SDNPA/ADC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PK, PG and KR had met earlier that day with Amy Tyler Jones (our NP liaison) and Lucy Howard (Senior SDNP Representative) for a very informative meeting, including discussion of our NP Public Consultation, in particular the six outlined development sites. Amy and Lucy stressed that they want to work <i>with</i> us, and will take all our comments into consideration.</li> <li>• JH has done great work with the Consultation Feedback Analysis, showing a general outcome that development outside the parish boundary is deemed unacceptable. PK reported to the SDNP meeting that no sites had met approval with villagers. After discussion, SDNP agreed that its initial requirement for 50 houses (about which we had not been directly advised) should be reduced to 30, or even 20, which could include small development (&lt;5 houses) on sites within the settlement boundary (currently classified as ‘windfall’) if such sites could be identified. These will be in addition to the SDNPA SHLAA sites already identified within the village. SDNP confirmed that our NP is indeed classified as ‘emerging’ and that, in accordance with their procedures, they will therefore not be undertaking a review of our current settlement boundary.</li> <li>• It was pointed out that the NP Examiner will require robust evidence to prove that every effort had been made to make provision for new housing, and that all potential sites had been investigated (in addition to the Housing Group’s research outside the village boundary). It was therefore agreed to immediately issue a parish-wide ‘Call for Sites’, as suggested by SDNP, <i>inside</i> the village boundary irrespective of potential development size. Feedback indicates any expansion <i>outside</i> the boundary is deemed unacceptable by a majority of the parish. The assessment of forthcoming sites will use the same criteria as used by the Housing Group for sites on the fringe.</li> <li>• It was agreed to request the same mailing company to deliver this letter to ALL residents, just with actual postage costs being reimbursable in view of their earlier error. KR was concerned about confidentiality (neighbours getting worried), but it was agreed that the process must be transparent meaning that potential development would be exposed. The Call for Sites process must satisfy the Examiner so, in addition to the residents’ individual letters, notices in Findon News and on the PC website would be issued.</li> <li>• The next SDNP Planning Committee Meeting is on 11 June. The aim is to have Call for Sites feedback before then. Whatever the outcome, the Neighbourhood Plan will represent the community’s wishes.</li> <li>• There was discussion about the Wyevale site and the current SDNP view that it is viable for housing, despite it being partly greenfield (although the garden centre itself is brownfield). TT suggested the NP includes that provision for alternative employment be a requirement in the event that the garden centre closes.</li> </ul>	<p>KR, PK, PG</p>
<p>15.24</p>	<p><u>For Discussion/Action</u></p>	

	<p><u>Consultation Event</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Progress on Analysis of Comments/Feedback</u> JH was thanked for his sterling work on the very complex job of compiling feedback from the Public Consultation forms. TT and EW also reviewed this analysis. RB and SF have also done summaries of their own Topic Group comments. PK proposes that each TG leader (with the exception of Housing) prepares a list arising from the feedback which merits amending the existing NP policies. Then give to PK for circulation a week before the next meeting. We still need the Reg 14 six-week consultation period, and to finalise the Housing Policy after the Call for Sites. The Public Consultation conclusion was accepted by the Steering Group: “The majority of comments arising from the Consultation give legitimate reasons for rejecting all development sites outside the boundary.”</li> <li><u>Mail shot problems</u> The mailing company has apologised for missing 265 addresses from the file in error. The new Call for Sites letter to use a specific NP envelope to distinguish it from junk mail.</li> </ul> <p><u>Historic Rural Roads</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was proposed to emphasise the importance of defining our Historic Rural Roads, in order to protect against kerbing, lighting and widening. PK to ask MC to identify our pre-1840 roads (eg Cross Lane, Stable Lane, Nepcote Lane, North End, Steep Lane etc).</li> </ul>	<p>JH, SF, EW, RB</p> <p>PK</p> <p>PK/MC</p>
<p>15.25</p>	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>TPO</u> - The list from MC is theoretically correct, but it is known that not all trees are still existing. It was agreed the Community Action Plan part of the NP will suggest the PC carry out a physical check.</li> <li><u>Dark Skies Policy</u> - The SDNP suggests wording to use. However, it was agreed that the number of residents’ votes required to change the policy is increased from 50% to 75%.</li> <li><u>Overall Draft Plan Progress</u> - This is everyone’s last chance to make comments. KR asked about a 20mph speed limit. If agreed, this will be a Community Action Plan suggestion for the PC to follow-up since it is not a planning issue. KR also asked can we make a design criteria to protect trees <i>and hedges</i> on the basis of equal planting for any cut down. To be considered.</li> <li><u>Parish Boundaries</u>- TT wants to acknowledge our committee’s huge achievement in protecting our parish boundaries, subject to the NP passing examination.</li> </ul>	<p>PK/PG</p>
<p>15.26</p>	<p><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></p>	
	<p>Monday 15 June, 7.00pm at The Gun</p>	

Meeting closed at 9.00pm