

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW STEERING GROUP (NPRSG)

MINUTES OF MEETING ON MONDAY 1st FEBRUARY 2021

By Zoom due to Coronavirus

IN ATTENDANCE:

Parish Council

Lucy Bartley (LB), Louise Davies (LD), Andrew Jackson (AJ)

Community Member

Keith Charman (KC), Sheena Overington (SO)

As Chair, SO opened the meeting at 7.00 pm.

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. **Apologies:** Received from Steve Rollinson (SR) (Parish Council). Steve had advised that he now had a commitment every Monday evening and was therefore unable to attend future meetings. He was keen to remain involved in the process and was happy to contribute by email if this was acceptable by the group. As the process was now reaching final stages and a consultant was being engaged, this arrangement was supported.
2. **Declaration of Interests:** There was no change to the interests previously declared and recorded.
3. **Minutes of the Last Meeting:** The minutes of the meeting held on 4th January 2021 were approved as an accurate record.
4. **Site Selection:**
 - a. **Site Consultation:** Statistics from the January consultation were provided. It was noted that there had been a better response than for the September 2019 site consultation. AJ displayed charts to demonstrate the results and all agreed that the bar charts were the easiest to interpret. It had been the right decision to undertake the consultation, particularly in view of the site detail changes. It confirmed community opinion and gave a clear steer. To meet the housing allocation number, it was likely that 4 sites would be required, but if the top 3 were built to potential capacity, this could reduce to 3. The Group were aware that planning applications were being prepared by at least two developers and there was a risk that these applications would progress ahead of the NP process; advice to be obtained from the Planning consultant.
There had been some invalid responses which had been incorrectly completed and so not included in the results. There had been some suspicious responses (addresses related to known residents) and it was agreed that it was not good practice to include what appeared to be fraudulent responses. AJ confirmed that these responses did not change the outcome. AJ would provide the charts to LD to

include in a Consultation Report which would be circulated for comment and approved at the next meeting.

Action: ALL

5. **Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment:** The AECOM team working on the HRA now required site specific policies to progress, and following receipt, would take a further 3-4 weeks to complete the report. As there was still some uncertainty with site numbers, they would work with the maximum numbers. The SEA team required no further information to progress but would be interested in the site-specific details for information. **Action: LD**
6. **Drafting Revised Document:** The draft document was displayed and the elements that required further clarification were discussed and amendments made. The re-drafted pages to be circulated for further comment.
 - 5-minute isochrone – to remain but provide explanation as to why sites were further out.
 - Settlement Boundary – amended to incorporate Great Meadow only.
 - Site Specific policies – the attributes, benefits and issues were discussed and agreed. The site-specific policies were discussed and intent recorded. Further advice and help with wording would be required from the planning consultant.
 - A virtual meeting was required with the Ansell's Yard agent, with either a family member present or on the understanding that he had authority to act for the family. Details to be discussed: plan, intent for paddock, conifers and screening, open access to woodland, inclusion of larger play area due to distance from village, pavement.
 - Advice to be sought from CDC CIL Officer in relation to the authority infrastructure contribution and how the pavement on the Green could be funded. It was noted that WSCC Highways had insisted on a pavement for the Stable Field sports field proposal. Advice on the mechanism for developer contributions to be obtained from the planning consultant.
 - **Updating and proof reading:** LD would circulate the updated pages. All to read and provide comments. **Action: ALL**
7. **Grant Funding:** LD had heard that day that the grant funding application had been successful and James Garside, Planning Consultant, would now be engaged. LD to circulate details for an introductory virtual meeting and would provide the information requested. **Action: LD**
8. **Regulation 14 Consultation:** Depending on the timing, it was likely that Covid regulations would prevent a consultation in the village hall. A possible response form had been drafted, primarily to obtain printing costs for the grant application. The consultation would need to be given further thought in due course.
9. **Any Other Business**
 - a. **Facebook:** Comments relating to the consultation flyer had been posted; several people appeared not to receive and were alarmed that it was a closing date reminder. LD advised that she had posted the first message on Monday 18th

January reminding that it was the final day on Friday 22nd January; links to the flyer were provided. LD had responded to the comments highlighting that updates had appeared in the parish magazine nearly every month since the process began in November 2018, and that the Ad Vincula was delivered to most households. Spare copies were also available in the shop, and the consultation flyer was also on the village website. For any further consultations, LD would post a message as the parish magazine was being delivered.

- b. Next Ad Vincula Article: SO would prepare an article for approval to give consultation feedback on number and village representation. To highlight that a consultant had now been engaged to help with policy wording and the final stages as we move towards the Regulation 14 consultation. With Covid regulations, it was likely that this consultation would again be a booklet in the Ad Vincula. **Action: SO**
- c. Resident's Email: LD advised that due to the consultation and other pressures, she had not responded to the Durban Road resident's email. It was agreed not to send but to hold on record for any further contact.
- d. Winterfold Garage: LD advised that the Parish Council had been offered the opportunity to purchase the garage, currently used by the Fete Society. This would be considered further by the Parish Council at the February meeting. Runnymede Homes had also advised that they had not been made aware of the landowner's discussions in relation to the garage, 6 houses and open area, and the financial agreement had been based on the whole site. Runnymede was therefore unable to offer the other garage to the Parish Council but was looking at providing alternative storage on the area between the garage and Warwick boundary.

9. Date of Next Meeting:
Monday 1st March 2021 at 7.00 pm, by Zoom.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.35 pm.