

SNDP Committee

Minutes of the meeting held at the Village Hall

On Tuesday 28th September 2017

PRESENT Jo Gilford (JMG)-Chair, Tony Glover (ToG), John Vale (JV), Ian Weaver (IW),

John Golding(JFG), Karen Edwards(KE), Jay Holliday(JH), Vanessa Lee(VL)- minutes

Members of the Parish (MotP)

1. 1. GOVERNANCE

1.1 Declaration and nature of interest - None

1. 2. MINUTES

2.1 Approval of minutes of the meeting held on the 19th September 2017.

T0G proposed, IW seconded, JV, KE, JH, JFG abstained, motion carried

1. 3. CONSULTATION DOCUMENTS

3.1 Training in Code of conduct and Standing Orders – Awaiting response - Deferred

3.2 All minutes to be published on SPC website following the meeting to be held on the 19th September – Completed

4. BUSINESS ARISING

4.1 Site update – Nothing to report

4.2 Documents for adoption

4.2.1 Consultation Statement – is in production at workshop

4.2.2 Site Assessment Statement & Site Proposals Map –deferred to workshop

4.2.3 Site proposals map - Deferred

4.2.4 2 x site specific policies- yet to be started on – Deferred

4.3 STAVERTON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Tasks from meeting with DDC following their comments of the SNDP

4.3.1 Comment 1 – Awaiting DDC wording - Policy SC11 will need rewording

- Deferred

4.3.2 Comment 5 – awaiting DDC wording - We have some suggested minor amendments of the village confines based on work they had undertaken

4.3.3 Comment 6 - photos to be inserted/table amended to DDC's format justifying the views

4.3.4 Comment 8 – one proposals map to be produced

4.4 Consultants

4.4.1 Health Check of Site Assessment Statement: - **JmG** reported that the hope had been to receive the Consultant's report by today but have been told it will be tomorrow. They have liaised with Daventry District Council. **JmG** to circulate when available.

From an email **JmG** stated that the Consultants are doing an independent assessment. The main points were:

Site 2 (By the School) and **site 20** (End of Braunston Lane) were considered to be appropriate to be included in the Development Plan.

Sites 4 (Silverbirch) & **site 6** (By the Church) have potential.

Sites 17 (The Beeches) & **site 18** (The Croft) not considered potential.

MotP What is the difference between appropriate and potential?

JMG Appropriate means less constraints, potential means more constraints and not suitable at this time. Sites 2 and 20 are more sustainable, Sites 4&6 could be looked at in the future but could take away the character of the village.

JH asked what have the Consultants received from us?

JmG replied Site Assessment Statement (various versions), Parish Questionnaire, Housing Needs Statement, Parish Confines Statement, and DDC Toolkits, along with copies of both the SNDP and PC minutes.

KE asked for clarification on what the brief for the consultants was as she was not aware we had commissioned an independent report.

JmG advised to undertake a health check on the methodology applied to the site assessment document and check whether it would stand up to the examination process.

JH asked had they received Draft Site Assessment copies.

JmG advised as each version was amended they had received the new version along with the DDC Toolkits

JV asked what information did they make judgement on?

JmG advised she understood they would be attending site on their own, assessing the six sites against the planning framework, then produce a report. The SNDP and SPC have to then take their views into consideration and have 2 weeks to comment and get back to the Consultants.

KE asked what housing numbers are they looking at?

JmG advised the numbers form the DDC Housing Needs Survey, the Housing Need statement and the Staverton Parish Questionnaire data.

MotP Were instructions sent to Consultants, how have the village views been taken into account?

JmG advised the long list of 25 sites that came out of the Parish Questionnaire was within the site assessment document sent to the consultants.

MotP One of the three sites selected came last in the village survey.

JmG advised both the SNDP and SPC had made a decision to include the end of Braunston Lane and by the School in the plan and that the Independent Consultants had the same view.

ToG advised that the developer and landowners of Silverbirch support 10 dwellings and the 5 dwellings would not be viable so they were not able to be considered for a smaller site.

MotP Why did you not go back to the village?

JmG advised as part of Regulation 14 there would be further consultation with the village. When all documents are complete all villagers/stakeholders will have a chance to influence the decision for example, if we receive 100 letters from 100 households all raising the same point it has to be taken into account for the final plan.

KE highlighted that only 50% of the SNDP committee were comfortable with the decision of the two sites to include in the plan and that the committee should go to the village.

JmG advised the committee vote was 4 in favour, 3 against, one abstention.

MotP asked was a written brief given to the Consultant.

JmG advised she was not aware of the original brief given to the consultant as **KE & JH** had instructed the consultant originally but understood the brief was to look at the methodology used in the site assessment document and as part of that process the consultant had advised

they undertake an independent site assessment and if the outcomes from both their assessments and the SNDP assessment are correct then the methodology is robust.

MotP Can the brief be posted to the web site, JMG responded yes.

MotP Can you explain what it means by larger sites quoted in the Parish Magazine Newsletter?

JmG advised the wording being used at the moment was a larger site should have no more than 10 dwellings.

MotP The questionnaire states less than 10

JH advised there was a meeting held where a proposal was made that a large site should not consist of more than 10 dwellings.

KE asked if the housing need statement stating the housing need as 15 had been published on the website yet.

ToG advised not as yet as it was waiting to be formatted into the corporate format being used for the statement. **KE** took away the task to do this.

MotP What about the people who don't have access to a computer?

IW advised there has been and there is a proposal to do a leaflet drops to all houses

JmG also advised the committee had put in any communication that you can have a hard copy of any information from any member of the SNDP committee.

KE asked that the email sent to SNDPC members today concerning the possibility of the examiner choosing to include further site be discussed as it showed the validity of her question, if a number of sites challenge the decision and are upheld would they be included in the plan?

JmG read the advice out received from Mags at DDC:

The examiner would need to justify the inclusion of an additional site based on need, of which I understand it that your 2 sites should cover any identified need . It would also effectively mean that the Examiner would be saying that the plan had failed to meet the basic condition if they considered an additional site had to be included to meet the need.

KE added that the response of Tom James contradicts that of Mags Howes and reminded all that we have to be robust in our policies for the examiner.

JmG advised she had taken further advice from Tom James to ask why the examiner would think there is a need for more when our analysis questionnaire showed there was a need for 15, the DDC Housing need showed there was a need for 16 and the Parish Council fast track Housing Need analysis identified a need for 16 and asked what other sources of data would there be to determine what the need is? Tom James had further advised that the Housing Needs survey is sufficient justification for the figures in the plan but that Tom James had wanted to make us aware that developers may argue for an additional need. This is not uncommon in Neighbourhood Plan examinations and obviously more critical when allocating a site so there could be a risk. However, some of these issues will be teased out through the Regulation 14 consultation.

MotP Builders have put in a letter for 25 houses.

JmG advised the plan would restrict this.

ToG suggested looking at the other plans eg. Moulton

KE reiterated her point that if Silverbirch decides the reasons for not being included in the plan are flimsy and the examiner upholds that challenge, could there be a scenario where there are more sites in the plan than needed, advising there is a fine line between selection and not?

JfG commented that if our policies are robust they should stand up. Concerning numbers

JmG advised Regulation 14 will feed into the plan Daventry District Council comments along with any developer comments and that any challenge would be against DDC under Regulation 15 therefore DDC would not let the plan progress if they felt it would not stand up to challenge.

MotP What is the timing for these documents?

JmG explained the procedure to go forward, & referred all to the action plan on the website, also advising statements are being shared as & when they are completed.

MotP Can a proposal be put forward to the committee to go back to the village now?

JmG advised the request could not be dealt with at tonight's meeting but a proposal could be put forward to go on the Agenda for the next meeting.

MotP asked why were sites put forward that were not appropriate for the village to vote on.

JfG advised we had 6 sites to look at, we had a vote on 3 large sites, and that all sites had always been considered viable and appropriate. Following the doubt over the Beaches and the Croft as small sites, Braunston Lane was then considered a replacement small site.

JmG advised that as there was only a requirement for 15 dwellings there was a decision to be made as to which two.

JmG Explained the Church Magazine was full for this edition therefore a leaflet drop had been decided on. VL and IW had worked on a draft newsletter and this had been discussed at a workshop.

KE asked if amendments could still be made?

JV proposed a further workshop for the newsletter development, seconded by **IW** all in favour motion carried.

7 FINANCE

7.1 Final costings report

JmG advised we are awaiting a quotation to revamp the website.

KE stated her concerns that Consultants have still not been engaged to work on our policies. **JG** advised that the PC were only able to have one avenue of technical support open at any one time and that the consultant would look at the policies when the sites had been selected.

JmG advised the consultants again would be assisting in this area and that AECOM will be working with the committee on the Site-Specific Policies, health check of the SNDP plan, consultation statement, and regulation 14 processes.

KE asked if the policies had been started on. **JMG** advised there were the generic policies created that had come from the vision and objectives that had been produced.

JH advised we need to have the site-specific policies in place, and that it was important we do not rely on neutral policies.

JV asked what is defined timescale? What is the chance of further consultation? Why do we need to set a date for the 4th tranche?

JMG read an email that had been circulated to all that advised the programme is from 2015-2018 and would cease on the 31st march 2018.

JV asked why does plan stop at March 31st? Is the Consultants AECOM determined by March 31st?

JmG advised yes, all consultant work would need to be completed by the 31st March as per the email circulated by **JV**. **JmG** took away the task to get further clarification.

MotP If the Consultant is paid by connection does this mean they will agree?

JmG advised they are engaged as being an independent source of advice.

JV asked when was the last engagement with the consultant in the action plan?

JmG advised at the end of Feb/Mar 2018 after Regulation 14 to assist with comments and actions.

JV asked in what way is the funding linked and why AECOM cannot work after March?
JmG would get further clarification.

ToG advised consultants cannot have multiple projects as being one of the reasons.

KE where in the action plan did it say we are we working with consultants on policies?

JmG advised there is a 6-week window and a further two weeks in early December programmed into the action plan and we would be working on them during this period.

KE asked if confirmation had been sought about the timescale and which consultant would be working on the policies with us?

JmG advised both DDC and the consultants had been consulted as to whether they could meet the timeframes within the action plan when it was produced and that AECOM would be working with the committee.

7.2 Submission of grant – **ToG** to submit when complete

8 PROJECT PLAN – on schedule

9 MEETING SCHEDULE

Meetings	3 rd October	SPC at Village Hall
-----------------	-------------------------	---------------------

5 th October	Workshop
-------------------------	----------

10 th October	SNDP at Village Hall
--------------------------	----------------------

Meeting closed at 21.20