

SNDP Committee

Minutes of the meeting held at the Village Hall

On Tuesday 10th October 2017

PRESENT: Jay Holliday (JH) Tony Glover (ToG) Karen Edwards (KE)

John Golding (JFG) Jo Gilford (JoG)-Chair John Vale (JV) Ian Weaver (IW)

Minutes Geoff Edwards

Also 8 members of the public (MotP) including 3 Staverton Parish councilors

1. 1. GOVERNANCE

1.1 Declaration and nature of interest - None

TOG proposed that the meeting be recorded. IW seconded. All in favour. TOG then started recording.

2. MINUTES

2.1 Approval of the Minutes of the meeting held on 28th September 2017.

JMG proposed the date be changed to the 28th September. KE seconded , All in Favour. Carried

Item 2.1 KE proposed to add JFG as also having abstained. JH seconded All in Favour - carried

Item 4.5.1 (7th paragraph) KE proposed that 'KE asked for clarification on what the brief for the consultant was'. Should include 'as she was not aware that the SNDPC had commissioned an independent report'. KE proposed, JV seconded KE JV TOG JH All in Favour. JFG IW abstained. Carried

As the amendments were taking so much time, KE proposed that the rest of the amendments be deferred until later in the meeting to enable the 5 non SPC members of the public to participate in the meeting. JFG seconded KE JFG IW JH & JV In Favour. TOG abstained. Carried.

3.1 The SPC are liaising with DDC and have requested dates.

3.2 KE advised that putting the Housing Needs Statement into the corporate format was 95% complete, and proposed once completed that it be given to TOG for uploading to the website. JFG seconded All in Favour. Carried

3.3 JMG advised that Locality had confirmed that funding ceases on 31/03/2018 and also mentioned that KE had also asked AECOM consultants previously . TOG read out in full an email from David Chapman of Locality confirming the funding situation.JMG then read out an email sent to Locality. And also a response to an email to DDC which stated that DDC do not have any dealings with funding. She then advised that funding will cease on 31/03/2018 and without it the plan can not be completed.

JV said that an individual at Locality had confirmed that consultant funding was a separate stream, and if funding for work is agreed before 31/03/2018 then consultant money can be used after that date . Most expenditure will be in the next 3 months so there is no pressure to spend all the money before 31/03/2018.

JMG replied that the next set of money ‘may’ be available from 01/04/2018 but seems unlikely to come to Staverton , as 3 years will have elapsed since the Neighbourhood Plan began.

KE stated that she had never written to Mr Chapman at Locality. JMG responded that KE had written to the AECOM consultants and JMG had forwarded that email to Locality. JMG also advised that the Action Plan includes some time for consultation days.

JH proposed that JV get written confirmation re funding beyond 31/03/2018. KE seconded. All in Favour. Carried

JV then stated that funding is only required up to when Regulation 14 is initiated.

4 BUSINESS ARISING

4.1 Consultants

4.1.1 Consultants Site Assessment Report

JV said that the base information used by AECOM for their report is incomplete. It is an independent report based on information provided by the SNDP committee, and a site visit. JV had grave doubts that it would align so well if it was truly independent. JFG is not reassured by the report why sites are valid or not. JMG then read out extracts from SNDP minutes from 20/07, 03/08, 22/09 & 16/09 where the Committee agreed to send various documents to the consultants throughout August & September 2017. There was also a resolution passed to ‘hand hold’ the consultants.

JV said that a new version given to AECOM is in a “very” draft form and therefore has any number of inaccuracies in it. JV stated that AECOM had not spoken to DDC planning.JMG said that she had spoken to Mags who had said AECOM had contacted Development Control Dept. DDC had said that they would expect the reports to be similar as all are working from the same baseline data. JH advised that this data is not yet agreed and JFG confirmed that the

baseline data is not sound, and that it still contains errors. JMG advised that AECOM had spoken to another department within DDC.

KE said that she had spoken to Shane Scollard at AECOM who stated categorically that he had had no contact whatsoever with DDC. JMG asked what his thoughts were. KE responded that Shane felt it was difficult to undertake a review as documents have been 'drip-fed' to him. The SNDP initial Site Assessment document was not robust enough and they had therefore used their own methodology looking at 6 sites. Subsequent documents provided to him indicated that the process was becoming more robust. The report would normally take 4 to 6 weeks, but they had turned it round in 2 weeks. KE stated that she had commissioned them in April but documents had not been sent until recently. KE stated that we have 7 pages of amendments, and some SNDP members have serious concerns re the baseline data.

TOG asked that we remember that it is only a draft document and they are expecting us to respond to them and they would then bring a more detailed report including our amendments.

KE responded that Shane had advised that our comments / feedback needs to be with AECOM by Friday 13th October (an already extended deadline) so that they could forward the final report on to Locality.

JH then advised that the committee had spent 2.5 hours at a workshop and had 7 pages of comments / errors, and the report is based on non-adopted draft data which may never be approved.

KE then proposed that the voting on amendments be moved further down the agenda and that the floor be opened to the members of the public. JFG seconded. IW JH JV JFG KE in Favour. TOG abstained. Carried.

KE then proposed that item 5.1.1 be dealt with next. JFG seconded. All in favour - carried

5 CORRESPONDENCE

5.1.1 Proposal from Mr R Frost

JMG read out the email from Mr Frost in full (copy attached)

JV advised that he had received notification from the Braunston Lane Site owners that the covenant on the site is not an impediment for the site. Also the Silver Birch site representatives had advised that 5 houses was not a viable option, so they were asked to plan for 10. He added that the SNDP Terms of Reference state that the involvement of Parishioners is key. Another consultation event is needed soon for parishioners to have their say on the detail.

MotP (John Wilkes) asked if the SNDPC know what percentage did not specify a site in the Village Questionnaire?

JH responded that 56% had not specified a site

MotP (John Wilkes) asked if the SNDPC know how many voted for the sites.

KE responded that from 363 eligible to vote, 126 actually voted (34%). Of these 126 votes, 57 voted for Beside the School equating to 45% of the vote, 45 for Silver Birch equating to 36%, and 24 for Braunston Lane equating to 19% of the vote. In terms of a percentage of those eligible to vote the percentages are Beside the school 16%, Silver Birch 12%, Braunston Lane 7% of all eligible voters.

John Wilkes stated therefore the majority 56% did not specify a site.

MotP Malcolm Holliday then stated that a vote including a 'no sites' option should be held. We were told it was not an option whereas it was always an option.

John Wilkes asked why don't we just rely on robust policies and omit specific sites. Only one made plan (Moulton) has sites specified. All the others don't specify sites.

TOG then gave the reasons why the SNDP committee had included sites - essentially if SNDP didn't specify sites then it would be up to DDC to decide where housing would be built and the number of houses and it would be very difficult for us to fight against it.

JV added that the Housing Needs Survey would give credence to a developer to provide 15 or 16 houses.

KE referred back to some of TOG's comments and stated that the developers of the site beside the school had expressed surprise that we were including sites in the plan, as DDC had exceeded their quota, and DDC had informed us at a recent meeting that they were not allocating any rural sites. She also added that she has fed back over a period of time anecdotal evidence that parishioners do not feel they were given the opportunity of no sites.

KE replied that Staverton already has strong protection including HS22, HS24, SLA & Conservation area and is a restricted infill village.

JFG felt that he would feel safer with preferred sites listed and that the plan would provide a safety barrier. But acknowledged that DDC would not impose sites. There had recently been a complaint made by a parishioner about this very point.

JMG said that the SPC (Staverton Parish Council) had taken a decision to include sites in the plan.

MotP Malcolm Holliday responded by saying that DDC state that sites do not have to be included.

JH reiterated that 56% of questionnaire respondents did not specify any site. The last consultation event was October 2016. The parishioners are the custodians of what we do. We surely have to ask them what it is they want.

JMG stated that articles had been published in the Parish Magazine and also Newsletters.

TOG added that only 2 parishioners had responded to the request in the Parish Magazine. And every parishioner had received a questionnaire and invites to the Consultation Events. At

the consultation events we stated that having no houses was not viable. It is impossible for us to say “no new housing”. You can propose ‘no sites’, but the likely outcome would be DDC determining the number of houses, and on which site.

SPC Councilor Margaret Nightingale said that the Newsletter needs to be sent out asap.

MotP Rupert Frost said that whilst parishioners were asked to vote for sites, they also have a right to vote for no specified sites at all. There was not a ‘No Sites’ option on the voting form.

TOG replied that some Questionnaire respondents had written “No Sites” in answer to the any other comments section. Parishioner can not say they do not want any housing. They were given the option of 1st 2nd & 3rd preference sites and there were a number of people who decided they did not want to propose sites. We went forward with the 126 who proposed sites.

KE commented that Parishioners can say Yes, No or anything else - we live in a democracy. She reported that in an email to the SNDPC the developers from the site beside the School had said that they were surprised that sites were being put forward as DDC have a 6.3yr land supply.

IW commented that there is a national need for rural housing. DDC has 6.3 years supply but the plan will go up to 2029.

JFG Advised that having no sites listed in the plan still allows the 15 homes to be built.

JV added that the SNDP need more involvement from the parishioners.

SPC Councilor Margaret Nightingale ask why the Village newsletter had not be sent out?

JH responded that the draft version of the Newsletter was felt to be biased, alarmist and strewn with errors.

Margaret Nightingale replied that it needs to be distributed around the village immediately.

JV then read out the draft newsletter

SPC Councilor Margaret Nightingale said there has been plenty of time to sort out the newsletter, so it should have been sent.

KE replied that committee members are currently working at workshops on average 6hrs a week. The newsletter was deferred at the last meeting to this meeting, so this is the next time it could be discussed. She asked the Chair to confirm this. Which JMG did.

Rupert Frost asked who had guided Shane from AECOM around the sites. KE responded that he had informed her that no-one had. Also he hadn’t entered the sites but had stood and viewed from outside the sites.

JV said that planning reasons should support the SNDPC, based on the views of the parishioners.

JV then proposed that “The Committee undertake a consultation in the Village Hall where all Parishioners can register their views before any further commitments are made or adopted including selection of sites giving the option of selecting no sites. JH seconded . JV JH JFG KE In Favour IW TOG against - carried. IW clarified his against vote was because of the inclusion of no sites.

SPC Councilor Margaret Nightingale said that all Parishioners should attend. MotP David Wilks reminded everyone that only 80 people can be accommodated in the Village Hall. Rupert Frost said that he was in agreement with the proposal.

JMG closed the meeting to the floor and the 5 members of the public left.

4.1.1 continued

JMG proposed that the committee go through the comments on the Consultants’ report one by one to agree then feedback to AECOM. JV seconded All in Favour - carried.

JH & TOG & JFG debated whether sending amendments would be taken that we are endorsing it as a final document. Each amendment / comment was then agreed (38 items) and item 24 was deleted.

JV then proposed that a letter accompanies the comments which qualifies the fact that the base data used is unconfirmed, and that the amendments are not an indication of acceptance of this document as a final report. KE seconded All in favour - carried.

KE agreed to put all the comments together, adding a covering email, and then send it all to Shane at AECOM.

JMG stated that the rest of the agenda be deferred until the next meeting. Discussion then occurred around a suitable date.

5.1.2 In response to Vanessa Lee’s resignation JFG will send a letter of thanks on behalf of the committee.

JH suggested that regarding the remainder of the agenda we need to continue and finish this as part of the workshop on 17/10.

JMG responded with a proposal that the workshop on 12/10 should finalise the newsletter and start planning for the consultation event. And the workshop on 17/10 & 19/10 continues with the consultation event. The workshop on 24/10 should then be a meeting to agree both the above.

A general discussion then took place. No seconder. Proposal failed.

Currently the next workshops are on 12/10, 17/10 and 19/10 TOG confirmed that the Village Hall is available & booked for the next 3 dates. After that at JMG’s as the computer is there.

The meeting closed at 9:42pm.