

Minutes form Staverton Parish Council

Extraordinary Meeting - 18th October 2017

Present: Jo Gilford (chair), Tony Glover (minutes), Ian Weaver, Shirley Frost, Margaret Nightingale, Terry Gilford, John Golding

Apologies from: Geoff Edwards and Sue Porter Clerk (on holiday)

5 members of the public

1 Governance.

1.1 Interests

1.1.1. JFG declared a personal interest in both the SNDP and SPC

1.1.2. JMG to confirm conflict of interest's position regarding belonging to both the SNDP committee and being a Parish Councillor with DDC.

1.2. Recording of meeting

1.2.1. ToG advised he would be taking the minutes and asked if there were any objections to him recording the meeting. None received

1.3. Declaration of Interest forms

1.3.1. JFG advised he thought there was an issue in connection with the declaration of interest forms currently published and their legality: JMG to take advice from DDC monitoring officer and report back to next meeting

1.4. Validity of meeting

1.4.1. JFG advised he felt the meeting was not a valid meeting and asked who called the meeting noting the agenda had not been signed by the chairman therefore did not adhere to standing orders. JMG would take advice from NALC and report back to the next meeting if there were any irregularities.

1.5. Chairman's opening statement

1.5.1. The full statement is appended to the minutes and covered the areas of:

Why the meeting had been called

The procedure applied to call the meeting

How the public part of the agenda would be administered

2. Open forum

Areas discussed by the public were:

Amount of public consultation undertaken in connection with the SNDP plan

The chairmanship of the committee

Relationships on the SNDP committee

Why was the committee being dissolved? what happens next?

The chair advised answers to these questions would be answered as the business of the meeting was conducted

3. Resignations

3.1 JmG read a statement to the meeting which is appended to the minutes covering the areas of:

The issue of four resignations received from the SNDP committee in a short space of time. The common themes of the resignations being: individuals health, divisions within the committee, team working

4. Performance of SNDP committee

4.1 The majority of the Parish Councillors present this evening had attended recent SNDP committee meetings to observe for themselves the activities/conduct of the committee.

4.2 JMG read a statement which is appended to the minutes covering the reasons for her resigning from the committee, the main reasons being the chairs position was untenable and the performance of the committee was being compromised due to personal opinions as to the selection of sites to be included within the plan

4.3. JMG advised she had taken advice from NCALC who had suggested her resignation letter should set out all the reasons for her decision to resign so that the Parish Council can discuss/review the efficiency and effectiveness of the committee.

4.4. JMG also advised that NCALC had suggested that rather than put a generic agenda heading which would allow pretty much anything SNDP related to come up for discussion, that in the interests of being absolutely open and transparent and so it was a matter of public knowledge before the meeting as to what was being discussed that the agenda clearly stated the Parish Council would be discussing the committees performance and possibility of the committee being dissolved.

4.5 JMG reminded all present she had been asked by several Parish Councillors to hold a meeting to consider dissolving the committee as a consequence of it's performance, advising she considered her own performance to be poor as well and that she really hoped that a solution can be found this evening as to how the situation can be resolved as a lot of hard work has gone into the process so far, commending Vanessa, Karen and Jay for the effort they have put into the committee which up until July had performed adequately well, i.e. prior to the commencement of the selection of sites to be included in the plan

4.6 TeG read a Statement to the Council which is appended to the minutes and covered the areas of:

Thank you to the committee for their hard work

The lack of progress on the plan since July

The opinion that certain factions within the committee seemed to have hidden agendas

The legality of the process to include the two sites within the plan being robust

The fact that half the parishioners who attended the open meeting felt the village needed younger families and housing, which was consequently supported by the findings of the DDC housing needs survey that was undertaken.

Reminder at the open meeting a show of hands indicated an acceptance of 25 Houses, the plan was allowing for 15.

The suggestion that the Parish Council hold a consultation event where all villagers will be able to see the prospective plans to the two sites nominated and then add their comments etc upon which then the PC act accordingly to the villagers views

The conduct of recent SNDP meeting

The decision of the SNDP committee to back track on its work to the point of asking if no sites was an option, acknowledging this was at the request of a resident of the village, but pointing out at that meeting where the decision was taken there were only five members of the public present of a population of around 400

4.7 SF went on to explain why she felt the meeting had to be called as she had witnessed firsthand the animosity & bad feeling within SNDP group. The time taken to approve minutes also concerned her. She agreed that the Parish should consult on the plan again, adding that she appreciated all the work that had been put in by the committee but felt the current state of affairs could not continue.

4.8 IW felt the PC had a obligation to complete the process and also thanked the committee for their hard work.

4.9 MN then read her statement, which agreed that the current situation could not

continue, reminding all that Staverton had evolved greatly over the 66 years she

had been associated with the village and that the proposed plan would enable the

village to move forward. She too agreed personal prerogatives were taking

precedence over the way the way forward and that to resolve the situation the

villagers should be consulted as a whole for the good of the community.

She too thanked everyone for the work that's been done.

4.10 JfG agreed with MN that the plan was for the good of the whole of the community and the PC should consult with the parishioners. However his perception was some members of the committee did not want to consult with the parishioners, but tell them what the committee had agreed. He also felt the chairmanship of the group had contributed to the position the committee now found itself in and that due process had not been followed in making the decision on sites but as it did not affect the outcome he had not made an issue of it.

4.11 SF highlighted that all are entitled to their opinions but it was exactly this animosity and bad feeling that she objected to.

4.12 TeG agreed, pointing out If everyone worked together then the plan could progress.

4.13 MN proposed that the Parish Council carry on with full consultations with the village. Ask them which of the two sites, the site by the school and the site in Braunston Lane they want, or both or neither. SF 2nd.

4.14 JfG: advised he would like to propose an amendment that all 3 sites be considered. Also, that no sites be considered adding that he would not support no sites and that the village would probably not support no sites either but considered the village should be offered the option.

4.15 JMG: Repeated the proposal and its amendment. JfG then withdrew the proposed amendment.

4.16 The PC then had a full debate on the proposal discussing reasons for selection of the two sites proposed, the reasoning and non reasoning behind the decision of the two sites selected, the performance of the committee, reasons for lack of progress of the plan and the suggestion to have more consultation events.

4.17 MN proposed that ‘the SNDP be dissolved and that the production of the plan be brought back in house and that consultants be brought in to assist the PC and that consultation goes out on the two sites.

4.18 JfG suggested that the members of the public who were present were asked their opinion.

4.19 MN confirmed all villagers would have the opportunity to give their views at the proposed consultation.

4.20 Vote: For: MN, SF, TeG, ToG. Against: IW, JfG proposal carried that the Parish Council carry on with full consultations with the village, asking them which of the two sites, the site by the school and the site in Braunston Lane they want, or both or neither and that ‘the SNDP be dissolved and that the production of the plan be brought back in house and that consultants be brought in to assist the PC and that consultation goes out on the two sites.

The chair then suggested the council work through the last SNDP committee agenda to ascertain the position on each subject heading.

5.1 SNDP Production of the Plan

5.2. Finances:

5.21 ToG reported that as the PC were choosing sites, there was a grant of £15,000. The PC had already received around £3000, leaving £12,000 that had to be spent before 31st March 2018. He recommended the PC apply soon when quotations had been received. Areas being applied for were: consultants to 'hand hold' the PC to undertake consultation, room hire, revamp the website, speed surveys, advertising, Village news insertions etc. He confirmed today the PC had received a quotation from Kirkwells Consultants to 'hand hold' the group for the remainder of the

process Inc. producing site specific policies, delivery of Reg 14, producing policies and delivery of 2 consultations. This is £5,000 plus vat.

5.22 TeG proposed that he be given authorisation to submit the grant application. 2nd

MN. All in favour with one abstention JFG. Motion carried.

5.3. Site Assessment Statement and Consultants report

JMG advised a workshop to review the consultant's final report received today and complete the site assessment statement to include both DDC's comments and the consultants findings would need to be held, adding that DDC felt the consultants report looked broadly correct and showed a methodical approach.

5.3 JfG highlighted the SNDP have never adopted the methodology regarding the site selection process.

5.4 JmG agreed with JFG that the process had not been completed and until the consultants report had been received and a workshop held the document could not be adopted.

5.5 Technical consultancy:

Kirkwells had advised an SEA needed completing by DDC as a matter of urgency as soon as a draft plan was ready and before any consultation on that draft. This highlights the pressure on ensuring even more that the funding was in place before Reg 14 progressed.

5.6 DDC have confirmed Kirkwells advice is correct that the SEA needs to be undertaken prior to the Reg 14 consultation commencing and that they could undertake the SEA as soon as they had received the draft plan from the Steering Group.

5.7 SNDP

The amendments to the plan that had been received from DDC still needed to be actioned and a workshop held.

5.8 Site update: AECOM had advised a site financial viability appraisal be requested from the developers. AECOM are quoting for this piece of work.

5.9 An email has been received from Sam Willoughby architects. They are willing to hand over some of the land to the rear of the church to help protect on any impact development may have on the listed building and be a real asset to the village. They have reviewed the site and would not have to remove any trees. They could get the access to work and believed that this is a really generous offer from the client and assured the PC that they were not going to try and over develop the site as was intended in a previous application by the owner.

5.10 JfG advised the Braunston Lane covenant is no longer effective. There is an insurance policy in place.

5.11 JfG Also advised he was not at all happy with the current situation and that the PC were not aware of what they are taking on and that he was not willing to take any further part in the plan or willing to take on any tasks.

5.12 Consultation. John Vale had circulated a possible flyer to the PC today which JMG had circulated in the format of a newsletter with further suggested amendments.

5.13 The PC discussed the two documents, including detailed discussion in the areas consultation dates, What groups should be invited, attendance of the school and developers. Why consultants should facilitate the event.

5.14 MN: proposed that the newsletter be sent out as it is with dates to be inserted for the consultation event. 2nd SF. All in favour. JfG against. Motion carried.

5.15 Action Plan.

JMG advised at present, there are 2 meetings a week scheduled in for a Tuesday and a Thursday. She suggested a formal meeting fortnightly (we should ask the clerk to minute these) and hold workshops on the other evenings. There are currently 10 weeks scheduled to produce the work ahead of Reg 14. The consultant thinks that this is sufficient and he can start work immediately. As to the question of sites or no sites, DDC have suggested that the PC run consultation in tandem so that when you get to the draft plan point, having taken input from the villagers, if they chose sites The PC would still be ready to go with Reg 14. If they chose not to go with sites, the plan be amended accordingly Work on regulation 14 should continue to ensure completion on time in relation to financial constraints.

5.16 Meeting Schedule MN proposed the PC continue to meet twice a week as before and have fortnightly meetings' 2nd TeG. All in favour. JfG against.

6 Public Open Forum Previous questions from the public: (1) Insufficient public

communication. (2) Why the SNDP has been dissolved had been answered as business was discussed.

Areas of discussion during the open forum were:

Timing of public involvement in relation to council decisions

Other Neighbourhood plans

Education of the neighbourhood planning process

The low percentage of plans that included sites

The decision of Badby not to include sites in their plan

The consultants brief JMG took a task away to send WG the consultants brief

Clarity of proposals, reading of proposals before being voted on, and amendment of minutes

Reasons to select and not select sites in a plan

Community benefit - affordable housing and village car park

Agreement that the Parish be asked if they want sites to be selected in plan

Suggestions for the format of the proposed consultation event and that the Parish are given information to make an informed decision.

Due process regarding site selection and rescinding of resolutions JMG Took away a the task to investigate JFG's statement

Meeting closed at 9:55