



Minutes of Steering Group Meeting – NDP

Monday 8th October 2018, 7.30pm

St Peter's Hall

In attendance:

Sarah Beggs	Rob Hunter	Keith Hardie	Paul Plowman
Steve George	Barbara Gratton	Peter Gratton	Rachel Underwood
Roger Townend	Brian Roe	Bill Bloxsome	

Apologies: David Smith

1. Declarations of Interests / Previous Minutes

There were no changes to the interests previously declared. The minutes of the last meeting were approved and signed by RH.

2. Examiner's Report and Revised NDP

We have now completed the examination phase. The examiner asked various questions which we responded to and she has produced her final report. It is now on HC's website and will also be posted on the PC's website. BB has produced an amended NDP to take into account the examiner's recommendations. Although they are called recommendations, we really don't have any scope to ignore the changes required by the examiner unless we fundamentally disagree with them because the examiner is saying that she will allow the plan to go forward to referendum if we make the changes suggested. Most of the changes are minor, but a couple require discussion.

In relation to policy PTS7 covering the protection of Peterstow common as local green space, the examiner wants to add some words at the end so that it provides that development on the common will not be supported "other than in very special circumstances". The reason behind this is that in planning terms, green belt is given the highest possible protection against development and yet even in relation to green belt, it isn't possible to say that there can't be any form of development in any circumstances, so we can't go further than this in relation to our green space. However, we have additional protection because the common is owned by the PC who are very unlikely to develop on it, and it is thought that under the law covering common land it is protected from development in any event. We also have additional protection for the common in other sections of our NDP, for example in the conservation area section. Having said this, the common is central to the village and its heritage and anything that might suggest that development on it is possible would be very unwelcome. We agreed, therefore, that **BB** would speak to HC and ask them to raise with the examiner whether we can change what she has suggested. If a form of words is absolutely necessary, then we would prefer it to be similar to what the examiner has suggested in her recommendation 15 for PTS18 (now PTS17), namely that development will not be supported except in "exceptional circumstances".

The examiner has suggested deleting PTS10 which covers traffic measures in the Parish. Whilst the inclusion of such a policy has been accepted in other NDPs, our examiner considers that it ought to be included as a community project instead. Consequently, this has been retained, but moved into section 11 which deals with delivering the plan. The section of the plan covering the CLEUD site has also been amended, as have the tables covering the housing numbers. This takes us above our

housing target but allows scope in case some sites aren't delivered or in case they have fewer houses on them than we provided for.

We then reviewed the proposed changes to the NDP. Most of these were uncontentious, but there was a concern that references to the village shop in PTS12 did not include references to the post office as well. **BB** will amend this. The maps also still need to be agreed. The examiner asked for the Wells Brook ecological corridor and protected views to be shown on the policies map, but HC do not want to do that as it isn't consistent with their other policies maps. They suggest putting them in as separate maps in the NDP and will issue a decision notice about this. **BB** will resolve any outstanding issues relating to the maps with HC. This will include getting the ecological corridor map produced by Hoople, the cost of which will be covered by our current grant.

Subject to the points raised above, the changes to the NDP were agreed unanimously by those present. As this included 4 members of the PC and other councillors had provided their approval by email, it was also approved by the PC such that it can now be forwarded to HC as our final Plan.

3. Next Steps

The examiner's report has now been published on HC's website which means that when the PC responds to two recent appeals against planning refusals in the Parish, it can refer to the fact that the examiner accepted that the proposed park homes count towards our housing target. It also means that our NDP will carry more weight now that it has passed the examination stage.

Once the revised NDP has been passed to HC they will trigger the referendum. This is a 6-week process run by the electoral services department. It is run like a local election and will take place on a Thursday. Postal and proxy votes are available in the same way as for a local election. As long as 50% plus 1 vote in favour of the NDP, it will be passed. There is no requirement for a minimum number of people to vote. However, it is important to get as high a turnout as possible so that everyone has their say. We will need to have large banners on display in the Parish publicising the referendum and will do a leaflet drop to each house giving details of how and when they can vote. We can also follow this up with house calls to check that people have received the information and to encourage people to use their vote. Once we know the date of the referendum, we will make the necessary arrangements either in a meeting or by email. We would like to get our referendum conducted before Christmas if at all possible.

4. AOB

- a) Data Protection – We have received a copy of Data Orchard's data protection policy, so we know that any data they handle on our behalf will be handled correctly in accordance with data protection legislation.
- b) Finances – We have a grant of £1,750 to take us to the referendum which ought to be enough for all the work we need to do.
- c) Traffic restrictions – It was noted that where the traffic lights are being installed in Much Birch, the speed limit is being reduced to 30 mph which provides a precedent which we can cite when trying to bring about a reduction in the speed limit through the village in the future.
- d) Next Meeting – to be confirmed.

There being no other business, the meeting closed at 8.24pm.