Neighbourhood Plan Meeting WEDNESDAY 14 OCTOBER 2020 19:30 hrs

Present: David Willingham (DW) Howard Hollands (HH)

Mark Hughes (MH) Robert Powers (RP)

Alan Routelodge (AR)

Notes: This meeting was conducted online using Zoom.

1. Minutes from the previous meeting on 16th September approved.

2. HH advised that BDC use PLACE to look at heritage as regards planning. HH confirming whether PLACE had done any work in the parish. DW advised that we also need to consider significant buildings, i.e. those thought to be important to parishioners but that remain unlisted. NPSC need to generate an initial list and then present these to the public for feedback and possible expansion of the list. AR has the beginning of a list. HH to continue investigating PLACE.

HH

- 3. DW had spoken to Jan Stobart (JS) of RCCE regarding concerns that some of the NP Objectives did not appear to provide a basis for forming policy. JS advised that the SNP objectives were fine and that both policy and action points could be derived from the objectives rather than policy alone. JS also advised that rather than trying to write policies ourselves, that we should engage a planning consultant. This would save SNP time as it is often the case that steering committees agonise over policy wording only for a planning consultant to radically change it. DW had emailed four planning consultants with a view to acquiring quotes in the near future. In addition to recommending a planning consultant, JS suggested that the NPSC might put together a 'policy framework' which could be sent over to the planning consultants. JS emailed an example framework which contained policy ideas and an action plan that would assist the consultant in producing the plan policies and actions.
- 4. There followed a discussion regarding how to proceed with the NP without being able to hold a public meeting to gauge feedback on work to date. It was suggested that the various lists and other elements of the evidence base were published to the website and then the public made aware through social media and local print media, namely the PC magazine and newsletter and asked for comment or to complete questionnaires. HH suggested that questionnaires could also be published in the PC publications. DW remarked that then the NP would be beholden to the PC printing cycle. DW to contact BDC asking for guidance on acceptable practices for progressing the plan while being unable to hold open meetings. BP suggested we should consider how any paper response to questionnaires should be received. Collection, mail, or posting to suggestion boxes or to the village hall were suggested as solutions.

5. DW stated that the NPSC should start to consider another grant application. Recent developments, namely the responses to the request for sites and the recommendation to use a planning consultant suggest that we will need funds to engage the consultant and possibly the Site Assessment technical package. Committee members should review the technical packages to see if there are that they think we should be considering.

ALL

6. Tony Dunn's response to the last NPSC letter was discussed. Consensus was that Mr Dunn's plans for building on his land are a personal project. At no point had Mr Dunn indicated that all or part of the land put forward would be offered up for development by other parties. It was decided to contact Jan Stobart of RCCE for further advice on the matter. DW to email JS.

DW

7. DW had found the community groups and businesses lists. Unfortunately there were no contact details for the community groups so these would need to be added. DW had drafted a letter for the both groups ready for distribution. DW to send business letters and also update community groups with contact details.

DW

- 8. MH advised that the Greenspaces map was ongoing. DW stated that since there was no open meeting planned, there was no pressure to get this done at present. At this point in the meeting, the issues with parking in Sarcel were mentioned. Two areas of greenspace outside the Greenfields housing have been identified as a potential site for extra parking spaces in an effort to alleviate parking congestion. It was questioned whether this area should be considered visually important space or greenspace. No conclusions.
- 9. Next meeting date agreed as 11 November 7:30pm.