

**Stoke Golding Neighbourhood Development Plan Advisory Committee**

**Draft Minutes of the meeting (SGNPAC 28) held on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2018 in Stoke Golding  
Methodist Church Hall**

	<b>Committee Members Present:</b> Jim Hope (JH) (Chair), Sarah Beale (SB), Ruth Fisher (RF), Rob Gaskin (RG), Bernard Lamb (BL), Kate McCreight (KM), (RT) and Mervyn Ward (MW)	Tasks allocated
28/1	<b>Apologies for Absence</b> Rachel Terhege (RT)	
28/2	<b>Declaration of interest on items on the Agenda</b> None	
28/3	<b>To confirm the previous minutes of 15<sup>th</sup> November and 19<sup>th</sup> November 2018</b> The minutes were approved and signed.	
28/4	<b>Matters not covered by the agenda</b> Subcommittee meeting to develop site allocation criteria. Alan White (AW) produced project flow chart which gave a good steer. BL and MW looking at the responses to housing in the questionnaire, whilst RG and AW are looking at responses of the various groups. Next meeting will take place on 12 <sup>th</sup> December at RT's house. MW said that they need to find out what sort of scale of development and what criteria to use.	
28/5	<b>Consultant</b> JH welcomed Colin Wilkinson (C) a consultant from Planit X and planning adviser to the Rural Community Council (RCC). To start he asked him to go through the proposed project with the committee. C said his plan followed the usual neighbourhood plan (NP) steps. There may be some steps in place already. Of the 11 steps the latter steps, 8 to 11, are outside our control as these steps are arranged by HBBC. – consultation, independent examiner and referendum. HBBC is also responsible for the funding of these.  So, focus on the early steps. Step 1 -are the basics in place? Utilise a traffic light system with green representing something that has been completed and red something not started. Step 2 is green, completed in 2016. Already finding out what community wants. What is missing is identification or not of housing sites. Starting point is a good understanding of the supply, what are the constraints, what is the infrastructure and what is expected. This needs to be discussed with HBBC. If there is a need to find sites, appraise sites, test against framework and consult community.  JH asked about mapping requirements. C said mapping used to show limits, areas for protection, areas of biodiversity and to identify sites. PC has licence to use OS maps. Must present information on a single map, called a policies map. MW asked if there was anything you had to have or expect to have. C said that you would expect to have protection of heritage and biodiversity. There may be some unique things which you would want protected.  MW said that they were looking for an ideal template/role model in plans already in the public domain. C said start from scratch. What are the key areas your community expects you to cover? What is the priority. For example, it might be to protect the identity of the village or to protect the gap between village and the urban area. So, each plan has common components, but covers what would be expected by the village. If you follow someone else's plan you may cover what you don't need and miss issues that are key. What do you want to include. Put it in a list of priority.  RG said that people seem happy with what they have and don't want loads of	

development. C replied that we all start off with no development, so what is reasonable for Stoke Golding. Look at other things. What are the housing needs of the community. Is it bungalows for the elderly? Affordable houses for the young? What is the state of the housing market? What is the capacity of the school?. These things give a picture of needs. Take this to HBBC. They will probably come to some conclusion, but your evidence base will probably be superior to theirs.

C said some NPs have an obvious housing allocation if a brownfield site is available.

MW said there is no brownfield site available and no small sites available.

C said then not to overload sites. Understand the landowner's intentions. Does this match what you want?

C said that you must convince the land owners of alternative housing sites, who haven't been selected.

MW said we might have to wait for an indicative number, which C thought would come next year. Asked by RG if we can defend site selection, C said they could if they showed a robust process for the selection of a site. Do we need to include reserve sites? No, was the response, but if you have a lot of interest in building you may want to. However, if you meet the allocation there is no need for reserve sites. The advantage of allocating housing sites is that it stops speculative housing with builders saying you haven't built your quota. You only get protection if you have designated a site.

What is the timescale? 2021 seems a long way off. Had hoped for earlier completion.

C said that we aren't in control of all the stages. There is a statutory requirement to consult for 6 weeks. MW asked if submitting gives any protection against speculative development. C said only after the Independent examination and being passed by referendum does the NP really bite.

MW said that another 2 years seemed a long time, when a team had been working on it for three years already. C said that the decision processes are lengthy. Could the consultation be reduced to three months and the plan be written in the three months prior to this? C replied that it wasn't realistic if you are going to come up with housing sites. Every NP group is over optimistic about the time scale.

C said he would hope to attend their meetings. He would take on responsibility for things like Equalities Impact Assessment.

JH discussed cost and funding. Consultation costed at £15,000. Charges £65 per hour. £9,000 is available from locality. An extra £8,000 if allocating a housing site. An Awards to all grant might be available, but none earmarked for NPs. Locality money should be enough and should cover printing.

Section 14 consultation only requires a summary to be sent out with hard copies of the full report available to view or available online. The online questionnaires involve a lot of extra work. RCC will help says RG.

C asked if we had a Village Design Statement (late 80s/90s). This could secure a second tranche of money. You can allocate a SHELAA site for housing.

JH asked the committee if all questions had been asked. They said yes. JH asked residents if they had questions.

A resident said we have done a survey. Does this give us a head start? It does help, C replied. You must be careful that you don't get a totally different result on housing sites from another survey, because people know the outcome of the first survey and change their preferences.

On a different point the resident had read that we have met our housing requirements up to 2026. Could we then allocate an increase in housing after 2026. C said you can't control timing. If allocate a number, they may build straightaway.

Someone asked if villages can do anything to counter building proposals. C thought

	<p>many big decisions are already taking place. Developers talk to HBBC. It is difficult for communities to engage at this level.</p> <p>C then left the building. The committee agreed that they needed support. MW approved of having a consultant but didn't agree with the steps. Suggested more discussion about the steps and putting a cap on how much money is spent over a period. Discussion to take place at next meeting.</p>	
<b>28/6</b>	<p><b>Meeting Dates</b></p> <p>SB suggested bringing forward the meetings in the new year to start 7<sup>th</sup> January instead of the 14<sup>th</sup> as initially proposed. There will be no meetings on official Bank holidays. This was agreed.</p>	
<b>28/7</b>	<p><b>Approval of new member/s of subcommittees</b> None</p>	
<b>28/8</b>	<p><b>Public participation</b> -see 28/5</p>	
<b>28/9</b>	<p><b>To receive and consider such communications as received by the Chairman</b></p> <p>JH will email out to the committee comments received from the planning department on policies to date.</p>	
<b>28/10</b>	<p><b>To consider items needed to be brought to the public's attention (AOB)</b></p> <p>None</p>	
<b>28/11</b>	<p><b>To consider future agenda items</b></p> <p>See 28/5</p>	
<b>28/12</b>	<p><b>Date of next meeting;</b> 16<sup>th</sup> December 2018 at 7pm. The meeting closed at 9pm.</p>	
	<p><b>7 Residents attended</b></p>	