

Stoke Golding Neighbourhood Development Plan Advisory Committee

**Minutes of the meeting (SGNPAC 29) held on 17th December 2018 in Stoke Golding
Methodist Church Hall**

| | | |
|-------------|---|--|
| | Committee Members Present: Jim Hope (JH) (Chair), Sarah Beale (SB), Ruth Fisher (RF), Rob Gaskin (RG), Bernard Lamb (BL), Kate McCreight (KM), Rachel Terheege (RT) and Mervyn Ward (MW) | |
| 29/1 | Apologies for Absence None | |
| 29/2 | Declaration of interest on items on the Agenda and dispensations When dealing with matters such as site allocation of future housing the committee needed to be transparent and declare an interest. For example, a committee member living near a proposed site or owning property near a site, should put this in writing to the Chair saying which site might affect them. The matter will be discussed at the next meeting of the committee, which then decides if this interest is to be noted or if the person concerned should not be involved when the item is discussed. This decision will apply throughout the series of meetings. SB stressed the declaration had to be in writing for dispensation to be given. JH as chair of the committee should write to the Chair of the Parish Council (PC). Even if an interest has been declared before, you should write in again. The likelihood is that everyone will be writing in. If the committee agrees to dispensation, then you can speak and vote on the matter. There were no matters on tonight's agenda where an interest had to be declared. | |
| 29/3 | To confirm the previous minutes of 3rd December Apart from altering the next meeting date to 17 th December the minutes were accepted as a true record and signed. | |
| 29/4 | Matters arising from previous decisions of the NPAC not covered by the agenda | |

| | | |
|-------------|---|--|
| | None | |
| 29/5 | <p>Planners</p> <p>The SHELAA has been released by HBBC. It can be viewed on the HBBC website. There are detailed appraisals of each site. These descriptors need to be looked at closely as there appear to be inaccuracies. Any errors can be discussed with HBBC. RG volunteered to look at the descriptors. If anyone spots any anomalies, they should send a note of them to RG. BL also looking and feeding any information to RG. JH thanked them for doing this.</p> | |
| 29/6 | <p>Consultants update</p> <p>The PC said that 3 quotes were needed before consultants can be approved. As Planit X was one of the original 3 consultants who submitted bids, advice was needed about the need to get an up to date quote from the other consultant, "Your Locale". Their quote would be lower because they would be more "hands off". RT said that the committee must consider what's best for NPAC. BL said that the committee was happy with all aspects of Planit X. MW suggested writing some bullet points about what was offered by Planit X and Your Locale and costs. This would assist NPAC and the PC to reach a decision.</p> <p>SB had received an email from Locality. The extra £8,000 of funding would not be available to this committee. It is only available if a housing site is not in the SHELAA allocation. JH said we would be £6,000 adrift. So far only £2,000 spent in 3 years. Planit X can work with what we have available,</p> | |
| 29/7 | <p>Consultation Subcommittee</p> <p>The Consultation Subcommittee (JH, MW, BL, RT, RG and Alan White (AW) is currently working on housing requirements and evaluation criteria, Stage 1 of process AW established based on Locality guide. This is a huge amount of work and needs input from consultant. MW said that the work done meant they could propose criteria and numbers but now needed consultant input.</p> <p>They have looked at Brigstock criteria to see if there is anything generic (48 pages). How many criteria are required?</p> | |
| 29/8 | <p>A vision for Stoke Golding</p> <p>What do we want SG to be like in 2036? JH said the Sheepy plan suggested the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unique character of village preserved • development reflects local needs • important views and valued landscapes are protected | |

| | | |
|------|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a prosperous local economy • character and beauty of Countryside preserved • important green spaces protected and added too • accessible countryside • local services and facilities preserved and improved • keeping pace with communication technology • new development enhances character of village • reduce traffic • maintain biodiversity • reduce carbon footprint <p>It was suggested some of the broad areas like carbon footprint are controlled by government and can't be influenced solely by small village communities.</p> <p>MW said that the Vision must have a strong evidence base. From evaluating the non-survey data RG put forward this vision: - Stoke Golding to remain a small village separated from its neighbours. It has diversity of building to support a good demographic spread of people and has retained a village centre at its heart. Green spaces and walkways have been protected. People like living in Stoke Golding where it is peaceful, safe and rural.</p> <p>MW's and BL's evaluation of the completed survey is telling them what the village wants. SB added that maintaining a sense of community was important. SB and RT stressed the need for evidence to back up the vision statement</p> <p>MW said the vision statement need only be 3 or 4 lines, then followed by the strategic objectives. He also said that the subcommittee was only looking at development, particularly related to housing. An evaluation was also needed of the other elements of the survey and consultation with groups – the infrastructure and services</p> <p>RG felt that so much could be gleaned from the survey and consultations that the only survey required now was the consultation on site allocation for housing.</p> <p>Some policies need to be worked on following feedback from HBBC.</p> <p>Re-iteration of need to look at non-development elements of the residents' survey and consultation of groups.</p> | |
| 29/9 | Whether to continue with public participation as currently allocated within the agenda or to invite participation after each item | |

| | | |
|--------------|---|--|
| | SB said that as a Subcommittee of the PC it was bound by the PC rules. There is one place on the agenda for public participation. | |
| 29/10 | Public Participation – to consider any comments or questions by the public on items on the agenda Resident 1 said that public consultation after every item would make the meeting too long. Resident 2 concurred. Resident 2 approved of the use of the consultant. It would make better use of the committee’s time. Then the committee was thanked by resident 2 for their commitment and for the work done so far. RT thanked subcommittee as well. | |
| 29/11 | To receive and consider such communications as received by the Chairman Already mentioned - the SHELAA, Feedback from Brigstock, email from Locality to SB and proposal from “Your Locale”. | |
| 29/12 | To consider items needed to be brought to the public’s attention The agenda, minutes etc are available to read on the Stoke Golding website. RF had amended the timeline for SGNPAC. | |
| 29/13 | To consider future agenda items Vision, Writing Plan and Reviewing Policies. | |
| 29/14 | Date of next meeting 7 th January at 7pm. Apologies RF. The meeting closed at 8.32 pm. | |
| | 4 Residents attended | |

MATTERS FROM WHICH THE PUBLIC AND PRESS MAY BE EXCLUDED None