

Stoke Gabriel Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Draft minutes of the meeting held at the village Hall, Stoke Gabriel on Wed 19 October 2016

In attendance

Peter Fenwick (Chair), Paul Bedford, Michael Webster, David Watts, Chris Roach, Tony Rowe, Richard Tully and Charles Reaves.

1. Apologies John Robinson and Richard Harris
2. Minutes of 21 September confirmed as accurate and approved
3. Matters arising
 1. **AP1 (September) outstanding, PF to review**
 2. Agenda items 4 - Project Plan Update - **PF to update and provide a simpler version AP1**
 3. Agenda item 5 - when notes received from SHDC **PF to circulate AP2.** [Expected soon]
4. Feedback Event

40 people attended and a number of further comments and feedback were received
Feedback presentation book to be placed in The Gallery shop, the parish church and the Church House Inn as well as a copy of the website.

DW offered the following remarks:

To observe SHDC on their progress to satisfy local plan - if they fail a problem for us
Their view may be too simplistic. We have to convince the Examiner.

There is no need for us to wait for SHDC and the Joint Local Plan (JLP)

Proposals contribute to NPPF. Process driven and required by Examiner

Spend time on the process and that it is being followed properly.

Must have regard to Government Policy

Constantly review this as each plan is different

Examiner is required to see that Basic Conditions are achieved, not what the plan is

Need to evidence how we do it. An e.g. - Need to evidence approval for NP Group

Standard questions to address, eg not going against European matters such as

Greater Horseshoe Bats

Anticipate SHDC will assist in us meeting the Basic Conditions.

Need to consider Strategic Environmental Assessment when we have a broad idea

SEA is under Sustainable Assessment that considers Social Economic and

Environmental

Although NP is not expected to undertake SA we will need to look at it when

considering Social Economic and Environmental

SEA then EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment) then HRA (Habitat Reg. Ass)

Independently and in combination where they affect protected species, significant effect then HRA if not, the plan fails.

SA embraces SEA but not the other way round - but need to address SA and demonstrate evidence all the way through screening opinion or scoping report.

Is this Nick's forte? Screening opinion proposals from Natural England, Environmental Agency and Historic England. Scoping report is how you assess.

Do not reply upon SHDC - make sure you understand it - and start early

Consider development or potential development sites.

Refer to PPG, Government guidance - unlikely to need SA if no development but if some, regardless of how few, SA and try to keep it simple

We will be considering for the future. SHDC must prove what they are doing

We need to explain and note

- what we gave them
- what they said
- what notice we took of it

- need to evidence what notice we took of the comments on the day (PF states 3 comments and 2 feedback)
- if quality rather than quantity - tell it as it is

What is missing is what do we want Stoke Gabriel to look like in 25 years time
DW suggested getting people to state a vision for SG and limited to just 10 words

Ideas on how to deal with feedback

Evidence how you responded to comments
Left hand side, comments and right hand side our response - good quick evidence
How you considered the comments, who you consulted, what they said, what you did.
eg. if you want to retain Village Hall, why should there be a change. Basic Condition test
If comments are not within NP then exclude
Consider that NP is land use driven. eg. Parking as offsite parking can be considered.
Recognise matters to go forward in other ways, keep positive
As a starting point, record what was said and your response
Comments may drive provision for the future although not for NP today
Decide what the community is trying to achieve
Number the items identified

Suggestion of using social media to encourage views from other age groups

DW recommends that Slaugham 2014 is read to see what details are required. See:

http://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/76349/slaughamparishneighbourhoodplan_examiners_report_final.pdf

This example showed evidence did not support proposals, stage 1 was skipped.

Reading the Examiner's report will identify the minefield of a NP.

AP3. PF. Identify one feedback to analyse. Is it likely to convince Independent Examiner that it addresses the comment?

5. Joint Local Plan status and workshop notes

PF states that housing numbers are expected from SHDC soon. Methodology used will be asked to see if there are inconsistencies between distribution and criteria to assess. To look for warning signs and establish if SHDC are overlapping.

6. Next steps - To complete feedback carefully before moving on.

7. Project Plan Fund

Income £7,701, expenditure £6,793.64 surplus £907.36

May need more funding but requirement to spend by end of March 17

AP4 PF and JR Review cost plan

8. Any other business

Protection of Green Spaces

Use 2008 Parish Plan and identify areas around the village, is it supported or do a swap

Local green space - what can or cannot be included see NPPF para 76/78 and PPG which is a description of what is allowable, see South Gloucester Council.

[https://consultations.southglos.gov.uk/gf2.ti/f/589314/15634277.1/PDF/-](https://consultations.southglos.gov.uk/gf2.ti/f/589314/15634277.1/PDF/-/LGSD_Updated_Guidance_Note_June_2015.pdf)

[/LGSD_Updated_Guidance_Note_June_2015.pdf](https://consultations.southglos.gov.uk/gf2.ti/f/589314/15634277.1/PDF/-/LGSD_Updated_Guidance_Note_June_2015.pdf)

Criteria given on how to identify sites and how is it demonstrably important to local community

Traffic Impact

NP and the regard to traffic impact. Any conditions will take precedent over SHDC. eg traffic impact when building at different sites within village due to one main road in and out and narrow walled road and pedestrians in a tourist area. School children and local parking are concerns as the roads get busy at times.

9. Next meeting - Wednesday 16 November 7pm Village Hall

Meeting ends 20:30