

Steering Group Minutes

Purpose:	Monthly Review	
Date/Time:	Date: 29/06/2015 7:15pm	Venue: Reading Rooms
Attendees:	Chris Butchart, John Hunter, Rose Morris, Mike Sanderson , David Sewell, Dee Spencer , Steve Millward, Keith Risk (for PC)	
Apologies:	Emma Restall-Orr, (David Restall-Orr attended in her place), George Stepney	
	4 members of the Parish Council 5 Residents	

Agenda

1. Review and acceptance of previous month's minutes
2. Report from any Sub-group activity
3. Report on Street Champion activity
4. Draft Policies/Plans
5. Financial Review (costs incurred in period, and identification of any future required spend)
6. Monthly Communication Plan
7. 'AOB'
8. Questions/Suggestions from residents

Agenda Item: Review and acceptance of previous months' minutes **Presenter:** Chris Butchart

Discussion:

Chris opened the meeting, giving brief explanation of the reason for NPG meetings and agenda. Previous minutes were reviewed and agreed, these were for March, as due to change of PC, meetings had been temporarily suspended.

Conclusions:

Action items:	Owner:	Deadline:

Steering Group Minutes

Agenda Item: Report from any sub-group activity

Presenter: Various

Discussion:

N/A to this meeting

Conclusions:

Action items:

Owner:

Deadline:

Agenda Item: Report on Street Champion activity

Presenter: Rose Morris

Discussion:

Rose had spoken to 11 residents in her SC area briefly prior to the meeting in order to gauge residents feelings to the NP; the consensus of opinion was that they were satisfied with progress, understood the process, and knew when the meetings were. They had confidence in the steering group and the process.
One asked to have her email added to data base.

Conclusions:

Rose will ask her SC's to contact their residents and give feedback. David suggested that they were asked a few leading questions to ascertain their thoughts.
The SC's have also recently assisted in delivering leaflets on behalf of Tysoe Post Office, which is under threat of closure.

Action items:

Email SC's

Owner:

Rose

Deadline:

18/07/15

Agenda Item: Draft Policies/Plan

Presenter: CB, MS, JH

Discussion:

Steering Group Minutes

Much of the work has been suspended in the past few months whilst a new Parish Council has been established. The NP Steering Group awaits clear confirmation from the new Parish Council as to what direction and pace ongoing development of the plan needs to take.

Chris read out minutes from the last PC meeting in relation to the NP as below:

The Neighbourhood plan is presently in second draft form and the consultation period had ended. We can start another consultation process as we do not have to wait for the next version to be available. Cllr Collier said that the Simple English version had generated quite a lot of interest and suggested this version could be used by those wishing to comment if the consultation can be re-opened. Idea to be discussed with Chris Butchart.

PC needs to be very comfortable with where we are up to and what the different aspects of the plan mean. Cllr Risk felt that the PC should allow themselves a month between now and their next meeting to get completely familiarise with the NP.

Cllr Howles said that she was concerned about delaying the process any further. It could delay the whole thing until February 2016. If the NPG are at a stage that they can communicate the plan we should go forward with this. There are areas that we need to be more familiar with but this can be done without delaying the process.

Cllr Cressman said that to be fair the NPG said that they need another month before they would be ready to present to the council.

Cllr Risk said that he was not for a minute wanting to delay the process but the PC are being asked to sign off on things that he is not sure the PC as a whole is totally comfortable with. Cllr Risk suggested a 3 month period for the third and final version to be produced.

Cllr Cressman said that this was very similar to what Chris Butchart was proposing. Cllr Cressman said that the village needs to understand the plan and its contents when it comes to a referendum.

Cllr Littlewood wanted to make a point it is quite clear that there is a process and a timeline and we do not need to think about a further timeline for this plan until we have direction from SDC. It was suggested that Matthew Neale from SDC be asked to speak to the PC about the NP.

What we can do is refine version 3 which will have the corrections and the amendments and that can be done in parallel whilst consultations and communications are taking place.

Cllr Risk said he was giving the PC suggestions for timescales but also have in mind was that the NPG be asked to produce Version 3 although we do not know at this stage whether this will be the final draft or not. He suggested 3 months in part because a lot of people will be away over the summer.

Cllr Cressman said that she believed that the PC needs to ensure that what people are saying in the village is being communicated. Cllr Collier had read some other draft plans Kineton, Tattenhall and the plain English version of Tysoe's NP is very similar to Kineton's. If the consultation can be reopened it should be done using the plain English version. Cllr Cressman asked who had seen the plain English version.

Steering Group Minutes

Cllr Littlewood said that in his opinion he could not see why we could not go ahead with Version 3 but that the Plain English version should be communicated more widely.

Cllr Risk proposed that we allow one month for the PC to become more familiar with the current draft and we allow a further 3 month period to consider what the third draft says and at the October 5th meeting the final draft is ready for submission to Stratford. Cllr Littlewood said that if we leave it until October it will be July 2016 would be the earliest date we would have a NPG to protect the village. Cllr Collier and CC Seccombe said that from a planning perspective the NP would carry weight once it had been formally submitted to SDC. This may need to be checked. Cllr Cressman asked if her thinking was correct, that Chris Butchart had said that it would be 10 months and therefore 12 months is really not that much longer to wait.

Proposed that the PC give the NPG instruction to continue as rapidly as possible with the inclusion of the new consultation into version 3 and get this into a publishable state. At the same time the Plain English Version should be made available. Cllr Locke said that one of the things that concerned him greatly, having heard feedback from Tysoe Utilities Trust, that if they are considering offering land for development, this could alter our approach to other planning applications and in submitting early we are in danger of panicking. CC Seccombe said that if she could offer any advice it would be to say that it will the NP will not be approved unless it can be seen to have all aspects thoroughly covered. Furthermore it is important that anything within the NP is covered and all aspects of evidence based.

Cllr Allen said that he was concerned about some of the things that are in draft 2. We need to make sure that the evidence base is correct.

Cllr Collier added that it is the policies that require consultation.

Do need to speed up the process that it is very clear almost as an executive summary.

Getting consultation of the plain English Version.

Method and ways of communicating it to the village need to be improved.

Proposal by Cllr Risk and seconded by Cllr Locke, 5 Councillors voted in favour.

Cllr Collier raised an issue that had happened at the February 2015 meeting regarding the submission of the Neighbourhood plan to SDC. Cllr Collier was challenged in public that he had failed to submit the plan to SDC. The Clerk confirmed that Cllr Collier had sent the plan as agreed at the time.

Keith, Chris and Mike had met with Matthew Neale at SDC on 22 June. He had offered good information and practical help and had been asked to attend the next PC meeting to speak to the PC to explain the process, and their role.

Matthew was complimentary over the work so far and overall gave a positive feedback. He said that no area in the district has reached referendum stage as yet. Three areas were at checking stage, Kineton, Long Compton and Stratford Town.

Steering Group Minutes

John Hunter reminded us that at our last meeting in March, Version 2 had had the consultation period extended. The feedback and comments had now been added to the evidence base by Mike. Chris explained how the draft NP works, i.e. potentially multiple draft versions, until we consider we have reached a point where the majority of views and preferences have been captured, and the draft is ready for submission to SDC for checking. It is the PC that ultimately makes the decision to submit the draft plan to SDC for checking prior to independent examination and referendum.

One subject that was raised by Matthew Neal was that of Site Allocations and Neighbourhood Development Orders, with the suggestion that if the Tysoe NP was to identify and allocate specific sites within our NP Area for future development then this could reduce future cost and work, and eliminate the need for SDC to allocate sites in future. This is a key decision that ultimately rests with the PC to make – should the Tysoe NP allocate specific sites for development? We could do that on the basis of the August 2014 survey which would mean site allocations based on the Utility Trust and Roses Farm sites. The reason why the current draft of the NP favours Development Orders is that the owners of these sites may not be comfortable with being declared allocated.

We are now at a stage where we need to produce Version 3 which will incorporate all the material, comments up to this date. Given that we have already had two consultation periods on previous draft versions, Matthew Neal had suggested there is an option to run a restricted consultation once Version 3 is drafted, that would consult with the PC and main organisations prior to submission. Alternatively, we could go to full consultation, which may lead to a Version 4. Version 3 will include the Plain English Summary, Chris explained that the final version must incorporate all the technical information, mapping etc., but the summary would explain all the key points in easy to read summaries. Mike Sanderson is custodian of the Evidence Base.

Keith requested clarity on how resident's comments are used/interpreted in the evidence base.

What were subjective or non-subjective factors, how do we decide which comments/suggestions to incorporate in the plan, or to ignore? Chris suggested finding a way to make the full evidence base available to PC, but also highlighted that to date there had been few, if any, substantive conflicting preferences or suggestions made, with the vast majority of residents that have shared their views all seemingly wanting similar outcomes. The only exception he could recall was in relation to wind farms, where one or two residents had communicated that they felt they should be considered. Ultimately, not everyone will get everything they want from the NP. The challenge is to reflect the majority view and this will be tested by the referendum.

The minutes of the previous PC meeting contained a proposal that the Steering Group should be instructed to proceed with version 3 as rapidly as possible with a 3 month consultation period. Chris stated that until the PC had met and discussed the matter of Neighbourhood Development Orders (NDO) versus Site Allocations, there was only a limited amount of work that could be started. This will be discussed and hopefully decided upon at the next PC meeting. Our understanding is that if the NDO mechanism was chosen this would lead to future referendums outside of the NP process for each NDO that the PC were to make. This is an area that the PC could/should discuss with Matthew Neal when he visits.

Steering Group Minutes

SHLAA sites were identified by SDC in 2012, and residents had been asked to give their opinion and ranking in the NP Survey we issued in 2014. Richard Melton asked whether we should be canvassing local landowners at this point. SDC have repeated the SHLAA process since the NP Survey, again requesting landowners to offer up suitable sites for development. John Hunter explained that currently the draft NP would show where development is preferable but not the quantity of houses to be built in specific locations. Mike Sanderson explained that the policies within our NP could result in making certain sites less attractive to developers if certain criteria (relating to the sustainability of our community) had to be met.

Of the 2012 SHLAA sites, the Tysoe NP Survey had highlighted the Utility Trust Feoffee Farm site as the preferred SHLAA site for development.

The subject of Local Service Village (LSV) was raised. SDC has not clearly defined what the Tysoe LSV is. Environmental Impact Assessments under the EC Directive have only been carried out in Upper and Middle Tysoe, but the Core Strategy refers to an entity termed Tysoe. SDC has confirmed that the Tysoe NP should clearly define which areas of the parish are included in the LSV and Version 2 of the draft NP contains such a definition based on walking distance to the Village Store and Post Office. Chris Butchart highlighted that any houses built outside the LSV boundary within the period 2011 to 2031 will not count towards meeting our target of 51-75 new houses as set out in the initial version of the SDC Core Strategy. Also, that any areas of the parish (including Lower Tysoe) that fall outside the LSV would not be 'protected' from future development simply on the basis that they fall outside of a defined LSV boundary, although our current draft NP applies higher criteria for any such development. Such areas could still see unlimited development subject to the merits of such development being considered by SDC under existing planning process/regulations. Such development would be counted as "Windfall Development" and contribute to separate targets within SDC's core strategy. Chris Butchart expressed his view that it is beneficial to the whole village to be part of the LSV.

Chris asked if the PC could seek more information on Tysoe's classification of LSV which has previously be set partly linked to the number of school places in Tysoe Primary School. It is unlikely, but possible, that recent restructuring of the school could be considered a reduction in places, that may be able to drop down Tysoe LSV down a category, which would result in Tysoe having to build fewer dwellings by 2031. This currently stands at 84 based on the latest version of the SDC Core Strategy.

John Hunter would like to review the Ancient monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation areas in Upper and Middle Tysoe as well as looking at Lower Tysoe. It was noted that SDC hadn't reviewed the conservation areas since 2006. The Steering Group thanked John for this offer and asked him to proceed with the review which could produce some recommendations for the PC and NP Steering Group to consider.

Richard Melton suggested that there is an opportunity for residents to come forward with suggested sites and areas to develop, i.e. they may have paddock, small piece of land.

Conclusions:

Mike would be able to prepare draft for V3 in a week with 3 more weeks of examination by sub groups and PC.

Steering Group Minutes

This can't start until PC has decided on whether they want to use NDO or Site Allocations. Stephanie (PC) suggested the draft Version 3 be issued to the PC first before a decision on future consultation period or approach is made.

David Restall-Orr and Mike will continue mapping work.

We are to have a stand at the Tysoe Flower Show. This will be another great opportunity to share the work that has been done and answer questions on progress etc.

Action items:	Owner:	Deadline:
Book stand at Flower Show	DS	27/06/2015
Update website informing that V3 is being drafted	CB	27/06/2015
Update names and roles of steering group on website	DS	27/06/2015

Agenda Item: **Financial Review** **Presenter:** Dee Spencer

Discussion:

The balance of NP account remains the same at -£308.27

Keith reported that he and Jane Millward (PC Parish Clerk) had met to look at the application form for further funding of the NP. There were a number of questions that they were unable to answer, and Keith asked that Chris meet with PC to discuss.

Conclusions:

The first funding had been simple to apply for, whereas this application was more complicated, requiring more detailed information.

Action items:	Owner:	Deadline:
Meeting with PC to complete funding form	CB	11/07/15

Agenda Item: **Monthly Communication Plan** **Presenter:** CB

Discussion:

Steering Group Minutes

Communication has been stopped over last few months due to elections and change of PC.

Keith asked what exactly the Communication Plan was, Chris gave an explanation.

We needed to discuss what was coming up, what was on website, leaflet dropping, updating website. Keith asked who was responsible for this, at present this was done by Chris, Mike and Dee.

The website had not been updated recently as since version 2 of the draft plan, as it was unclear which direction we were going.

Keith and Beverly Cressman reported that they both had held individual sessions inviting residents local to them to attend and discuss the NP. They had been fairly well attended and received. Keith thought this idea could be rolled out across the village using some of the SC's, though it was felt that extra volunteers would be required to facilitate this idea.

Conclusions:

Action items:

Website to be updated

Owner:

Various

Deadline:

ASAP

Agenda Item:

AOB

Presenter:

CB

Discussion:

Keith asked what resources we were short of. A website manager was suggested. Also more help for the SC's.

Mike pointed out there are outstanding consultations, namely local farmers. Also the PC needs to consult with other PCs, particularly Kineton who share resources, e.g. school and doctors.

Conclusions:

Action items:

Seek extra assistance

Owner:

KR

Deadline:

25/07/15

David to contact Percy in order to progress consultation with farming community

DS

11/07/15

Steering Group Minutes

Agenda Item: Questions and Suggestions from members of the public **Presenter:** _____

Discussion:
 No questions or comments from public

Conclusions:

Action items:	Owner:	Deadline:
Meeting ended at 9.40pm. Next meeting is 27 th . July	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____