

# Kimble NP Working Group Meeting: Minutes

Date 19/09/2018

Time: 7.30 pm

Venue: Kimble Stewart Hall

**WG Attendees:** Delia Burton, James Cripps, Tom Dixon, James Good, Alun Jones, Sue Howgate, Robert Martin, Gerald Redding, Tim Shirra, Zeena Shirra, David Williams

Invited visitors: Neil Homer

Apologies: Iona Mackinnon, Roger Howgate

Attendees from public: Rick Everly

Early departure: Tom Dixon apologized that he needed to leave the meeting early, at approx. 20.30 and James Cripps who left at approx.. 21.30. The meeting finished at circa 22:10

	AGENDA ITEM	Minutes
1.	Welcome, introductions	NH was welcomed to the meeting, as was a member of the public, identifying himself as Rick Everly, who declared he was attending to listen to the proceedings, without specific questions.
2.	Minutes of last meeting	Approved
3.	Conflicts of interest: updates	No changes indicated
4.	Feedback from WDC Exam	The WG thanked JC for having circulated a summary of the WDC meeting he and NH had attended on behalf of the WG. NH confirmed it was a good and fair summary of the meeting.
5.	RUR6 Changes	<p>Discussion happened around the latest version of the RUR6 changes and there was agreement that the definition of the villages was clearer in the latest draft. Discussion was also had around pros and cons of using the format /definitions of 'small site' from the latest National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>The public visitor questioned whether site owners amongst the WG should be engaged in discussions which might ultimately affect site allocation decisions. It was explained that the WG has an agreed Conflicts of Interest policy, where WG site owners are required to declare their interest, with any changes in such interest being reported at each WG meeting. Additionally, WG site owners are not allowed to vote on matters related specifically to their site(s) or participate in discussions concerning them, save at the discretion of the WG, to provide information concerning such sites.</p> <p>An action was agreed by WG members to consider and give their approval or non-approval to the latest RUR6 draft by the end of the week. <i>Update following meeting: support was expressed by email from GR, SH, DW, TS, ZS. DB, TD and JG. RM had given his approval subject to comments he had made being addressed by NH. No opinion had been received to that point AJ. RH indicated he did not support the wording. JC had expressed contentment at the meeting with the revised RUR6 (including the binding notes as to interpretation).</i></p>
6.	Pre-sub NP Policies Draft	NH walked WG members through a draft of the policies he is recommending, stressing that the number of policies in terms of Neighbourhood Planning best practice should not really exceed those presented, or if so, carefully considered so as not to risk diluting the impact of their collected sum. The WG agreed an action to review, consider and feed back as soon as reasonably possible. It was noted that, where possible, such material should be made available to the WG as soon as it is available, in order to give adequate time for people to read and consider prior to WG meetings.

7.	Other pre-sub NP sections	NH gave a very helpful overview of the typical contents of the other sections of the Neighbourhood Plan, indicating those that would be prepared by him/his team, and those that would be based on input from the WG. The key one of these will be section 4, a 2-page (target size) section describing the community engagement activities, which the WG would draft, following an example to be provided by NH. In considering section 6 (additional matters not contained in the specific policies in section 5), it was recommended that WG members review the Bledlow NP again as a useful example.
8.	SA / SEA	NH reported that Aecom have been sent everything required to carry out their task, and that currently there was nothing to indicate they would not complete this within the target time of the next 3 weeks. It was agreed that it would be a good idea if Aecom could be persuaded to carry out a 'walkaround' of the local area so they could truly understand the local issues and challenges related to landscape, pedestrian / cycling access etc. JG to contact Aecom re Parish walk about and confirming timing of report release.
9.	Project Timetable	NH presented the latest updated plan, drawing out key dates, the next of which is to prepare a pre-submission draft of the NP in time for the Parish Council meeting on November 14 <sup>th</sup> . If approved, this would be followed by a 7-week consultation running to early January, followed by a proposed preparation of a final submission version for approval by the PC in mid-Feb.
10.	Marsh Rd Action Group	It was agreed that JG would invite this group, or representatives thereof, to a subsequent WG meeting.
11.	Site owner discussions	It was agreed NH would recommend a sequence of actions.
12.	AOB	None raised.
13.	Next meeting	Agreed as October 17 <sup>th</sup> , at KS Hall, commencing 7.30 pm.