

Minutes of Steering Group Meeting – 19th Mar 2014

Meeting Date: 19th Mar 2014 - 7.00pm Village Hall, Park Place, Ashton Keynes

SG Attendees: Dave Wingrove (DW), Malcolm Carter (MC), Kevin Winstone (KW), Ernie Tidmarsh (ET), Keith Newman (KN), Geoff Winslow (GW),

SG Apologies: Terry Klee (TK), Mike Jackson (MJ), Chuck Berry (CB), Phil Moran (PM)

Other Refs: Simon Jefferson (SJ), Cotswold Community (CC), Neighbourhood Plan (NP)

Ref.	Public Attendees		
7.1.0	None		
Ref.	Approval of Minutes from the Last Meeting		
7.2.0	The Minutes from the previous Steering Group meeting (DocRef. AKNP-SG-Minutes-190214) were approved and will be listed on the AKNP website (www.ashtonkeynesneighbourhood.com)		
Ref.	Focus Group Updates		
7.3.0	Updates given by Steering Group Theme Leaders or by the Project Coordinator where provided.		
Ref.	Amenities Focus Group (AFG) Update	Who	When
7.3.1	<p>KW advised that a draft report had been created incorporating the assessment of the current amenities and the results of the amenities community survey. Objectives have started to be defined, and stakeholder consultations will be added.</p> <p>The AFG plan to meet again on 25th Mar to refine the report and conclusions, and to start work on the exhibition material for the Amenities theme.</p> <p>KW advised that the AFG is on track to have a vision and objectives by the end March.</p>	KW,PM	By End Mar 14
Ref.	Historic Conservation Focus Group (HCFG) Update	Who	When
7.3.2	<p>MC gave an update on the HCFG. A meeting was held on 10th March.</p> <p>The HCFG is making progress on its report, and this is being led by David Moss. The assessment of the character of the Parish, and in particular the listed buildings and notable properties, will be the basis of this report.</p> <p>The vision and objectives for the Historic Conservation theme are still be defined. In particular it has still not been decided whether non-listed building of notable character should be proposed for listed status.</p> <p>The Group are starting work on the material for the public exhibition and the format display.</p> <p>The HCFG are committed to having its vision and objectives defined by the end of March. The next meeting is set for the 24th March.</p>	MJ	By End Mar 14

Ref.	Economy Focus Group (EcFG) Update	Who	When
7.3.3	<p>This is now being led by MC with KN and TK offering to assist on reviewing information.</p> <p>The list of businesses started by SJ is being expanded to include all businesses from large company employers to the self employed.</p> <p>A survey has been created for businesses in paper and on the AKNP website. The intention is to have survey results for the public exhibition.</p> <p>Committed to having vision objectives and exhibition displays by 10th Apr.</p>	MC	By 10 th Apr 14
Ref.	Environment Focus Group (EnFG) Update	Who	When
7.3.4	<p>The last meeting was the 23rd Jan when version 2 of the draft objectives were proposed. Group members were asked to comment and suggest amendments to these objectives for the next meeting</p> <p>DW is planning the next meeting to progress the vision and objectives for the theme in readiness for the public exhibitions in April.</p>	DW	By End Mar 14
Ref.	Housing Focus Group (HFG) Update	Who	When
7.3.5	<p>MC gave an update on the HFG. The Group met on 18th March.</p> <p>TK has produced a 54 page draft report covering the existing housing mix, population statistics, and housing needs.</p> <p>A set of objectives have been proposed that need to be further refined.</p> <p>The HFG discussed the importance of the CC in it's findings. The idea of designating an area of land in CC as a Development Site was agreed. The FG wish have a succinct Statement from the PC on it's position re the Amita proposed development that can be referenced in the exhibition display for housing.</p> <p>The format for the exhibition displays was agreed to be centred on an A1 map showing potential housing sites with supporting survey data.</p>	TK	By End Mar 14
Ref.	Infrastructure Focus Group (IFG) Update (formerly Services)	Who	When
7.3.6	<p>The group last met on 17th March. KN has produced a draft report framework identifying the elements of the infrastructure and services. From discussion of the elements identified a selection of 4 meaningful objective headings were chosen to focus on.</p> <p>A stakeholder letter asking for plans for the next 5yrs and 10 yrs is to be sent to all identified significant stakeholders to form the initial evidence base for the Infrastructure theme.</p> <p>The stakeholder evidence and the main objectives will form the basis of the public exhibition displays. Community feedback will be sought from the public exhibitions via the combined survey for all focus themes so that an overall evidence base of objectives and aspirations can be logged.</p> <p>The group has started work on preparing the content and format of the public exhibition displays for the theme.</p>	KN	By End Mar 14

Ref.	Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) Update
7.4.0	<p>GW outlined the current status on the WCS examination. Discussions and exchanges of documents regarding aspects of the WCS continue, which may go on for several weeks yet.</p> <p>The proposition for an increase in housing for Wiltshire has been agreed taking the total number during the Plan period to 42,000, and increase of 5,000. This will be dealt with outside the WCS.</p> <p>To identify where this additional number will be sourced from a Site Allocation Plan is in development with WC Spatial Planning. A Housing Land Supply Statement document has recently been published with indicative disaggregation allocations to Regions of Wiltshire and Community Areas. The allocation to the Malmesbury Area excluded Malmesbury itself is 167 between 2014 and 2026. Using the population of each Parish MC calculated a pro-rata indicative number for Ashton Keynes as 17 dwellings between the period 2014 to 2026.</p>
Ref.	Consultant Support
7.5.0	<p>Members were asked for their views on the information circulated on three consultants that MC had discussions with and had received preliminary information from; Enfusion, Paul Weston, and URS. Members had not reviewed the information sufficiently to give an opinion or comment.</p> <p>MC asked for opinions on whether we need a comprehensive invitation to tender and a detailed requirements specification, or if we should use a simpler request for quotation and a requirements specification. Members had no opinions on whether a detailed RFQ/Tender is necessary, but held a common view that a scope of requirements is a priority before engaging in any further discussions, and that this would not become clear until after the public exhibition.</p> <p>MC explained that the need for consultant support will be for a Sustainability Appraisal /Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) and overall process guidance, and that this had been the basis of discussions with consultants so far. MC also explained that the basis of the NP grant that we had obtained was largely for consultant support and that the criteria for the application of grant support was directed mainly at consultant support as against community engagement and meeting costs, etc. Grant support money could not be used for capital purchases of equipment, exhibition stands, etc but could be used for publishing and printing costs.</p> <p>GW asked for cost information that the consultants had provided. This ranged from £350+vat/day, to £450/day vat exempt. GW thought this to be much higher than expected.</p> <p>GW stated the importance of getting a correct process for a NP in place early in its development rather than at a later stage which if proven unsuitable could result in a lot of rework should the approach taken, on scrutiny, not comply with NP regulations. Consultant support at an early stage should ensure that the development plan process will be correct for the purpose intended.</p> <p>GW confirmed that the timescale to use support grant money is typically 1 year, which if not used is then lost and must be repaid. MC also explained that quarterly reports on grant usage are needed.</p> <p>MC raised the point that a consultant will assist in guiding the development of key reports such as an SA/SEA Scoping Report by acting as a mentor and critical-friend but would not, for the available funding, create these reports for us. MC said that we therefore need to agree which SG members would be the main recipients of consultant support. MC offered to be one of the SG members, however, no agreement was reached at this time as to who else would be willing to be a recipient.</p> <p>MC said that he had applied to Locality for free Direct Support for the NP when the next round of resource allocation had opened on the 25th March. Unfortunately, the application was too late to be accepted, despite it being made online by 10.30am. Direct Support can be complementary to contracted support from a chosen consultant, or coordinated with a chosen consultant.</p>

7.5.0 (cont)	MC has been in discussion with Planning Aid who coordinate the free Direct Support on behalf of Locality and will liaise with them on the next opening of applications on the 1 st April. Planning Aid have expressed an interest in being involved with our NP which is considered an interesting case study. MC has been given a regional contact in Planning Aid to talk with regarding our needs for NP guidance and support in advance of any resources being provided.
Ref.	Development Site Allocation
7.6.0	<p>The proposal for a designated site or sites for housing development was discussed. There was much discussion about whether in fact we need to do this given the indicative number of 17 over 2014 to 2026 deduced from the Housing Land Statement . It was felt that this could be achieved from windfall development without designating sites.</p> <p>GW explained that a NP is a proposal for a Neighbourhood Development Plan which as such should propose positive community supported objectives for the development of the Parish. As a NP is primarily about land use and policy it is expected that site designation would form a main component of a NP.</p> <p>MC said that a development site designation is usually supported with a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and also a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) demonstrating how a site was selected as against other possible sites. This was supporting information that an examiner would expect to see.</p> <p>The range of SHLAA sites in the Parish was discussed but there was no agreement on considering any of these sites as designated development sites at this time. Further discussion on this topic is deferred until the next SG meeting.</p>
Ref.	Public Exhibition Planning
7.8.0	<p>MC presented the publicity material and the exhibition layout planning for the public exhibitions set for the 12th and 16th April. An action list for planning the exhibition was discussed giving timescales for presentation material to be created.</p> <p>It was agreed that the SG and FG's would assist in distributing flyers by door drops.</p> <p>GW agreed to provide display material for an overview of the status of the WCS and support for NP's. GW also advised that he would participate in the public exhibition if possible.</p> <p>DW expressed a view that we should have some proposals of significance to share with the community rather than just results from surveys. Whilst each FG will have its own vision and objectives to share, some important objectives will span FG themes and should be presented as part of the overall NP update display.</p>
Ref.	Date of Next Meeting
7.9.0	The date for the next meeting was agreed to be Thu 3rd April 2014 7.00pm at the Village Hall finish by 9.00pm.