

Minutes of Steering Group Meeting – 2nd Oct 2014

Meeting Detail: 2nd Oct 2014 - 7.30pm 3 Four Acre Close, Ashton Keynes, SN6 6PJ

Attendees: Dave Wingrove (DW), Malcolm Carter (MC), Kevin Winstone (KW), David Moss (DM), Margaret Cooper (MCp), Geoff Winslow (GW), Tom Cole (TC)

Apologies: Terry Klee (TK), David Carlisle (DC), CL (Catherine Loveday)

Other Refs: Neighbourhood Plan (NP), Focus Group (FG), Planning Aid (PA), Cotswold Community (CC)

Ref.	Public Attendees
12.1.0	<p>No members of the public attended.</p> <p>Welcome and introduction to Tom Cole of URS.</p>
Ref.	Approval of Minutes from the Last Meeting
12.2.0	<p>The Minutes from the previous Steering Group meeting (DocRef. AKNP-SG-Minutes-030714) were approved and will be listed on the AKNP website (www.ashtonkeynesneighbourhood.com)</p>
Ref.	Draft Scoping Report Review
12.3.0	<p>MC previously circulated a working draft document of a scoping report with sustainability appraisal for review and feedback from the Steering Group.</p> <p>GW said it looked good and was about 90% complete. It was suggested that some fine tuning and additional references could be included on; Infrastructure, Economy, and CC. It was also suggested that links to the latest WCS exam 39, and reference to the Malmesbury NP would be useful.</p> <p>TC said it was a very good basis to move forward, with a strong evidence base. It was better than a lot he had seen, and was 95% complete in his opinion. We should be ready now to move forward to creating policies.</p> <p>KW said it looks impressive from what he had read.</p> <p>MCp said it looked good but had some missing bits, notably Infrastructure and HCFG objectives.</p> <p>DM thought it was a very impressive report.</p> <p>DW though it was very good. He suggested a change to the Amenities vision to be based around a new village hall and community hub.</p>
Ref.	Preparing Plan Policies
12.4.0	<p>MC had previously circulated to the Steering Group a guide from Locality on writing planning policies for review and feedback.</p> <p>GW said lots of other groups were referring to it for guidance.</p> <p>MC clarified that there was important linkage to the scoping report and that the policies would describe how the objectives of the scoping report and draft NP would deliver the plan.</p>

Ref.	Preparing Plan Policies (continued)
12.4.0 (cont)	<p>It was agreed that each FG should come up with their own policies and that the Steering Group would then discuss them and decide which are real and deliverable policies that should go into the draft NP.</p> <p>It was agreed that some external support would be helpful in understanding how policies should be created and particularly what policies we should be creating. The direct support agreement with Locality already identified this as plan development and writing support. CT of Planning Aid will be on maternity leave from 24th October and has co-ordinated with Locality and URS to have direct support delivered by URS.</p> <p>GW suggested a brainstorming session with all FG members could arrive quickly at an outcome that could be used to decide which policy ideas are relevant to our draft NP.</p> <p>DW suggested that maybe URS could help in facilitating this session. TC felt that this would be possible. MC advised that the agreement with Planning Aid listed this topic as a subject for direct support.</p> <p>MC suggested that a task leader was needed to amalgamate the chosen policies by theme into a draft plan framework. No members agreed to undertake this task.</p>
Ref.	Site Allocation Process
12.5.0	<p>MC explained the process needs to show linkage with the scoping report sustainability objectives and also the draft plan policies. It was suggested that this process should be started as soon as possible and that community engagement would be essential in building on the existing evidence base. A site allocation proposal would form a key part of the draft plan and would need to be supported by a clearly defined policy and assessment rationale.</p> <p>DW proposed an idea based upon an existing SHLAA site as an enabling development that would fund the provision of a new village hall on an alternative site. This was debated and the conclusion was that the community feedback was supportive of improving the village hall on the existing site, and that any variation from this would need to be put to the community as a consultation in some form before it could be considered.</p>
Ref.	Next Steps
12.6.0	<p>There is a need to find a task leader for drafting the Plan and incorporating the agreed policies. MC agreed to support this task but not lead it. (action: All SG to consider possibilities)</p> <p>There is a need to find a task leader to plan the next community engagements; a workshop on policies and site selection, consultation survey, and exhibition consultation on draft plan when ready for review. MC agreed to support this task but not lead it. (action: All SG to consider possibilities)</p> <p>A workshop session on writing policies facilitated by URS is to arranged as soon as possible. The objectives is to involve all SG and FG members and to arrive at an agreed list of potential policies to refine for the draft plan. MC agreed to coordinate with URS on dates for this event . (action: MC)</p>
Ref.	Date of Next Meeting
12.7.0	A date for the next meeting is to be agreed if possible before the end of Oct.