

## Minutes – SSDC / NPWG – 20<sup>th</sup> July, 2017

10:35 meeting started

### **Attendees:**

#### **South Somerset District Council (SSDC)**

David Clews (DC)

Jo Manley (JM)

#### **East Coker Parish Council Neighbourhood Planning Working Group (NPWG)**

Bridget Sugg, Parish Chairman (BS)

Sandra Snelling, Parish Councillor and NPWG lead (SS)

Paula Hodge, Parish Councillor (PH)

Gillian Macpherson, Clerk (GM)

Barrie Hartley, Councillor (BH)

**Footprint Futures:** Simon Williams (SW)

The meeting started with introductions.

The NPWG and SW introduced themselves. David Cluse has been a planner for 30 years, 12 of which was with SCC. He was made redundant and recently joined SSDC to help with local policy work, including NP. He hasn't worked directly with NP before, other than recently in connection with the Wincanton Neighbourhood Plan. Jo Manley took over from Jo Wilkins and is the point of contact. She is involved with community consultations and hasn't been involved with NP's before.

SW gave an update to regulation 14 and noted that there had been a surprising amounting of responses. NPWG are going to do a health check before regulation 15. The plan has been a 3 year project and the NPWG feel it needs to move on to the Health Check then proceed to regulation 15. The NP should go for the health check in a month and the turnaround should be 6 weeks, so hopefully regulation 15 by the end of October. DC has forms from the Wincanton NP regulation 15 consultation that can be recycled. It was noted that the current South Somerset team has not coordinated a NP at regulation 15 stage before. DC commented that if a health check was to be undertaken, then in his view it would be beneficial for the consultation report and basic conditions statement to be submitted with the plan, so that the health check examiner had the full picture.

DC noted that the Local Plan Consultation views, expected October – December, will be used by the examiner when looking at ECNP. He also commented that the evidence for the plan needed to be expanded or made more apparent and the HELAA and SHMA of October 2017 should be referred to. DC did not agree entirely with the housing assessment, JM commented that all groups need to work together and that the examiner will be made aware of the differences. The examiner's decision is final, although there is some confusion on SSDC's part as to if the NP has to then go back to their Committee for formal approval before the referendum. **Action:** CD to clarify and advise and SW to also check up on the current regulations.

It was noted that the ECPC NP website page needs updating. It was agreed that SW would now complete the Consultation Document with links into the chronology listed documents on the website being provided.

**Action:** SW. Old documents, although not relevant, but still evidence should go onto another 'archive' page. The NP pages need updating **Action:** SS/Clerk

JM asked if NPWG wanted additional comments, SW advised that the NP group now wished to progress to the next stage of the Plan process, with any further SSDC comments being provide at Regulation 15 stage.. DC suggested larger plans for the green space and JM agreed to provide OS Plans for this purpose. SW to liaise with JM.

Views and Vistas were discussed. DC noted that there was little suggestion if the view was near or long range. He asked if it was possible for small maps with further pictures to show the detail. SW noted that examiners would wish to see all proposals illustrated on the main Proposals Map but that smaller maps can be included in the plan to show the detail. **Action:** JM to send OS maps to NPWG.

JM asked about the evidence for Employment and it was pointed out that the outcome of the business survey is summarised within the Plan document. However the survey needs to go onto the website and this is also referred to in the Consultation Statement: **Action:** SS/Clerk.

DC asked for a 'key' for the pictures within the green space section with cross reference to the Proposal Map. **Action:** NPWG. DC commented that any 'assumptions' in Appendix A need to be justified, to explain the basis for the assumption. JM asked about the methodology for the housing section and BH confirmed that the latest HEELA and SHMA had been taken into account and also noted that ONS do not publish Parish level of data.

On asking for comment on the plan by PH in general, DC in response said that he would give it an 'amber' light and SSDC, did not express any serious concerns regarding the content of the latest NP at the meeting.

JW / DC left the meeting 11:30

It was agreed for SW to continue with the consultation document and JWdd would prepare a draft of the Basic Conditions statement. The evidence on the website should be colour coded in line with planning land use colours. **Action:** SW to provide an estimate *[These elements are already included within the latest cost estimate which was provide a few weeks ago. It just means that the work will be brought forward and be done, at least in draft, sooner than planned, rather than leaving until after the health check.]* SW to also send Clerk the colour coding for each land use; housing etc. .

BS suggested looking at the NP for Trull, near Taunton which has been 'made'..

SS was asked SW for estimated time frames for the plan from now on and advised aqs follows:

Mid-August, 2017 – NP to NPIERS (Health Check)  
Early October 2017 – Amended plan to SSDC  
November 2017 – Regulation 15 consultation  
February 2018 – NP to examiner (expect lots of questions, which will go through SSDC to NPWG)  
Further procedures leading to Referendum in Spring