

# BARNWELL NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN WORKING PARTY (NDPWP)

## Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> February 2021 via ZOOM at 7.00pm

**Present:** H Hanlon (Chair), T Herring, S Utley, J de Bock , G Wise. H Veegar, B Pallash (Vice Chair), W de Bock, J Croser

**In attendance:** N Phillips (Parish Clerk), C Wilkinson (Consultant Planit-x)

<b>1</b>	<p><b>Meeting forum acknowledgment</b></p> <p>Given the situation with Covid it was not practical to publicise this as a formal meeting to the broader public and is as such considered an informal full Working Party meeting.</p>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Welcome &amp; introduction</b></p> <p>HH thanked all for attending</p>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Approval of minutes of meeting on Thursday February 4<sup>th</sup> 2021</b></p> <p><b>Resolved:</b> To add J Croser to the list of attendees</p>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Discussion with C Wilkinson (<i>please refer to attached sheet for questions asked</i>)</b></p> <p><b>Site Criteria Assessment</b></p> <p><b>(Q1a,b,c)</b> – as the NDPWP has previously resolved not to assess and allocate housing sites there is no need to include criteria as the NHP and Design Statement (DS) will contain sufficient robust policies to ensure that any planning application fits within the vision of the NDPWP.</p> <p><b>(Q4)</b> – Where criteria is included they can be customised but the list of criteria compiled by CW has already been proven to be robust enough</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan/Design Statement</b> -The NHP will cover all planning applications inside the settlement boundary (red line) which has been drawn up by CW – the NDPWP will need to make changes to it if they do not agree that it has been drawn in the correct place. All sites identified are situated outside of the boundary settlement and therefore unlikely to obtain planning permission other than those allowed under Permitted Development Rights and exemptions. CW advised against gathering all the various points and conditions contained in the NHP and DS into one list</p> <p><b>(Q2)</b> – BWPC will have to formally agree both the NHP and DS at some point but DS can be published on the PC website prior to this.</p> <p><b>(Q3)</b> – CW unable to answer this question</p>
<b>5</b>	<p><b>Next Steps (Q5 + 6)</b></p> <p>To finalise the Plan before consultation with key stake holders (BWPC and neighbouring PCs, Church, local businesses, Historic England, etc.). with a six week response period.</p> <p>Circulate printed copy of NHP and DS to all houses with a six week response period.</p> <p>Consult with BWPC at key stages and obtain agreement to submit to NNUA</p> <p>Collate responses and make any amendments necessary before submission to North Northamptonshire Unitary Authority for consultation followed by independent examination who may make further changes.</p> <p>Referendum and if supported the NHP and DS could be completed by the end of the year.</p> <p><b>Resolved:</b> That CW circulates up to date copies of the NHP and DS to all NDPWP members. That the NHP and DS is submitted to BWPC for approval when it meets on March 16<sup>th</sup> 2021.</p>

<b>6</b>	<b>Any other matters arising from minutes</b> None
<b>7</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b> <b>Resolved:</b> to meet on Wednesday February 24 <sup>th</sup> at 7.00pm. NP to circulate ZOOM login details
<b>8</b>	<b>Any other business</b> None
<b>9</b>	<b>To close the meeting</b> The meeting closed at 8.06pm

## Questions for Colin

1. We were hoping to use the sites put forward in the Call for Sites to 'test' the criteria only, and have no intention to put forward a site for development. Advice from Michael Burton is that in preparing the Neighbourhood Plan, we must at least demonstrate that we have given consideration to any potential development sites that have been put forward by landowners/ developers (if only to reject these as unsuitable).
  - a. We are required to consider "reasonable alternatives" in arriving at the chosen policies and proposals in the Neighbourhood Plan – what does reasonable alternatives mean and what do we need to do in order to demonstrate we have done this?
  - b. Can we weight the scoring to place greater emphasis on criteria that we feel is more important?
  - c. How 'customisable' is the site selection criteria? Are there mandatory questions that need to be included in order to satisfy the approval process or do we have free reign over the questions asked?
2. Does the design statement need to be approved by the parish council before being published?
3. Why is Friars Close Farm detailed on the [map.argis.com](http://map.argis.com) as an Approved Development site Submissions and the farm outline is shown in green? Also, under relevant plan documents the Barnwell Neighbourhood plan is listed however this is not approved. We understand all sites are required to complete an online form which, when vetted and approved for publication, will be shown on the website. Is there any particular reason why only this one site is green and all the others remain red? Does this mean the forms for other sites have not been vetted and approved for publication? If that is the case, why are they even shown on the map?
4. When we have a set of site assessment criteria that we are happy to proceed with, our plan is for each member of the committee to score the sites independently and then call a meeting to discuss outliers in order to agree a final scoring for each site. Is this process appropriate? Do we evidence that each of us scored the sites and came to agreement in a plenary/calibration session or do we just present the final scoring in the plan document?
5. Once we have completed the site selection assessment, what are the next steps required in order to submit the plan for approval?
6. Can you remind us what the approval process is and timeline and pitfalls to avoid?

**Signed:**

**Dated:**