

**The Winterbournes Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG)**  
**Minutes of the 28th meeting held on 26 October 2016**

**Attendance:** Graham Lloyd, Chair (MA), Mervyn Pannett (MP), Richard Folkes (RF) , Barry Lake (BL), Chris Campbell-Jones (CCJ), Gaenor Nokes (GN), Charles Penn (CP), Andrew Argyle (AA), Daniel Steedman (DS) and Peter Biggins (PB).

1. **Apologies received from:** Maureen Atkinson (MA) and Michael Lawrence (ML) who has advised that due to other commitments, he has withdrawn from the NPSG.
2. **Minutes of the last meeting.** The minutes of the last meeting (27th) held on 29 September 2016 were accepted and approved.
3. **Matters arising from the previous minutes.**
  - a. The Parish Council continue to review the budget submission presented by GL.
  - b. MA has yet to report her findings in respect of the 60 NP Questionnaires provided to the DNBC but not returned.
4. **Correspondence.** None
5. **NPSG Budget Submission – update.** As minuted at paragraph 3a, above.
6. **Village Questionnaire.**
  - a. Village Meeting – comments/views/feedback. The village meeting was considered to be a very successful event and the presentation was warmly received by the attendees. There was a concern that the meeting could have been dominated by the Pegasus proposal (S90) but clarity as to its status was provided by the owner of the land and Michael Hewitt (Wiltshire County Council, Unitary Councillor) ie the land had not been sold, no outline planning permission had been applied for and, in any case, Pegasus were looking at a number of other sites in Wiltshire that might be suitable. It is telling that Pegasus cancelled a village meeting due to be held in November 2016. There is an outside chance that the owner has concluded an option agreement with Pegasus and the NPSG should bear this in mind. In any event, the results of the Winterbournes Neighbourhood Plan Household Survey (the Questionnaire) would have to be taken into consideration should planning permission be sought for any potential site, including S90.
  - b. Questionnaire Hard Copy Data Storage – CP agreed to act as the guardian of the completed questionnaires and it was agreed that these would be kept until the NP is finally adopted, following which they could be destroyed, as explained in the Questionnaire. They would not be released into the public domain. The point is that information provided by individuals as part of a NP process may be seen as being personal: both in the general sense that it represents personal opinions expressed by the individual and in the technical sense of falling within the definition of the Data Protection Act.

c. Questionnaire Analysis – update and next steps. As a result of the exercise the Parish Council are now in a much better position to represent the view of parishioners when planning applications are submitted. It is understood that once a NP process is under way, only a NP can change a settlement boundary and that planning outside the boundary would not be considered by the planning department unless the NP was in agreement. The NP would provide certainty for parishioners who were considering their own plans in life (eg whether to stay or move out of the village). As far as the analysis itself was concerned, CP explained that all of the comments had been placed in the boxes in which people wrote them and that the next stage was to assign them, where necessary, to those boxes which were actually applicable. There is a need to keep the first order comments as submitted for audit purposes as well as the second order revised version. The last stage would be to generate a final version that could be published. This activity should be reviewed by all the NPSG members, as some redacting may be necessary to preserve confidentiality, and the relevant documentation is available in Dropbox (Questionnaire folder).

**ACTION: ALL**

## **7. Production of the Neighbourhood Plan**

a. Project planning schedule. Before a schedule of activities on the road to a draft NP can be generated, it is necessary to consider its structure. Although the “Planning Aid Template: structuring your NP” publication provides an excellent guide for ‘putting the pieces together”, AA had recently read the Tatenhill Neighbourhood Plan and commended it to the SG. (*Filed in Dropbox under Other Communities NPs - not to be confused with Tattenhall NP*). The aim is to have clarity and simplicity in the drafting of the NP where the Tatenhill NP excels, whereas the Tattenhall NP appears to have a complexity and professionalism that is not really necessary. AA proposed that he provide a draft structure for the Winterbournes NP using the paragraph headings in the Tatenhill NP, where sensible, as a basis for further discussion. This suggestion was readily accepted and the SG members agreed to read the Tatenhill NP within the next week and comment to AA as to the acceptability of its structure as the template for our own NP’s structure. AA would then prepare a document ready for discussion at the next NPSG meeting.

**ACTION: AA and SG members**

b. Editorial planning. Subject to the outcome of the project planning action above.

8. **A.O.B.** The question arose as to how the SG would deal with new potential building sites that were identified after the Household Survey and before the NP was adopted. CP suggested that the NPSG would take these sites into consideration and that they would be on record but it should not be necessary to seek the views of all the parishioners.

9. Date of Next Meeting: 21 November 2016