

## **Minutes of the Meeting of the Pirton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group held on 4 July 2016 at the Pirton Village Hall.**

**Members in attendance:** Diane Burleigh (Chair,) Jonty Wild (Deputy Chair,) Tom Gammell, Ann Webb, Gil Burleigh,

**Public Participation;** No members of the public attended

### **1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Nick Parkin and Lorna Sexton

### **2. Declarations of Interest**

JW added to the Declarations Book.

### **3. Minutes of the Meeting Held on the 13 June 2016**

On a proposal by JW, seconded by GB, the minutes were approved.

### **4. Matters Arising and Actions Taken (if not on the agenda)**

(4.5) DB reported that she had not prepared a paper recording her replies to the points raised at the consultation open meeting through a lack of time to date. It was agreed that there was no need to do this, as there was so much more pressing work to be undertaken

(5) DB confirmed that the letter to landowners had been sent, but unfortunately it contained the incorrect date; letters of correction will be sent the next day.

(5) DB read out the email from Clare Skeels of NHDC re Exception sits. As a result of the email, DB had read the Neighbourhood Plans that CS had brought to her attention. DB will draft something simple to cover the point on housing for the elderly, based on what is normally an exception site. DB confirmed that she had telephoned the Chilterns Conservation Board for further assistance on "design". They did not return her call to date. GB has still to advise on the Historic England detailed comments.

### **5. Consideration of refined Reg. 14 Outcomes**

The work on refining the outcomes continues. See 7 below.

### **6. Design Group Work**

Considerable progress has been made in a short space of time. TG and JW will finish this part of the outcomes work, using response forms, and Build for Life, The

Chilterns Conservation Board policies and the work of the Design Group. Particular attention will be paid to being more prescriptive where advised or indicated. JW will include a comment box to the resulting table to enable the PNPSG to comment on the recommendations.

## **7. Forward Planning**

AW and DB will conduct the same review for “Meeting Local Need” and, if there is time, on the remaining policies. TG, DB and AW will meet on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> to go through the documents so they are ready for discussion with the PPC.

DB and GB will review the Visual Character Areas by Monday 11 also. .

## **8. Finance Report**

TG reported that the UV invoice had been received and passed to the Parish clerk for payment. He reported further that the PPC has an allocation of about £1200 for further work. UV have still to be called on to assist with the Consultation Statement. There is also funding for Mr Munro’s work on the Basic Conditions statement.

## **9. Date and Time of next meeting**

1 August at 8pm at the Village Hall.

## **10. AOB**

The Confidential Minute of the 6 May was considered, and on a proposal by GB, seconded by TG, was approved.

JW brought to the meeting’s attention an email from a Pirton resident which criticised his membership of the Steering Group whilst editing the Pirton Website and offering observations on planning applications, including observations on how to object to particular planning applications. The same resident alleged in the email that former members of the Steering Group had been removed for being pro-development, and asserted that JW should also consider his position.

JW left the room whilst the issue was discussed. It was noted that JW had long been the editor/owner of the Pirton website before joining the PNPSG. His knowledge and ability to assist with communication with the community was considered a strength. Within the relatively small Pirton community it was felt that his position as editor/owner of the website was well understood. Additionally, it was felt that JW made it clear the capacity in which he offered observations and advice on his website, and the capacity in which he dealt with NP matters. The meeting did not think there were any grounds to consider that JW as “anti-development as such. DB pointed out that, in any

event, it is not a pre-requisite of NPlanning that SG members are “pro development”; it is the NP itself that must demonstrate how it plans for future growth within the NP area. GB added that the NP also deals with sustainable growth, not inappropriate or unsustainable growth or overdevelopment. Objection to individual, particular planning applications on a variety of grounds may be justifiable if they would breach the draft NP policies, local plan policies or otherwise be unsustainable.

The meeting was clear that no one had been removed from the PNPSG for being “pro-development”, but only for reasons of breaches of the PNPSG Code of Conduct or Constitution. Being “pro-development” does not constitute a breach of the Code of Conduct or Constitution, and so could not lead to removal from the SG.

.