

**The Winterbournes Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG)  
Minutes of the 37th meeting held on 11 September 2017**

**Attendance:** Andrew Argyle (AA) Chair, Charlie Bruce-White (CB-W) Gaenor Nokes (GN), Barry Lake (BL), Chris Campbell-Jones (CCJ), Maureen Atkinson (MA), Richard Folkes (RF), Peter Biggins (PB) and Dan Steadman (DS).

1. **Chairman's remarks.** As contributed during the meeting.
2. **Apologies received from:** None required – full attendance. Whilst AA thought that Charles Penn (CP) might have attended this NPSG to offer a view on a specific point relating to the Village Meeting, PB thought that as CP was now Chairman of the Parish Council (PC), he would need to maintain his independence from the work of the NPSG. Both PB and MA would be happy to report any PC views to the NPSG, as required.
3. **Minutes of the last meeting.** The minutes of the last meeting (36th) held on 31 July 2017 were accepted and approved. There was a question over what the “something” was that might feature on land surrounding the cricket square (See para 5 NP Projects). It is not possible to specify what the “something” might be, if anything at all.
4. **Matters arising.** None.
5. **NP Update.** CB-W reported that whilst the Open Spaces piece was well advanced, there had been a major setback to the NP in that the Council's Conservation Officer does not support the two sites on Land Adjacent to The Portway (S1045 and S122) because new build would ‘suburbanise the approach to the conservation area’. Consequently, English Heritage cannot provide us with a positive screening opinion and require a SEA to be undertaken. This would take a considerable amount of time and money and, in any event, the report would be likely to go against the inclusion of The Portway sites. One option would be to abandon The Portway sites altogether, another would be to contract with an independent conservation consultant for a second opinion together with advice as to how English Heritage's concern could be mitigated (eg screening). However, the first option would fly in the face of the views expressed by parishioners in the Village Questionnaire. On reviewing the map of the conservation area, it was difficult for the NPSG to believe that the Conservation Officer could be correct in his assessment, most especially with regard to S1045, which on the face of it appears to have no bearing on the conservation area, especially as design plans do not currently exist. The cost of an independent report would be in the region of £500, for which funding would need to be applied for and approved by the PC, and it would take a few weeks after receipt of the report before English Heritage could make a judgement. It was agreed by the NPSG to contract with the conservation consultant as quickly as possible. RF raised the issue of the site at S92 where APM Services was actively looking at overturning a Wiltshire Council decision to exclude it from the SHLAA and wanted informed reasons for the decision, otherwise they would push on with a plan to build 50+ dwellings on that site and S90. RF was planning to call the MD of the company shortly for an update. CC-J observed that at the NPSG held on the 26 June, the Link Officer had said that the NPSG must demonstrate why the whole of S90 was not being considered to accommodate more than the 13 units envisaged by the community. This warning, together with the adverse decision of the Council's Conservation Officer regarding S1045 and S122, and the company's aggressive stance led

him to think that perhaps the four years of effort to gather villagers' views, examine options, analyse possibilities, discuss and debate with a wide cross section of the parish had been wasted, as higher authorities could be thought to be conspiring to ensure that the draft NP was manipulated to reflect one that they would have produced in the first place. However, there is nothing to substantiate this view.

**ACTION: RF**

**6. Village Meeting – 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017.** Given the set-back detailed above, it was decided that the village meeting should be postponed until the conservation area issue at The Portway sites had been resolved. It would not be possible to place a notice in the Village Link as the next edition was not due to be published until after the 7<sup>th</sup> Oct, but leaflets could be posted through parishioners letter boxes and a notice placed in the Village Shop and at the Glebe Hall. The leaflets could briefly explain the reason for the cancellation. The meeting was to update the villagers on the draft NP and the housing allocations at the selected sites, including The Portway, but this is not now possible. Villagers would probably not wish to gather just to be advised of the complex technical issue that is being addressed. It had been hoped to continue the momentum of the NPSG by proclaiming that a draft NP would be issued shortly, but this is not now the case. CB-W would draft the wording of the leaflet which, when finalised, could also be published on the website.

**ACTION: CB-W**

**7. NP Projects.** RF provided an update on his work on NP Projects which included the circulation of a draft section which gave the reasons why particular projects had been selected. The NPSG had previously discussed the subject of 'community orchards and planting of trees' and so RF had included an Appendix which shed more light on the policies that govern such projects. The listed environmental projects that could support and maintain the local environment as listed were simply broad ideas for consideration stemming from answers to the Village Questionnaire. It is recognised that there will be an overlap with other sections in the NP, for example Chapter 1 covering Social Objectives, The NPSG members considered that perhaps a project to "Create a village Design Statement" (page 2.8) required a clearer understanding of the requirement. For instance, a Village Design Statement would be more generic compared with design statements for individual sites. RF will consider this aspect as he continues his drafting of the chapter. The other issue arising from the draft concerns 'high speed broadband' (page 3) and where this sits with the PC. The PC do not have this requirement on their agenda and it is probably not a project for the NP. The suggestion was put forward that AA and CB-W might want to take the opportunity to brief the PC at the next meeting so that the PC could understand if it could help in progressing the NP in any way. AA would consider this idea.

## **8. Planning Applications.**

- Black Horse Lane (16/10998/FUL). Remains under consideration.
- Rose Farm (17/02198/OUT). Remains under consideration.
- Rose Cottage. As far as the NPSG is aware, there has been no further appeal and the planning application has been rejected.

- Down Barn Road. The consultation period has just ended.

9. **Other NPs.** AA mentioned Downton (NP approved 2016,) which had received a planning application for 10 dwellings on a site that had not been included in the plan. The planning application was refused and so the developers went to appeal. However, the appeal was dismissed by the Court who judged that the extant NP was a sound defence. It is therefore important for the NPSG to keep the momentum going towards achieving a successful examination of and referendum on our own NP so that the community will have the legal right to guide the future development and growth of the Winterbournes.

8. **AOB** None.

Next Meetings:

Monday, 23 October 2017

Monday, 27 November 2017