**MInutes for Committee**

**7.30pm, Tuesday 15 November 2016, Hand and Flower Pub**

**Present**

Brian Willman (Chair)

David Williams

Andree Frieze

Danielle Coleman

Chris Ruse

Penny Frost

Justine Glynn

Geoff Bond

Anne Powell

Stan Shaw

**In attendance**

Sarah Gatehouse

Justine Langford

Chas Warlow

Siriol Davies

1. **Apologies for absence** were accepted from Jean Loveland.

2. **Draft Neighbourhood Plan**

Sarah Gatehouse, consultant editor to the NP, introduced herself as a planner with 30 years’ experience of planning and policy including time at Westminster City Council. Her brief was to do an editorial review, ensuring consistency with strategic policies and checking that the evidence justified the policies. She has worked with the authors of the plan to ensure that policies comply with government guidance re. development and use. Items which simply repeated policies already in use by the borough were deleted and any inconsistencies redrafted. She had also looked at overlaps between policies and ‘beefed up’ the evidence as far as possible, with sometimes limited information. In general she advised reviewing the justification for policies, as local support was not sufficient – more detailed analysis was required for some policies where the evidence was thin. This will be important for the formal exam.

Other documents required for submission are:

1. Basic condition statement (to state compliance with higher level plans)
2. Strategic environmental assessment screening exercise (to consider if any significant environmental impacts would follow from the plan; the borough may be able to help with this)
3. Consultation statement (A draft has been started)

SG counselled allowing the borough to comment on the draft to confirm consistency with local policy **before** the formal submission, so that it can be submitted with confidence. It is also worth checking **which** borough policies the plan needs to comply with, since at present there is an emerging Local plan, but also an adopted core policy dating from 2009 and a management plan from 2011.

BW and CR have a meeting with Andrea Kitzberger on 28th November. CR will send her the draft plan before that meeting.

Suggestions/comments included:

Is it a sensible tactic to be tougher at the outset to allow room for retreat? SG explained that all our proposals need to be consistent with the Local Plan. Most of the green spaces are already protected by their designations as MOL or OOLTI.

An executive summary at the beginning? One will be prepared for the H&P magazine

Showing the vision and objectives earlier

Listing all policies in one section for ease of reference – this was considered unnecessary duplication

Foreword – CW and JG to look at wording. Names of contributors, committee members etc to be listed in an appendix, in alphabetical order. A photo of the Chair to be included.

Glossary of terms – CR and JG to look at the borough glossary.

Abbreviations – to be defined on first use, rather than having a list.

p.8 CIL re. the borough’s priority list: BW and CR to discuss this with Andrea Kitzberger as the list is not valid and will be deleted.

p.12 Latchmere – AF to consider whether there is sufficient attention paid to it.

p.17 Re. Vision – this has been reworded. For clarity, this paragraph could be divided into 1. Purpose (sentence 1) 2. Vision (sentence 2), 3. Objectives (sentences 3 & 4, followed by list)

The Opportunities for change section is not listed under objectives since it is not a policy in its own right, but is subject to all the other policies.

p.19 Re. the establishment of a Conservation Area Management Group – amend to say that the NP encourages a review of the 2007 Character appraisal and management plan etc, without specifying the creation of a particular group.

p. 21 The term ‘less sensitive locations’ was queried and compared with the housing policy wording on p. 26

p. 24 Query on PTAL – JLfd to talk to Lisa Fairmaner.

p. 26 Re. ‘4 storeys in appropriate locations’. SG to check against Local Plan.

p.33 Re. library space – DC to draft a paragraph for SG. BW to amend list of churches.

p.36 Ham Parade - suggestions for a cycle shop and office services for the self-employed.

p. 39 Re. light pollution – clarify whether this policy applies to the whole area or only green spaces.

**Opportunities for Change:**

p.2 Re. Ham Parade policy 1: ‘single surfaces’ to be clarified (JLfd).

p.6 Ham Close policy – ‘equivalent replacement’ queried. To be compared with Community Facilities section.

**Appendix 2 Draft list of priority projects –** the advantage of having this in an appendix is that it can be updated easily. These are projects for which funding will be sought. To be re-assessed at the December meeting. Any changes to the list need to reflect what is in each policy chapter.

The Chair was very pleased with the draft and thanked SG and the authors for the enormous amount of work already done. Minor points and corrections to be emailed to SD.

5. **The minutes of the Committee meeting of 18 October 2016 were approved.**

6. **Matters arising not covered on the agenda**

Response from the developers of the Cassel Hospital to be discussed at next meeting.

7. **Update on the financial situation** - postponed to the next meeting.

8. **Any other business**:

A reminder of the meeting re. Ham Close with RHP and LBRuT on16th November and discussion of whether the NP is likely to be approved before their planning application is submitted and likely consequences.

The agenda of the next meeting needs to include planning for the AGM.

9. **Date, time and place of next meeting** – 7.30pm, Tuesday 13 December 2016, Ham Children’s Centre.