

**Meeting** 9

**Meeting Title:** Neighbourhood Plan Working Group

**Date:** 17<sup>th</sup> March 2016

**Venue:** Holwell Village Hall

**Attendees:** Sally-Anne Holt (Chair Holwell Neighbourhood Plan Working Group) SAH  
Steve Atchison SA  
Rodney Antell RA  
Patrick Constable PC  
Phil Curtis PhC  
Jo Edmondson JE  
Colin Evans CE  
Lord Aldenham LA  
Robert Hole RH  
Dave Hollex DH  
Peter Macfarlane PM  
Bob Pearce BP  
Neil Peirson NP  
Katrina Wall KW  
Libby Wilton LW

John Baker (Buckland Newton) BN  
Diana Gibbs (Holwell Parish Council) DG

**Agenda:** The aim of this meeting had been to have a rehearsal / dry run for the forthcoming Village Open Meetings. However, preparations were insufficiently advanced for this, and the meeting covered the following:

- 1 Apologies
- 2 Opening Remarks
- 3 Notes of last (8<sup>th</sup>) Meeting – February 2016
- 4 Communications
- 5 Layout and Format of Village Open Meetings
- 6 Recent Discussions With WDDC
- 7 Presentation at Village Open Meetings
- 8 Feedback and Questions To Be Discussed
- 9 Way Ahead Post Village Open Meetings
- 10 Date of Next Meeting
- 11 AOB

### **Actions**

1. **Apologies**

Robert Hole (RH), Peter Macfarlane (PM), and Bruce Duncan (BD) were unable to attend.

**Actions**

2. **Opening Remarks**

SAH opened by introducing John Baker from Buckland Newton, and Diana Gibbs, from the Holwell Parish Council.

3. **Notes from 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting (18<sup>th</sup> February 2016)**

The notes from the previous meeting were discussed.

The date at the head of the notes need to be corrected.

The text under Section 7, dealing with how the Neighbourhood Plan could develop was considered to be unclear, and it was agreed that this would be reworded.

A revised version has since been issued (see Appendix A).

4. **Communications**

SAH said that the poster and flyer have been completed and the flyer will be distributed with the magazine. It was agreed that it would also be useful to have an additional letter, to be hand delivered; this could be co-signed by the Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group.

SAH added that we should also aim to ensure that stakeholders such as local businesses (Nursery School, Digby Trust, etc.) are involved / informed.

5. **Layout and Format of Village Open Meetings**

SAH distributed her planned layout; she would like the different Groups to host their areas.

SAH asked whether we were comfortable with the bigger maps, to help with discussions. It was agreed to use A0 size maps, with all properties shown, and the village boundary.

Different means of providing feedback and responses were discussed. BP thought that there should be boxes for people to put private comments in.

The use of name badges was discussed; some thought that this might be too formal.

JB: explained that, at Buckland Newton, they had spent quite a lot on stationary, printing, etc. Stands had been bought for £900. In addition, £4,000 to £5,000 had been spent on employing Jo Witherden as a consultant. JB offered to lend the stands to us for the Village Open Meetings.

6. **Recent Discussions With WDDC**

After a recent meeting with planners at WDDC, SAH said that they were not keen to present at the Village Open Meetings (though they did say that they liked our FAQs, with the boundary map on the back).

However, it was agreed that we needed WDDC to support the Village Open Meetings and that we would like councillors to attend if possible.

**Actions**

7. **Presentation at Village Open Meetings**

The format of the Village Open Meetings was discussed, particularly whether there should be an opening presentation, or whether just to rely on a more open-plan, walk-around type of meeting.

It was agreed that it would be better to have some kind of introductory explanation. JE pointed out that it would otherwise be hard for people to take the presented information in, and JB said that, from his experience at Buckland Newton, people would get lost without a short introduction. LA said that we need to provide a framework, so that people know what questions to ask. Thus, it was agreed that there should be a short (5 to 10 minutes) talk soon after the start of the meeting.

The contents of this talk were discussed. It was felt that it should be assumed that people know nothing about the Neighbourhood Plan and that the information given should reflect this. Thus various points needed to be made, including:

- That the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group is part of the Parish Council.
- What a Neighbourhood Plan is.
- Why we might want a Neighbourhood Plan.
- That we don't have to have a Neighbourhood Plan.
- What could happen with and without one.
- That it would be community led.
- How the Local Plan fits into the scheme of things (as in theory we're outside the areas earmarked for development).

The format of the talk / presentation was discussed. SAH hoped that it might be possible to get hold of Jo Withenden's earlier presentation; JB said that he could ask her. SAH said that the aim is to provide information to explain the options. LW suggested that, in the absence of Jo Withenden's presentation, we could maybe use our FAQs as a starting point.

8. **Feedback and Questions To Be Discussed**

The questions of how we handle the feedback we get, and at what level of detail we would like to pitch the discussions were considered. JB said that, at this stage, we are asking if a Neighbourhood Plan is wanted.

The question of obtaining views on planning and where development should / shouldn't take place was discussed. JB said that he was not sure how far we should go with this, and that asking about housing might be too much at this stage, as people won't have thought very deeply about it. He believed that we were now providing an explanation of the Neighbourhood Plan and possibly asking if we move forward; we would probably have to repeat the exercise later in a more formal format to collect more detailed information.

## **Actions**

DG said that people will find out about the Neighbourhood Plan for first time at these meetings, and that saying whether they liked or disliked the idea might be as much as we should aim for, and that asking where housing development might take place would be too much at this point. SAH added that we may need to ask less direct questions.

PhC asked what the policy would be regarding the level of feedback and number of responses. DH said that this would indicate the level of interest in the village. SAH said that, if the response level was low, we may need to go back and ask again. JB explained that, given the size of the village compared with Buckland Newton and other villages (Loders situation is similar to Holwell), we might hope to get 60 or so people interested. In Buckland Newton, where the population is around twice that of Holwell and has more amenities (school, shop), they had 109 questionnaires returned.

SAH said that further information would be available for people from the FAQ sheets, and that the WDDC website could be useful. JB warned that the WDDC website information was very technical, and that we need to lead people.

SAH added that she had created an e-mail link that goes to her from the Holwell Parish Council website: [holwellneighbourhoodplan@gmail.com](mailto:holwellneighbourhoodplan@gmail.com)

### 9. **Way Ahead Post Village Open Meetings**

SAH summarized what the key stages will be once we move forward with the Neighbourhood Plan:

- Draft Plan
- 6 week consultation.
- Independent examination
- Modifications as necessary
- Referendum
- To WDDC for approval

The timescale for these would be 38 weeks.

### 10. **Date of Next Meeting (DONM)**

The next meeting is to be on Thursday 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016, to discuss the practical side of the Village Open Meetings.

### 11. **Any Other Business (AOB)**

JB said that he could help with the presentation.

PC asked about preparing the environment board.

**Appendix A - Notes of last (8<sup>th</sup>) Meeting – February 2016**



NP Mtg 08 Minutes  
18 Feb 2016 Issue\_2.

---