

**MINUTES (AMENDED DRAFT)  
BERRICK SALOME PARISH COUNCIL  
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP  
13<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2018**

A Meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group ('the Group') was held in the Berrick Salome Village Hall on Tuesday 13<sup>TH</sup> November 2018 at 7:30 pm.

Present:

Brian Tracey (BT)  
Ian Glyn (IG) (Chairman - Parish Council)  
Chris Cussens (CC) (Parish Clerk)  
Conrad Shields (CS)  
Ray Perfect (RP)  
Sarah Russell (SR)  
Douglas Taylor (DT)  
Chris Kilduff (CK) (Chair)  
Sue Lyons (SL)  
Sarah Vaccari (SV)

**1. Apologies for Absence**

All present.

**1b. Appointment of Chair**

**CK** was appointed to act as chair for this meeting.

**2. Declarations of Interests**

**SL** declared a beneficial interest in a paddock in respect of which a planning application (P13/S2758/FUL) for a new dwelling had been submitted to SODC in 2013 but subsequently withdrawn prior to determination.

**IG** declared a beneficial interest in an agricultural field in Berrick Salome located to the rear of the 'Old Post Office' and opposite St Helens Church.

**3. Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The Minutes of the previous meeting, held on 25<sup>TH</sup> October 2018, were unanimously approved.

**4. Matters arising from the Minutes**

Several actions agreed at the previous meeting had been omitted from the minutes. One such action (of particular relevance to agenda item 10, below) was: "*NH to advise if Settlement Boundaries [affect] PDR*" (Permitted Development Rights). **IG** confirmed that in **NH's** opinion PDR would not be diminished where part of a property (for example a large garden), to which such rights would normally apply, was deemed to be outside a Settlement Boundary.

**5. Pre-Submission Plan (draft v.10) - final review**

**IG** reported that, at a public meeting held on 8<sup>TH</sup> November, the PC had authorised the circulation of the draft pre-submission plan to Statutory Consultees.

Several Members raised queries over some of the wording used in the draft text. **SL**, as the document editor, asked those Members to contact her directly with any such queries. **Action: All**

**DT** asked if there was written advice from **NH** to the effect that the draft pre-submission plan, as it presently stands, is entirely satisfactory for the intended purpose. **BT** confirmed that written advice to that effect had been received from **NH**.

**IG** circulated correspondence he had received recently from a parishioner in connection with the informal consultation. It was suggested that the parishioner's observations be added to the 'Consultation Statement draft 3'.

**Action CC**

**BT** reported that SODC had yet to respond fully to the informal consultation. In the meantime, SODC had:

- (a) asked for a copy of the latest draft of the plan. **SL** advised that a copy of v.10 had been forwarded to SODC;
- (b) requested a delayed start to the s.14 consultation to allow time for SODC to comment on the plan. **BT** advised that **NH** was of the opinion that we should still proceed with the s.14 consultation as planned. Following discussion, it was decided not to delay the start of the consultation;
- (c) tentatively indicated that a SEA (Strategic Environment Assessment) might be required on account of the Settlement Boundaries - even though there were no site allocations. **BT** said that he did not think a SEA was necessary and believed that **NH** was of the same opinion. After discussion it was agreed that **BT** would ask **NH** to speak directly to SODC to clarify the issue.

**Action: BT**

**BT** was asked what were the likely consequences should SODC insist upon a SEA accompanying the plan. He replied that, to the best of his knowledge, in such an event a SEA would need to be produced - which would incur additional fees and possibly take up to eight weeks. Furthermore, there was a risk that the forthcoming s.14 consultation would need to be repeated. However, **BT** assured the meeting that **NH** was confident a SEA would not be required.

**6. List of pre-submission plan consultees - final review**

No statutory consultees were proposed in addition to those already on the list circulated to Members by **CC** on 22<sup>ND</sup> October. However, **IG** and **CC** requested the names and contact details for several local landowners who should be notified about the pre-submission plan:

- (i) absentee landowners in Roke. **Action: DT;**
- (ii) owner of the 'fisheries' (the old watercress beds) in Roke Marsh. **Action: SR.**

In addition **IG** volunteered to notify, on behalf of the PC, the respective owners of the relevant community assets (e.g. the band hut on Chapel Lane and the two pubs). **Action: IG**

**7. NP website: observations about; and timing of NP material publication**

The Meeting expressed satisfaction with the PC's new NP website and commended **CC** for his excellent work in creating it.

It was decided that the pre-submission plan and supporting EBR (Evidence Base Report) would be published on the NP website to coincide with the start of the s.14 consultation period (currently planned as 16<sup>TH</sup> November).

**8. SODC Grant Monies**

The Members present chose to defer any further decision on the allocation of the SODC grant monies for the time being and re-affirmed what was previously decided at the Steering Group meeting on 9<sup>TH</sup> October 2018, under agenda item 7: *"It was agreed that, subject to approval by the PC, a proportion of those funds [the SODC grant] could be used to defray administrative costs including publication of the emerging Plan for consultation purposes. Further, Members looked favourably upon a suggestion that some of the funds might be put towards additional Plan drafting work by external consultants."*

**9. Forward Plan - next steps in NP process**

Following the end of the s.14 consultation (currently scheduled as 11<sup>TH</sup> January 2019) the next major task will be to prepare the Submission Plan. This will be based upon a revised version of the s.14 pre-submission plan and will incorporate any changes needed in response to consultation input received. Regarding timescales, Members anticipated that the Submission Plan will be completed around mid March 2019. Once SODC is satisfied that the completed Plan meets the criteria for examination by the Planning Inspectorate the next steps are then: plan submitted for examination; and, if the examination is passed, the plan proceeds to a referendum. The timing of those steps is largely down to SODC but assuming no complications arise then it is expected that the referendum will probably take place in the autumn of 2019.

It was noted that an NP does not carry full weight in planning decisions until it has passed referendum. Prior to that, the amount of weight attributed to the plan is largely down to the judgement of the District Council when determining an application.

**10. Methodology for defining settlement boundaries**

**DT** said he was not convinced that the settlement boundaries, as shown in the pre-submission plan, had been defined consistently and cited a couple of examples to illustrate the point. However, some Members disagreed with his contention, saying that they were aware of the criteria used for drawing the boundaries at the various times when these were discussed and finally agreed. Nevertheless, Members accepted that it would be prudent to verify that the boundaries were consistent and agreed to **DT's** proposal to draw up a formal statement of the rules/guidelines governing boundary definition, based upon the descriptions of the same in paragraphs 5.7 and 5.8 of the pre-submission plan, against which the pre-submission plan boundaries could be compared. **Action: DT**

**11. AOB**

There was no other business.

**12. Next meeting**

The date for the next meeting is Tuesday, 15<sup>TH</sup> January 2019 at 7:30pm, to be held in the rear meeting room of the Berrick Salome Village Hall.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9:00 pm.

Signed ..... Chairman

Date .....