

Minutes of a meeting held by the Neighbourhood Development Plan Committee in respect of the Neighbourhood Development Plan on 2nd November 2021 held at Clipston Village Hall, 7.30pm

Minutes taken by Felicity Ryan, Clerk/RFO.

Contact: clerk@clipstonparishcouncil.org c/o Aysgarth , High Street, Naseby NN66DD
07759076161/01604 740429

Attendees: R Burnham (Chair), A Price, D Wragg, D Wilford, J Tyson, G Kirk (Your Locale), P Hooper, J Oldershaw , S Woodgate

207. Apologies for Absence: None

208. Declarations of Interest : None declared

209. Approval of the minutes from the meeting held 12th May 2021 : It was **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of that meeting as drawn.

210. Public participation: No members of the public present.

211. Publicity for the Referendum 2nd December 2021.

1. Current position – The referendum will be held from 7am to 10pm on the 2nd December 2021. Polling cards will be issued to all residents and a press release issued on West Northamptonshire Council’s website.
2. Suggested form of Executive Summary (“ES”) of the Plan delivered to Parishioners (attached as approved by West Northamptonshire Council ‘WNC’) - This was approved as drawn and now did not include reference to any site allocation and to make it clear that Clipston Parish Council was the document owner.
3. Delivery of ES – AC volunteers – A group of volunteers were allocated to deliver to all of the residents in Clipston. **ACTION : D Wilford to arrange printing.**
4. Suggested form of poster attached as approved by West Northamptonshire Council – It was **RESOLVED** to approve the poster as circulated.
5. Social Media/Banners/Parish Council website. It was **RESOLVED** to upload the link to the WNDC website on the social media sites for the village.

212. Neighbourhood Plan de-brief and post plan analysis.

1. **Q.** In view of the Examiner’s decisions, how will the Parish Council (“PC”) assess future planning applications for housing? What sites are now feasible for development? What happens to the number of houses set by the chosen site allocation, now thrown out? What is the impact of Clipston’s Conservation Village status on these issues? **A.** If the plan is rejected, planning decisions will be made using current WNC planning policies (including the Clipston conservation area designation and the village design statement). If the plan is accepted at referendum any planning application would be treated as at present by the PC.
2. **Q.** Can Tony Price and Gary Kirk recap the rationale for the chosen site allocation, especially taking into account advice from DDC (as was) about possible problems.

According to DDC, questions about the proximity of the Scheduled Monument ("SM") were first raised in July 2019. The progress of the planning application for the Gold Street site then became relevant because of the proximity of the SM in that case. Given that DDC had no specified number for housing allocations, would a smaller number of developments have been a better idea? Would a tightly controlled linear expansion of the village have stood a better chance of success with the Examiner? **A.** The rationale for the site allocation was made following extensive research carried out by the process carried out in the Neighbourhood Development Plan and was logical in relation to the number of affordable housing in relation to full cost houses. WNC did not give an indication that the site was unsuitable, but made a recommendation to carry out a further environmental site assessment and this was completed. Clipston has many areas which prevent development due to the presence of scheduled ancient monument. The Examiner did not think that the suitability of the chosen site had been completely assessed.

3.Q. Can the PC reflect upon the relationship between the Advisory Committee ("AC") and the PC when the AC is made up of PC and non-PC members. When the 'driver' of a Neighbourhood Development Plan ("NDP") is a member of the PC, there's a danger that the PC is advising itself, and that non-PC members' views will be marginalized, or actively discouraged. In any future NDP or similar exercise, should a clear space between the 'driver' and the AC be established at the outset, controlled by the PC Chair, in order to facilitate a secure check on any perceived shortcomings, oversights, etc. in proceedings? And in this context, did our AC have sufficient time to reflect upon ongoing developments before being asked to sign them off by a 'driver' who is also an AC member? Should details, or at least a summary, of relevant ongoing developments have been circulated to the AC well before NDP meetings? **A.** The NDP committee was appointed by the Parish Council and has a terms of reference included. The approval of the work of the plan is carried out by the Parish Council and it is essential that the latter is involved to ensure community cohesion.

4. Q. Could more tasks have been delegated to AC members to guard against too much work and responsibility being invested in the hands of the 'driver'? **A.** A number of members have been involved in the NDP process and the approval of each stage has been approved at each stage. **5.Q.** Would it have been a good idea for the three Theme Groups to meet with each other, the better to understand the interaction between their criteria, decisions, and intended outcomes? Would this have facilitated a more holistic approach to finding an identity for the parish within the aspirations of the NDP, and for selecting a site, or sites, for development? Would it have saved time and money? **A.** The theme groups came together once their individual aspect of the plan was completed and liaison took place throughout, but this could have been more frequent.

6. Q. In view of the PC meeting which took place with disgruntled parishioners could PC communications with parishioners have been improved? **A.** All meetings are open to the public and advertisements were circulated at the beginning of the plan to encourage residents to join the committee. Some residents have raised questions and asked for progress updates regarding in particular, the community action points, but they were subsequently published ahead of the plan.

7.**Q.** Can members of the AC be supplied with accounts to date of fees and expenses claimed and paid in connection with the NDP, if possible broken down to provide details of how much was spent on site allocation matters. **A.** A copy of the accounts were circulated and are also available as they form part of the parish council accounts.

8. Copy E Mail from AECOM dated 6th October 2021 (attached) – Noted.

213. Any other matters for discussion

Thanks given to all those who worked on the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Meeting closed 8.52pm