

Minutes of Stonehouse Neighbourhood Development Plan Working Group held on 21 September 2017

1. Present: John Callinan (JC), John Jaynes (JJ), Carol Kambites (CK), Rachel Russell (RR-Minutes), Claire Sheridan (CS-Chair), Terry Webb (TW)
2. Apologies: Alastair Shankland (AS),
3. Declarations of interest: None
4. Accuracy of the minutes and Actions:
The minutes of the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) Working Group of 8 June 2017 were approved. All actions had been completed.
ACTION: RR to check dates for next Stonehouse News in the light of information from JJ.
5. **Project Progress**
 - a) **Budget and finance**
RR reported there had been no change since the budget information provided to the last meeting and attached as appendix 1 to the minutes of 8th June 2017.
 - b) **Project timetable**
The referendum date of 23rd November 2017 has been confirmed from Stroud District Council (SDC) after the Examiner's modifications were accepted by SDC's Environment Committee on 14 September.
ACTION: RR to prepare report for next Town Council meeting (23 October) on project progress.
6. **Examination of Neighbourhood Plan**
 - a) The report of the Examiner on the Neighbourhood Plan has been circulated and was noted.
 - b) Stonehouse Neighbourhood Plan Group's responses to a request from the Examiner for clarifications were agreed by e-mail in August in order to meet SDC's timetable for achieving a November referendum date after late notification of the request to SNPG by SDC. The agreed responses are attached as an appendix to these minutes.
7. **Preparation of a referendum version of the Plan**
 - a) A designed Referendum PDF and hard copies of the Plan must be ready for 16th October which SDC have advised will be the start of the referendum period.
ACTION: RR to add Examiner's modifications to PDF of Plan for designer to work from and obtain final versions of extra maps from SDC as advised by Examiner by Friday 29th September
ACTION: CK to proof read by 29th September
ACTION: RR to obtain quotes for printing 10 copies of the Plan.
DECISION: Cheapest printing quote will be acceptable as long as within SNPG publicity budget.
 - b) **DECISION:** A quote of £250 from Steve Palmer of Isight Design, designer of previous versions of the Plan, to design the referendum version was accepted.
8. **Referendum Publicity**
Advice currently received from SDC and examples of NP referendum publicity provided by the Clerks of Stroud Town Council and Kingswood Parish Council were considered.
DECISION: Publicity encouraging people to vote to be provided during the Referendum period (16 October – 23rd November), no publicity to be displayed on Council offices. The following programme was agreed:

Publicity material to be produced by Stonehouse Town Council	Location
<p>Stonehouse News front page with text: “Stonehouse Neighbourhood Development Plan, Our local Referendum, Decision Time! Vote on Thursday 23 November 2017”</p> <p>Article inside with information about Referendum date repeated and link to Stroud District Council web page on referendum, link to Stonehouse Town Council Neighbourhood Plan pages. No content promoting a Yes vote.</p>	<p>Newsletter circulated to all households by volunteers. Some may be delivered during referendum period.</p>
<p>3- 4 banners with text and Stonehouse Neighbourhood Plan Group logo, “Stonehouse Town Council” in words: “Stonehouse Neighbourhood Development Plan, Our local Referendum, Decision Time! Vote on Thursday 23 November 2017”</p>	<p>During referendum period (16 Oct-23 Nov 2017) displayed on railings belonging to infant school, Town Green surgery and possibly Maidenhill School and Bethel Church. (i.e. not on Council premises)</p>
<p>Posters and flyers with Stonehouse Neighbourhood Plan Group logo, “Stonehouse Town Council” in words publicising date of referendum and encouraging people to get on electoral register.</p>	<p>During referendum period (16 Oct-23 Nov 2017) to be distributed to town centre businesses, shops, pubs, cafes, restaurants. (i.e. not on Council premises)</p>

ACTION: RR to seek advice from SDC as to whether above Plan complies with Regulations and ask if printer and publication details on publicity items are required.

ACTION: CK to ask if Referendum can feature on front or back page of Stonehouse News.

ACTION: JJ to ask if banner can be displayed at Stonehouse Infants School

ACTION: TW to ask if banner can be displayed at Bethel Church

ACTION: CK to ask Pam Swain to speak to staff at Medical Centre on Town Green re displaying a banner

ACTION: RR to ask Jo Byrne to design banner and poster to the above guidelines and as quoted for in her quote of February 2016.

ACTION: RR to provide text for Stonehouse News and poster.

9. GRCC consultancy time

RR reported that there were still 2.75 hours of GRCC consultancy time outstanding; she had asked for some advice regarding Referendum publicity but no further use could be seen for this consultancy time.

10. Review and implementation of Neighbourhood Plan

It was agreed that this was the responsibility of the Town Council and was thought to have been included in the Terms of Reference for the Council’s Regeneration and Environment Committee. RR advised that the Town Council would need to monitor SDC’s implementation of the Neighbourhood Plan, should it be agreed at referendum and reported that Stroud Town Council had given a presentation to Planning Staff on the Stroud Town Centre NP.

11. Any other business

RR showed two new map prepared by SDC for Plan on Local Green Space and Important Character buildings and asked for help to check accuracy of latter map.

ACTION: CK to check location of Midland Road Railway Bridge

12. Next meeting date: November - December 2017?

Formal closure of SNPG and social event.

Stonehouse Neighbourhood Plan Group Response to Examiner's Request for Clarifications, August 2017

Stonehouse NP Policy	Examiner's request for clarification	Stonehouse Neighbourhood Plan Group response
Policy AF1	Why has the Plan sought to make a distinction between 'existing community facilities' and 'particularly locally valued community amenities and facilities'? How would the owners of facilities in the former category know that they are affected by the policy if they are not included in the list in the second paragraph of the policy?	<p>This comment was also made during the Health Check.</p> <p>The policy has evolved and been revised several times. The policy attempts to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reflect residents' wishes for the protection of all community facilities (category 1) in Stonehouse 2. Itemise those facilities particularly mentioned in public consultation. These facilities are a sub category of category 1. 3. Relate the protection of both category 1 and the sub category to Local Plan policies. <p>All existing community facilities have some protection under Local Plan policies; this policy highlights those facilities of particular local value.</p> <p>If the examiner can suggest any alterations to make this policy as clear as possible, they would be welcomed.</p>
Policy AF3 (second paragraph)	I can understand the wish to increase the diversity of the retail offer in the town. However how is it envisaged that this policy would operate given that the Use Classes Order does not draw a distinction between different retail uses?	<p>Planning applications have been made recently within Stonehouse when previously empty properties have been taken over by new businesses, even when both the previous and proposed use have been within Class A.</p> <p>Obviously, it is for the District to decide when planning permission is required. The intent is for the Neighbourhood Plan policy to encourage a range of businesses even if they are all within Class A so that the town is not oversupplied with, for example, take away food shops. This intent is in line with both consultation results for the Neighbourhood Plan and with Local Plan policy CP12 which aims to enhance the vitality and viability of all the District's centres.</p>
Policy T4	What is meant by a 'walkable neighbourhood'? Should the policy be more free-standing rather than an implementation tool for Policy EI 12 of the Local Plan?	<p>An indication of the meaning of "walkable neighbourhood" is given within section (ii) of the policy with some further clarification given in the supporting text.</p> <p>The working in relation to Policy EI 12 of the Local Plan was suggested by Stroud DC in their response to the Regulation 14 consultation and accepted by SNPG.</p>
Policy H1	The final paragraph of the supporting text on p43 refers to the commitments that exist in the Plan area and makes	Policy H1 is intended to apply to future developments within Stonehouse parish.

	comments about future development. Is Policy H1 intended to apply only to further developments?	
Policy EM2	How would The Town Council expect the third criterion to be applied by Stroud Council? Does it have the clarity required by the NPPF?	<p>SDC's comment on the submission draft version of this policy was : "Point iii) of the policy is ambiguous (sic) and would be open to different interpretations. It should therefore be removed."</p> <p>The criterion could be removed if the Examiner determines this would make the policy clearer.</p>
Policy EM3	The policy clearly has regard to national policy. On this basis is there a particular local reason why it requires a developer to demonstrate 'market demand'?	The text "they demonstrate market demand and" could be removed; the policy would still have the intended effect.
Policy ENV3	The proposed local green spaces would benefit from greater prominence on Map 11 given their significance in planning terms. The policy also repeats elements of the (excellent) detail in the evidence base on this matter. Would it be possible to insert key findings from the evidence base into the supporting text?	<p>Visual prominence of Local green Space could be improved, perhaps by providing extracts from the map at a larger scale.</p> <p>Justification text could be expanded to provide some information from the evidence base. When would revised text be required by?</p>
Section 4	The NPPF anticipates that a neighbourhood plan will generate interest in both land use and non-land use issues. The Plan correctly identifies a series of projects/priorities in Section 4.2. However, Section 4.1 includes a series of land use and non-land use matters and links them to CIL/Section 106 funding. Is there a particular reason for this approach?	<p>The projects in section 4.1 are to inform a list of priority infrastructure projects held and updated by the Town Council.</p> <p>Our understanding is that the neighbourhood element of CIL can be used for a wide range of projects as outlined in paragraph one of the introduction to this section:</p> <p>"including the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure, or anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands development places on an area."</p> <p>We have interpreted this to mean that both land use and non land use matters might be eligible for neighbourhood CIL funding.</p>