

Draft Minutes

NP Steering Group meeting 6.30pm 16/6/26

Present: P Debenham, M Stamp, K Sadler, J Shadegg, E Schooneveld, L Monteith

1. MS brought to the meeting the materials he has received from John Dain. Our intention had been to review the posters from a previous public engagement meeting about the last NP policies that were retained by John Dain. For whatever reason there was only one poster, a diagramme of the Parish. So, this heightened the need to get as much support from the steering group to go through policies ourselves and identify (a) 3 bullet points that captured the gist of the policy, (b) any text that appeared difficult to understand or apply, and (c) any thoughts about any improvements/updates that suggested themselves. **It was decided there and then to each take on board a policy to review and allocate the remaining to Steering Group members to have a go at (see*)** . At the meeting the following agreed to review the policy indicated:

Policy	Policy title	
1	Settlement boundaries and building in the countryside	
2	Housing supply to meet local needs	
3	Housing in Bishops Green	
4	Housing in Ecchinswell	JS
5	Design quality in the Parish of ESBG	
6	Design quality in the ECA	
7	Community engagement in design	
8	Support for rural businesses & workspaces	ES
9	Support for home working	KS
10	Broadband and mobile communications	MS
11	Community facilities	LM
12	Green infrastructure network and nature recovery	MT
13	Landscapes and key views	PD
14	Local green spaces	
15	Dark skies	
16	Zero carbon building	
17	Encouraging active and sustainable travel	

*As members of the Steering Group were absent, it is hoped that reading these minutes will prompt them to identify a policy and have a go. If no response is received within a few days, then remaining members would be asked to review an allocated policy, with any exceptions already indicated to PD.

2. In a parallel action to try and progress policy review, PD commented he was a convert to ChatGPT following its use to resolve ET Planning costing categories (see point 5 below). It was felt that we could ask ChatGPT to review the policies with reference to the BDBC Local Plan Update, and the latest version of the National Planning Policy Framework. MS offered to give this a go with Policy 10 , comparing the result to his personal assessment of the Policy. MS would request for the Clerk to set up a subscription account for PC members to use.
3. MS also indicated that a number of new PC and Steering Group members needed access to Trello which required a new subscription for additional members

4. It was agreed that for the community engagement meetings that we would use the theme format previously used for the last NP as advised by John Dain, i.e.
 - Explain what the existing NP is, and what it has achieved
 - Why we need an update
 - Seek community views on how the policies might be updated.

KS took outline notes of what documents would be expected to be displayed

(post-meeting comment; the policy work discussion meant we forgot to set tentative dates for meetings at BGVH and EVH. This needs to be a key first point at the next meeting).

5. The ET Planning charging structure was received just in advance of the PC meeting for consideration, but its format of costing by Stages, did not directly appear to map to their originally proposed Phased tasks/actions. PD applied ChatGPT (with help) to the challenge of aligning the two formats and it did so in what appears a helpful placement of the phased work with the costed stages. This was then sent to ETP to ask if this distribution of the tasks/actions into the Stages was correct. No confirmation response was received in time from ETP. So, the costing Stages with the ChatGPT assignment of the Phased work was shared with the PC, but they would be unable to authorise the expenditure until ETP has confirmed the fusion of the phase work into the costed Stages.
6. ETP has drafted a response to the Catesby document submitted to BDBC supporting their 50 house development proposal using appeal cases which had overturned a NP based argument against such developments. This arrived just prior to the meeting and would be shared with the PC, but the gist of the response drafted by ETP (costing £2.5k plus VAT) is that the context of each of the 4 appeal cases submitted was critical, and that in each case the context was not comparable to the current 50 house proposal at BG.
(Post meeting comment: the PC had not had time to read the response so no decision was made, but an urgent decision of the document should be made before the deadline for the response is required.)
7. Meeting overran into the PC meeting and so content and timing of the next Steering Group meeting were not decided. This would be followed up in subsequent correspondence.