



Minutes of the **Botley Neighbourhood Plan Committee Meeting**
held on **Wednesday 16 December 2020** at 7:15pm.
This was a virtual meeting using Microsoft Teams:

Voting Cllr members: Cllr David Weeden (Meeting Chairman); Colin Mercer, Stephen Wildin.
Voting non-Cllr members: Jonathan Appleby, Tom Gurd, Graham Hunter, Peter Kemp

In attendance:

Minutes Secretary: Mrs Rosemary Nimmo

Non-Committee Councillors: 0

Members of the Public: 1

51/20/NPC Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence for personal or business reasons were received from Hugh Dixon, Sue Grinham and Jeff Jones.

52/20//NPC Declarations of Interest

No declarations of personal or pecuniary interest were made in relation to items on the Agenda.

53/20/NPC To approve the Neighbourhood Plan Committee minutes of 18 November 2020

The Minutes were approved unanimously and will be signed in the presence of the Parish Clerk in due course.

54/20/NPC Matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting

There were no matters arising.

55/20/NPC Chairman's report

In support of discussion to be held under a later agenda item the Chairman once more laid out the vital importance of getting the Evidence Base (EB) absolutely correct and appropriate. The whole Plan was dependant on the EB, which allowed the Inspector to test it against comment and evidence from Statutory Bodies and other consultees. Policies or supporting papers without sufficient evidence would be struck out and the Botley Neighbourhood Plan (BNP) could be declared unsound or made subject to a Public Hearing. This would be a disaster, not least because Planet had made it clear that they would no longer support us if we chose to ignore their advice and allow such a situation to arise.

Also, the Chairman explained that there had been so many Community Aspirations that there was a real risk that the BNP would encourage unreasonable expectations amongst the residents. Therefore, it had been decided to remove those that had little or no chance of success.

56/20/NPC Question time/public session

No questions had been submitted.

57/20/NPC New member's update

Kaylee Stephens had not been in contact for this meeting, but we hoped would continue with her interest when her circumstances allowed.

58/20/NPC Documents for noting

- BPC Report 2020-12-08 in NP Reports to Parish Council
- NP Change list 2020-12-08 in NP Reports to Parish Council
- BNP Update 2020-12 in NP Updates

59/20/NPC Documents passed into the public domain

None this month

60/20/NPC Documents for the next meeting

- 3rd draft of the Botley Neighbourhood Plan
- Locality Green Matters Paper

There was a possibility that the 3rd Draft would be ready but there were still some issues to be dealt with.

61/20/NPC Process for managing comments on Papers

61.1 Tom Gurd had suggested a new, more formalised way of dealing with comments and discussions, so the Chairman explained how the present system had been chosen. It appeared to be the best way for everyone to have their say and this was accessible by all, regardless of their communication abilities. Once all comment had been received by the Chairman, he and the appropriate authors of any evidence base paper then decided what could be accepted, declined or was appropriate for discussion by the Neighbourhood Plan Committee. If a member's suggested change was declined he/she could raise this at the next NPC meeting. This seemed to

have worked satisfactorily for the most part. The Chairman thought that it was the only method that met the needs of the situation but if the committee thought otherwise then it could be changed.

Cllr Mercer said that the existing system had worked very well and had got us so near to finalisation of the Plan that it would be unwise to change it now. Graham Hunter, Peter Kemp and Jonathan Appleby endorsed this view and Cllr Wildin thought it would be difficult to find a more comprehensive method. Tom Gould then said that he had misunderstood some of the arrangements and, after discussion with the Chairman, also now agreed that the method should not be changed at this time. Graham Hunter suggested that a more formal mechanism might be considered for future working committees, after the Plan was Made. The Chairman thanked Tom Gurd for his acceptance of other opinions and felt that it was important that we should learn from any failures and make improvements where necessary.

- 61.2 Consideration was given to what details of Evidence Base discussions should be made generally available. The Chairman thought that this should be limited but asked if it would be helpful to put the whole Plan (to date) on the restricted section of the website. The members having agreed, he would work with Cllr Mercer to arrange this. Changes to text or corrections could still be made; all input should still be addressed to the Chairman. If anything was rejected it would be for very sound reasons and could be challenged.

62/20/NPC Botley Neighbourhood Plan

- 62.1 Questions posed regarding Housing Mix and Wastewater and other responses had been circulated with the Agenda.
- 62.2 A significant anomaly had been discovered regarding a Housing Mix table after Tom Gurd had queried the large percentage of flats suggested. After considerable work the Chairman and Graham Hunter had found that a table from EBC's Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) had been inserted and this applied to the whole of the Borough rather than Botley specifically. We would replace it with our own evidence-based assessment. In fact 60% of responding residents did not want more flats but the Housing Paper authors were suggesting 77 new flats, not necessarily in blocks, over the next twenty years. Eastleigh's HNA was likely to change now the Inspector had removed some major developments from the Local Plan but the Botley AECOM HNA would still be valuable.
- 62.3 Careful consideration was needed over adding wording about the sewage problems around Botley. Regarding flooding, the Water Authority was legally responsible for dealing with this but Cllr Mercer commented that it was always very difficult to deal with them. Sewage had been a big problem in Botley and Boorley Green for many years, but we had no influence on Southern Water (SW) or the Environment Agency (EA). However, growing emphasis on the green agenda, Solent water quality and Wildlife projects might be ways of attack. Graham Hunter said that this would not be accepted as valid content of the NP but contact details for the EA would be included.

Tom Gurd said that he had recently spoken to SW and the EA but the local Environment Officer had told him that as the Hamble was an official discharge point he could not do anything about individual complaints. However, the Parish Council could raise any serious problems. Cllr Mercer said that the BPC had not appreciated this, they had been told the opposite, that only individual residents could make complaints. They would certainly make an official approach. Tom Gurd would check with the EA Officer again.

63/20/NPC Updated Working Papers

- 63.1 Infrastructure Paper v 32 and Appendix v 32.
- 63.1a Graham Hunter and Peter Kemp had carried out extensive work on Settlement Gaps and Green Spaces, although they had been unable to find a definitive list of the latter.
- 63.1b Richard Kenchington had submitted a lengthy document with requirements for the Footpaths and Bridleways section. Graham Hunter said that the paper could be filled out a little if adequate evidence was available. They would look at this submission and include anything that was appropriate; it was important not to raise too many expectations. Peter Kemp said that having reached version 32 the paper was very nearly complete!
- 63.2 Aspirations
- Tom Gurd wondered if aspirations would change over 20 years so were we considering them for the short term or the duration of the Plan? The Chairman said that the main intention of the BNP was to deal with the future housing development. Aspirations were secondary and must not suggest to residents that inclusion in the Plan necessarily meant that they could be carried out. They were just expressions of opinions but did assume that Statutory Bodies would carry out their legal responsibilities. The BNP could be modified every five years, when minor changes could be made, although anything major would require public consultation. Changes in Government or other regulations might affect what could be contained in the Plan.

64/20/NPC Current status of Working papers

- 64.1 Botley SLAA
No further updates had been needed.

64.2 Communications

Last month's communications had been added.

64.3 Economy

Cllr Wildin had continued to work with local businesses towards their re-launch of the Botley Traders as Botley Business Group. Their intention was to work with the local community and be generally proactive.

64.4 Education

Additional aims regarding libraries had been added. The need for community information terminals was already included and these could also serve as access points for public services such as Job Centres. The Chairman suggested that maybe such centres could be combined with some form of library provision.

64.5 Health and Wellbeing

This was as up to date as possible. Problems arose because Botley was overseen by two Clinical Commissioning Groups. A merger was being considered and we would be kept informed.

64.6 Heritage, Design and Materials

This paper was current.

64.7 Housing

Only minor changes had been made.

64.8 Infrastructure.

As discussed at 63/20/NPC

64.9 Locality

This required a little further work.

64.10 National Planning Policy Framework

No changes needed.

64.11 Surveys.

Tidying up of some text and tables still required.

64.12 Transport

This paper was now complete. Cllr Mercer reported that we could expect a significant financial contribution from a Section 106 agreement in the Uplands development to help fund upgrades to the Square. This funding would be paid directly to the Hampshire County Council Highways Department.

64.13 Vision & Objectives.

The Chairman was anxious about wording for the wastewater problems. He would ask Planet to suggest better phrasing for our consideration. He would also add some further comments to improve the wording on Community Aspirations and ask Planet to approve them.

65/20/NPC Correspondence

No items of correspondence had been received.

66/20/NPC Date of next meeting

Wednesday 20 January 2021 using Microsoft Teams

The meeting closed at 9.05 p.m.