Notes on a Meeting of Tatsfield Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group held on Wednesday 20^{th} April 2022

Present: Martin Allen (MA), Bob David (RD), Paul Jackson (PJ)

Jill Hancock (JH), Nichola Stokoe (NS),

Ian Mitchell (IM), Jason Syrett (JS), Sue Smale (SS)

There were 0 parishioners present

The meeting commenced at 20:04

		Action
1.	Apologies had been received from Ruth Yeeles (RY), Jim Yeeles (JY) and	
	Kim Jennings (KJ).	
2.	Declaration of Interests – No interests declared.	
3.	The Minutes of the Meeting held on 16 th March 2022 were presented	
	and signed by MA.	
	By resolution, the Minutes were accepted and adopted as a true	
	record. The Minutes would be passed to the Parish Council (PC) for	PCClerk / IN
	acceptance at its next meeting. In the meantime, IM would upload	RY
	these Minutes to the website as a draft copy and RY to Drop Box.	
4.	Dropbox – RY had confirmed that Dropbox was still working correctly	
	and she had put in all the latest documents received from JS. RY and JY	
	had finished their consultation statement.	
5.	Update and response from the Communication and public	
	consultations of the Neighbourhood Plan Reg 14 Consultation	
	(a)(b) Online and paper responses received from the public:	
	There had been 27 responses in total – 21 Yes, 4 No and 2 Unsure.	
	Comments on the post-it notes from the public open day to be included	JS
	on spreadsheet	
	The main areas brought up on the responses were: Local Transport,	
	particularly buses, Pastiche Design, Light Pollution (Dark Night Sky) and	
	Shops (Local Economy)	
	All the comments had been read and where concerns had been raised	
	these would be looked at specifically if they had not already been	
	addressed in the plan. If accepted the NP would be changed or it would	
	be explained why there would not be a change. It was felt that with	
	most of the No responses, their later comments implied that they are in	
	agreement and support the objectives of the plan.	
	(c) Responses from TDC (circulated to Group)	
	Page 2 Map – Legend difficult to read – JS to adjust and add labels and	JS
	also scales to all maps	
	Page 5 – Foreword – Yes, link should be to all documents on website.	
	MA to check	MA
	Page 11 Third para – JS to move ref to plots, fruit trees, etc	JS
	Page 12 Sect 01.2 – JS to insert suggested words	JS
	Page 14 Sect 01.4 – JS to include 2018 update	JS
	Page 18 – JS to adjust Glossary – Update will be reviewed if received	JS
	from SCC in time	
	Page 19 – Map of Listed Buildings – Acknowledged but no action	
	Page 22 Sect 02.3 – JS to increase definition of names and Glossary	JS
	definitions	
	Page 23 – One of the North points to be removed. JS to make parish	JS
	boundary thicker and lighten surrounding area	

	Page 24 Sect 02.4 – PJ to rewrite words to be more specific about areas being valuable – All character areas? JS to send PJ word document of	PJ/JS
	section Page 30 – MA to check with TDC re Local Green Spaces - how they	MA
	comply with criteria. IM and NS would look into notifying owners of LGSs – most owned by PC	IM/NS
	Page 32 Sect 02.6 Map – JS to adjust	
	Page 38 policy TNP02A – Take out (a) JS to have a conversation with Anna	JS
	Page 38 policy TNP02B – Remove (a) Name roads and add street map	JS
	Page 38 policy TNP02C – Some duplication – reword to clarify policy	JS
	Page 38 policy TNP02E – No change – explanatory note	
	Page 39 policy TNP02G – Biodiversity Net Gain – add definition in	JS
	Glossary. Add comments from responses on biodiversity. Page 40 policy TNP02H – Rephrase policy positively.	JS
	Page 40 policy TNP02K – Replicase policy positivery. Page 40 policy TNP02K – Be more explicit about what is in Defined	13
	Village or outside in light of John's Road Residents Association comments	
	Page 40 – refs to CS policies – Relevant? JS to check	JS
	Page 42 Sects 03.3, 03.4, 03.5 – AECOM exclusion from NP – Talk with	MA/JS
	Anna before decision made. All to look at rest of housing comments Rest of TDC responses to be discussed at later meeting.	All
	(d) Responses from Statutory Consultees One objection to the plan had been received from Thames Water – Plan says objective is to have all pipes, etc underground. Thames Water point out that pumps etc have to be above ground. Plan to be amended. Use their words to reword TNOP4H	JS
	Also response from SCC Historic Environment Team – lack of mention of archaeological sites in the area.	
6.	website – IM reported that there had been 38 viewings of the NP website since 4 April 2022. 699 visitors had viewed the site this year compared with 528 for the whole of 2021. Between Jan and April 2021	
	website – IM reported that there had been 38 viewings of the NP website since 4 April 2022. 699 visitors had viewed the site this year	
	website – IM reported that there had been 38 viewings of the NP website since 4 April 2022. 699 visitors had viewed the site this year compared with 528 for the whole of 2021. Between Jan and April 2021 there were 193 visitors.	
7.	website – IM reported that there had been 38 viewings of the NP website since 4 April 2022. 699 visitors had viewed the site this year compared with 528 for the whole of 2021. Between Jan and April 2021 there were 193 visitors. Strategic Environmental Assessment Plan – TDC Response SEA screening document concludes that the TNP does not need an SEA, together with some notes on NPs sent by the Environment Agency in response when TDC consulted them. Also HRA screening assessment from 2020 concludes that an assessment of the Plan under the Habitat Regulations is not required. What do we do next from here?	
7.	website – IM reported that there had been 38 viewings of the NP website since 4 April 2022. 699 visitors had viewed the site this year compared with 528 for the whole of 2021. Between Jan and April 2021 there were 193 visitors. Strategic Environmental Assessment Plan – TDC Response SEA screening document concludes that the TNP does not need an SEA, together with some notes on NPs sent by the Environment Agency in response when TDC consulted them. Also HRA screening assessment from 2020 concludes that an assessment of the Plan under the Habitat Regulations is not required. What do we do next from here? MA to respond to Mike Pendleton email.	MA
7.	website – IM reported that there had been 38 viewings of the NP website since 4 April 2022. 699 visitors had viewed the site this year compared with 528 for the whole of 2021. Between Jan and April 2021 there were 193 visitors. Strategic Environmental Assessment Plan – TDC Response SEA screening document concludes that the TNP does not need an SEA, together with some notes on NPs sent by the Environment Agency in response when TDC consulted them. Also HRA screening assessment from 2020 concludes that an assessment of the Plan under the Habitat Regulations is not required. What do we do next from here?	MA
7.	website – IM reported that there had been 38 viewings of the NP website since 4 April 2022. 699 visitors had viewed the site this year compared with 528 for the whole of 2021. Between Jan and April 2021 there were 193 visitors. Strategic Environmental Assessment Plan – TDC Response SEA screening document concludes that the TNP does not need an SEA, together with some notes on NPs sent by the Environment Agency in response when TDC consulted them. Also HRA screening assessment from 2020 concludes that an assessment of the Plan under the Habitat Regulations is not required. What do we do next from here? MA to respond to Mike Pendleton email. Essentially: a) review and consider all the Reg 14 feedback - public, statutory and TDC	MA
7.	website – IM reported that there had been 38 viewings of the NP website since 4 April 2022. 699 visitors had viewed the site this year compared with 528 for the whole of 2021. Between Jan and April 2021 there were 193 visitors. Strategic Environmental Assessment Plan – TDC Response SEA screening document concludes that the TNP does not need an SEA, together with some notes on NPs sent by the Environment Agency in response when TDC consulted them. Also HRA screening assessment from 2020 concludes that an assessment of the Plan under the Habitat Regulations is not required. What do we do next from here? MA to respond to Mike Pendleton email. Essentially: a) review and consider all the Reg 14 feedback - public, statutory and TDC b) decide what to amend	MA
7.	website – IM reported that there had been 38 viewings of the NP website since 4 April 2022. 699 visitors had viewed the site this year compared with 528 for the whole of 2021. Between Jan and April 2021 there were 193 visitors. Strategic Environmental Assessment Plan – TDC Response SEA screening document concludes that the TNP does not need an SEA, together with some notes on NPs sent by the Environment Agency in response when TDC consulted them. Also HRA screening assessment from 2020 concludes that an assessment of the Plan under the Habitat Regulations is not required. What do we do next from here? MA to respond to Mike Pendleton email. Essentially: a) review and consider all the Reg 14 feedback - public, statutory and TDC b) decide what to amend c) write consultation statement (RY & JY has started this)	MA
7.	website – IM reported that there had been 38 viewings of the NP website since 4 April 2022. 699 visitors had viewed the site this year compared with 528 for the whole of 2021. Between Jan and April 2021 there were 193 visitors. Strategic Environmental Assessment Plan – TDC Response SEA screening document concludes that the TNP does not need an SEA, together with some notes on NPs sent by the Environment Agency in response when TDC consulted them. Also HRA screening assessment from 2020 concludes that an assessment of the Plan under the Habitat Regulations is not required. What do we do next from here? MA to respond to Mike Pendleton email. Essentially: a) review and consider all the Reg 14 feedback - public, statutory and TDC b) decide what to amend c) write consultation statement (RY & JY has started this) d) write basic conditions statement	MA
7.	website – IM reported that there had been 38 viewings of the NP website since 4 April 2022. 699 visitors had viewed the site this year compared with 528 for the whole of 2021. Between Jan and April 2021 there were 193 visitors. Strategic Environmental Assessment Plan – TDC Response SEA screening document concludes that the TNP does not need an SEA, together with some notes on NPs sent by the Environment Agency in response when TDC consulted them. Also HRA screening assessment from 2020 concludes that an assessment of the Plan under the Habitat Regulations is not required. What do we do next from here? MA to respond to Mike Pendleton email. Essentially: a) review and consider all the Reg 14 feedback - public, statutory and TDC b) decide what to amend c) write consultation statement (RY & JY has started this)	MA

9.	Next Meeting:	
	Wednesday 25 th May 2022 at 8pm	
	The meeting closed at 9.56pm	

MA/JH/04/22		
	Chair	Date