**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group**

**Minutes for the SPNPSG Meeting, 7.30pm Thursday 27th July 2017, at The Pavilion, Seend.**

1. **Present:** Georgina A’Bear (GA)(Chair), Kevin Rigg (KR), Tony Murch (TM), Sarah Chard (SC), Adeltha Raymond (AR), Pamela Akerman (PA). **Apologies:** Carola Thorpe (CT), Sue McCulloch. **Also Present:** Tony Trodd (taking minutes), Carole Vince, Margaret Ryan, John Goman and Mr & Mrs Lawrence.
2. **Declarations of Interest:** None noted.
3. **Minutes of the Previous Meeting (29.06.17):**  GA read through the previous minutes, as circulated, with minor changes to wording, which were duly approved.
4. **Matters Arising:** It was noted that CT had requested that Minutes be more detailed. It was also noted that the meeting of the Community Land Trust (CLT), held July 11th, was well supported. It was also reported that Yvette Rowe had resigned from the Group because of work commitments.
5. **Steering Group Review: Members Tasks -** GA asked if there were any ideas or suggestions to be made :

i) She referenced a circulated email from CT. AR said that emails may be misconstrued and TM added that absences made it difficult to continue dialogue, that ideas should ideally be discussed during meetings and that members should be encouraged to attend. GA said that she did encourage people to attend and acknowledged the number of people present.

Ii) GA spoke to the issues following on from Steve Vaux’s resignation – accessing The Pavilion was not a problem but maintaining the Group’s website was. If it were outsourced to a professional group there may be a monthly charge (£25-30) or an hourly charge made, depending on the time required to update it. A local company had suggested these alternatives and could offer a trial run. SC volunteered to have a look at the website if it was just updating that was needed. AR offered SC her support with this.

iii) The Group’s banners – Two banners are usually placed on the Lye Field boards, two others for Sells Green (at The Magpies, by the telephone kiosk) and one for Seend Cleeve (location to be sourced). These continue to be stored by Steve Vaux. AR offered to help out with this if required.

1. **Review of work done to date & the plan going forward:** GA explained that the Action Review record was on the website and that she kept a backup file of all that was recorded. The Visions, Objectives and Policies (VOP) document would require a closed workshop to progress. At present the Group are in the process of identifying possible consultancy services that would be able to support this work. SC and KR spoke to this point: that if consultants are identified to proceed, apace, in obtaining quotes (advice and opinions from possible consultants were at least free), and that the main issue in using their experience is the detailed brief to be set by the Group. GA added that it may require a sub-group to work on this as it is likely to progress rapidly.
2. **Settlement Boundary Review:** Wiltshire County Council (WCC) have undertaken a review of Seend Village’s settlement boundaries and are consulting on this – an outline map (along with a Legend and Map References) is located in the Village Post Office:

i) Extensive discussion followed on from GA’s starting point at The Bell Car Park -

Obstensibly, the criteria for exclusion or inclusion, as she explained, in or out of the Village boundary, is based on the perceived view of how one feels if standing in this area: is the feeling of ‘Countryside’ (Outside) or of part of the Village ‘Urban’ context (Inside)?. KR was unequivicable in stating that The Bell car park gave a clear ‘countryside’ view and that, not least for planning purposes, should be considered as outside the Village boundary, even though it was hardstanding. He continued ‘a settlement boundary should contain the Village and give or help create a sense of place’ and saw no reason to ‘include’ the car park and questioned the change. The view was that the car park should remain an open space and those present agreed in principle, that it should not be included within the boundary.

ii) Just following the boundary around – excluding roads where possible – it appeared that Seend House and Seend Park had been particularly excluded but other people’s gardens had been included. The Church was included, incorporating the Churchyard.

The opinion expressed was ‘Can we retain the settlement boundary as it previously existed?’ and a view was taken that the ‘review’ had been inconsistent in its application.

iii) The WI Allotments & Lye Field were next for consideration. The allotments were excluded. AR asked about the length of time these boundaries stood for – it appeared that the WCC’s paper and pen exercise had more changes to it than had been other Village’s experience. TM then spoke to the point that The Lye Field in particular should be included within the boundary as it conveyed a sense of ownership and ‘belonging’ to the Village community. The issue of the Village assets and [protecting] its open spaces has been brought into focus by the Seend Neighbourhood Action Group (SNAG). GA explained that It will be for the Parish Council to respond to comments from parishioners as they had put the call out for comments and not the SPNPSG, as it is not in their brief. She reiterated that the Parish Council has to follow pre-set protocols and guidelines and keep to frustratingly slow timescales. Whether to include the Lye Field or exclude it from the settlement boundary is a sensitive issue, as all in the Group agreed and the implications need to be reviewed. ‘On advice we may change our thoughts’ was the consensus.

iv) The settlement boundary response submission is required by 22nd September. TM explained that it goes to WCC cabinet for approval in October/ November and adopted by 2018 and reviewed by an inspector. The Group will respond, as will the Parish Council.

1. **Website and emails:** SC and AR to access and review what needs doing.
2. **Spotlight Article:** The next edition will be for October.
3. **Finance:** The only expenses to-date has been for the banners and preparing the copies of the VOP’s. [Visions, Objectives & Policy documents).
4. **Action Plan Review:** All updated to 28th June by Steve Vaux. GA said that some items had been updated positively but still awaits consultancy advice (e.g. Environmental Contexts, pg. 3 / Play space and equipment provision)
5. **A.O.B.:**
6. Is the P.C. a member of the CPRE (Council for the Protection of Rural England)? GA affirmed this.
7. KR mooted the idea of a ‘business card’ – a visual aide-memoir – to advertise the Neighbourhood Plan, perhaps as a magnetic card to pin items to a fridge. He offered a colourful painting as an example. The conversation then focused on the whole of the Seend area, rather than just the village on the hill and the suggestion that one of the Parish Church windows, depicting both canal and countryside, may offer the appropriate neutral background for the Group’s use, encouraging the public to keep the Neighbourhood Plan in mind whenever they see it. SC suggested co-opting a family member to draft such an image.
8. The meeting ended on this happy note, concluding with the note that a closed workshop would need to be arranged and set the date for the next meeting as: **Thursday 31st August, 7.30 at The Pavilion, Seend.**