



### Minutes of the Working Party

Date of Meeting: 18<sup>th</sup> August, 2020    Venue: 6 Whittlebury Road, Silverstone.  
(Observing Social distancing guidelines)

Name	Initials	Present - P Apologies - A Absent - AB	Name	Initials	Present - P Apologies - A Absent - AB
Nick Ashby (has resigned but will continue to receive minutes)	NA	DNA	James Laband	JL	P
Robert Brightman	RPB	P	Carol Mason	CM	AB
Charles Challenger	CC	AB(Unwell)	Carol Tosh	CT	P
Clive Girling	CG	A(shielding)	John Rudland	JR	A (shielding)
			Martin Williams	MW	P

Chair	Clerk	Quorum - one third of total membership (i.e. 4)
Robert Brightman	Carol Tosh	Quorate – 4 members

Item	Comments
1	<b>Welcome and apologies for absence</b>
	This was the first meeting since 13 <sup>th</sup> February due to the Covid 19 Pandemic. Apologies were received and as noted above.
2	<b>Secretary/Clerk</b>
	CLT agreed to take notes of the meeting.
3	<b>Declaration of Interests</b>
	There were no Declarations of Interest.
4	<b>Minutes of the previous meeting</b>

Item	Comments
	The minutes of the meeting held on 13 <sup>th</sup> February were recorded as a true record of the meeting.
5	<p><b>Matters Arising</b></p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan page on the website has recorded 4,807 views from March 2017 to 22nd September 2020.</p> <p>All matters arising have now been completed.</p>
6	<p><b>Budget and Grants</b></p> <p>CT to contact Groundwork to ascertain the new limit for grant funding at Stage 1. Also to check how to access funding/advice for the Allocation of Sites element of Stage 2 (estimated at circa £10k, which we qualify for).</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>CT</b></p>
7	<p><b>Ellie Gingell</b></p>
	<p>The Parish Council had agreed to the expense of an Executive Summary and other advice being commissioned from Ellie who had previously been our contact as Neighbourhood Plan Officer at SNC and was very familiar with our plan and its objectives and had been most helpful in guiding our work. The policy section of the SNDP was thought to be repetitive and wordy and needed refining, without losing the meaning or nuances implied in the Annexes to the Plan. Although an executive summary was not a legal consideration, it would greatly assist the general public to have a simplified version of this quite complicated Plan which will aid understanding. Also included will be a 'how to use this document' section. Note that a significant part of the Plan are for either future legal reference (Annexes); or for general public interest on systematic issues which impact the village (Appendix).</p> <p>A draft of Ellie's work is required in order to progress the Plan through its next stages. It was confirmed that the earliest date for a Referendum would be May 2021.</p>
8	<p><b>Royal Town Planning Institute - RTPI</b></p> <p>RPB is considering an article for this professional body as we enter the 'marketing' phase of our plan.</p>
9	<p><b>Landowners and Stakeholders</b></p> <p><b>RPB agreed to write</b> a collective update for the four landowning groups.</p>
10	<p><b>SNDP drawings/graphics</b></p>
	<p>Caroline Brown's work on all the graphics had been on hold for some time since the Covid situation made it difficult to meet and 'pore over' plans. Post lockdown it was now possible to restart the process.</p> <p>There were some 65 pages of full page illustrations to be added at appropriate places. These would be whole page (rather than 'wrap-around the text') to make desk top publishing easier, more flexible and cheaper.</p> <p>RPB advised that he was very concerned that our high quality ambitions for the 'Hub' (new local centre) might not be met unless we gave more detailed, visual guidance in the form of layout and perhaps elevations in more detail than those shown in the MPV. Hence, he had been working on some 'built form studies' to guide the general tone of our aspirations and ensure that the result was much more than a cluster of bland, brick</p>

Item	Comments
	<p>buildings in a sea of tarmac. More detailed work was also underway on the 'Silverstone Centre' (new village hall) to similarly establish the requisite level of accommodation and built quality which the village deserves and needs. Also required was more detailed work on a typical wildlife corridor/public movement/agriculture illustration and a study to prove the feasibility of the restored lake and to raise excitement for this great opportunity.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>RPB/CB</b></p> <p><b>MW to calculate the village perimeter.</b> Various statistical information needs to be collated. RPB to work out the existing built area of the village using his famous digital planimeter.</p>
<b>11</b>	<b>SEA – Strategic Environmental Assessment</b>
	Kirkwells to complete this.
<b>12</b>	<p><b>Recent White Paper</b></p> <p>The working party were awaiting guidance from the professional press and associations (RTPI/TCPA). JR/DB to set up a meeting with Andrea Leadsom and, through her, possibly meet with high ranking civil servants in the department of Robert Jenrick, Secretary of State.</p> <p>CT had contacted DB as our local councilor to write an intro to our plan which he had agreed to do. He, in turn, was to contact and brief Andrea Leadsom to ask if she would offer her support.</p> <p>Discussions took place around the crucial principle of 'land value capture' which dated back to the 1947 Act which, in effect, 'nationalized' the right to develop land.</p> <p>To summarize, a considerable sum of money is needed (via planning gain/land value capture) to fund our vision. Both Clive and Paul (Griffiths) are to produce an order of magnitude for this capital figure, taking into account the lake proposal, local earthworks necessary and such other items as cycleways, fencing, tree planting, Silverstone Centre and external works for the Hub etc. This estimated sum would be vital for all future planning negotiations. There was also a need to ensure that there was adequate funding for future maintenance of all new public works. This should be managed by the PC with the benefit of an in 'perpetuity trust fund', also to be derived from planning gain (to preclude SRA type problems).</p>
<b>14</b>	<b>Definition of a Phase 1</b>
	All members of the group had been asked to consider the definition of a Phase 1 development. The group reached a consensus on the general principles for a way forward. There is a legal requirement for us to define an area to be developed by 2029 (which is by no means all the land shown for future development in the MPV).
<b>16</b>	<b>Next Steps and Progress</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>RPB to complete all the required drawings and illustrations.</b></li> <li>• <b>CB's first draft document would need to be inspected by the group as a whole</b></li> <li>• <b>Ellie's edit was awaited.</b></li> </ul>
<b>19</b>	<b>AOB</b>
	There being no further business, the meeting closed at 4.45pm

Item	Comments
	<p style="color: red;">FUTURE MEETING DATES ARE LISTED BELOW.</p>

<b>Formal Meetings</b>	
To be decided given the current Government Legislation. Zoom meetings are available.	