**Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Group.**

**Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 8th January 2024**

Present: Ron Simpson (in the chair), David Ainslie, Liz Clarke, Andrew Mankowski, Tony Streeter, Godfrey Jennings, Mike Fish, Howard Thompson, Margaret Simpson, David Casewell, Bob Fisher, Nick Townsend. Ramsey Ross 6.35pm

Also In attendance: Clive Keeble Consultant, Sharon Coe Town Clerk, and Cynthia Ondeng Administration Assistant.

9 members of the public

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1.2.3.4.5.6.7. |  | **Welcome**The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and wished them a Happy New Year.**Apologies for Absence**Received from Christine Edwards, Janet Thompson.These were accepted. **Declarations of interest.**These would be declared if an item of interest on the agenda became apparent**.****An opportunity for members of the public to speak (limited to 15 minutes)To receive an overview of the working party immediately before this meeting.**A member of the public read a statement in her view that the plan had failed to meaningfully consult the wider community and demonstrate transparency. Although presentation of the plan was agreed. She urged NPAG to demonstrate the community interests not the developers. The Chair thanked her for her statement.**To consider the draft consultant’s response to the points of clarification requested by the external examiner.**The Town Council was praised as having full transparency. Point of order was raised regarding Vanguard. The Chair of council asked if we could return the agenda being discussed. The huge amount of work done by our consultant over the festive break was acknowledged. The Consultant would be asked to explain the approach and then we would step through each response in turn. A question was asked if we could have a synopsis ? but in order of transparency these would we stepped through; the synopsis is held within the covering note which had been distributed before the meeting to all members.The consultant picked up on the timings that had been raised, and for that reason the response deadline had been requested and granted. The examiner clarification questions were quite normal at this time. It was noted that RCC were happy with the plan as submitted but wouldn’t disclose what papers/policies they were going to rely on. At that point they had not released their Local Plan. Hence the surprise at some comments made. The examiner would take these matters into consideration.The responses were considered one by one with the consultant explaining the response that he suggested – the chair asking at each response if NPAG had questions or were happy before moving to the next.**Clarification discussions :*** Densities : we wanted density to represent the character of Uppingham. The point would be strengthened to have smaller houses/and to attract young people.
* The ARUP report that was commissioned by the Town Council would be sent to the examiner.
* Convenience stores were discussed , this was planning jargon – a supermarket was what was proposed. Impact on the High Street. A sequential test would be applied.
* Access to Uppingham Gate would be picked up in the 5yr review.
* Open Spaces – Leicester Road Allotments to be added.
* To strengthen the employment statement and the Town Council’s commitment to the Station Road area.
* Post Office – this was due to be discussed at the Full Council.
* Monitoring and review – Delete the last statement regarding NPPF and RCC.
* Once the local plan is made UTC would consider whether or not there is conformity between the NP and LP within 6 months.
* Two members had to leave at 7pm. (Dave Casewell and Margaret Simpson- prior commitment)
* The consultant requested NPAG’s views on the question regarding the Allison Homes site and Uppingham Gate. Uppingham Gate is a designated employment site, the site on Ayston road has a reserved area for employment/supermarket.
* Examiners questions were concluded.
* It was unfathomable that RCC had comments indicating that none of the sites were suitable.
* RCC had signed off this plan which had been approved to go forward to the External Examiner (both through cabinet and Full Council). UTC used the 2019 RCC SHELAA policy in order to pass the sites used, through its site allocations document. We need to understand why this negative comment has been made. Cllr Ross agreed to take this up on our behalf at RCC. The matter will also be addressed at Town Council.
* Additional analysis that NPAG had received from NPAG member Nick Townsend will be attached to the final document that Town Council will consider.
* Walking and Cycling – could we emphasis this in the responses. Could we add ‘disabled mobility access’ i.e. wheelchairs.

The Rutland County Council questions were then approached with the consultant highlighting any pertinent facts.* Town Centre Parking – Working parties and groups were formed – RCC had taken this as a criticism initially. We were entitled to make these points as part of the NP. This had been communicated to Officers in a face to face meeting.
* Resolved to recommend this report as amended tonight to Town Council for discussion. Thanks were given to Clive. ( 9 for 3 abs)

**To receive a courtesy update on the council’s standing orders working party with regard to NPAG.**An update was given that the UTC standing orders working party would look at NPAG as to its constitution going forward. A protocol would also be suggested for working with the developers.**To acknowledge receipt of correspondence and replies by the Clerk to a member of the advisory group.**The receipt of correspondence was noted.The Chair thanked everyone for their attendance and the meeting closedat 7.40pm. |
|  |  |  |