**NOTES AND ACTIONS FROM THE PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE WORKING GROUP MEETING ON 29th APRIL 2019**

**Attending:**

PIWG Board members:

* Martin Veal (Chair)
* Liz Hodges
* Nick Hurst
* Ed Macalister-Smith
* Mark MacKenzie-Charrington

Additional Board member attendees:

* Cate Mack

Officer:

* John Mills

**Apologies:**

* Mike Dean

**Agenda items:**

**1. Notes and action points from the meeting on 31st January 2019**

N.B. Most of the actions related to agenda items for this meeting (29th April) and are addressed under those agenda items. Other topics / actions from 31st January are as follows:

* Regular slot in Cotswolds Lion newspaper
  + JM informed PIWG that Martin Lane had advised that the Cotswold Lion wouldn’t be an appropriate forum for a regular article on planning issues.
  + Some PIWG members were not happy with this (including the fact that the officers had ruled out a recommendation of the Working Group) and would still like a regular feature.
    - **ACTION:** JM to look into having features about specific planning cases.
* Major development:
  + Some PIWG members were disappointed that the Management Plan would not be updated for another 4-5 years.
  + JM advised that he is already compiling notes on potential updates and that the review process will begin within the next couple of years.
  + NH indicated that, in Stroud, ‘small sites’ are those that constitute fewer than 10 dwellings or those which would increase the number or dwellings in a settlement by less than 5% (whichever is the lesser of the two).
    - **ACTION:** JM to review case law regarding the number of dwellings (or % growth in number of dwellings) that constitute major development, in the context of paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
* Local authority contacts:
  + **ACTION:** JM to ask local authority Board members to update local authority contacts list.

**2. Consultation responses in 2018/19**

* Discussed the most appropriate mechanism for making relevant local authority elected members (e.g. planning committee) aware of the Board’s planning consultation responses – agreed that the Planning & Landscape Officer should send the response the relevant Board local authority appointee and that the local authority appointee should then send the consultation response to relevant local authority contact.
* PIWG members suggested that this issue could potentially form part of the roles and responsibilities of Board members.
* **ACTION:** MV to raise the issue of Board member responsibilities at Executive Committee meeting.
* **ACTION:** JM to review planning decisions for planning applications that the Board commented on in 2018/19.
* **ACTION:** LH to run the flowchart past the Gloucestershire Association of Parish and Town Councils (GAPTC).

**3. Guidance for stakeholders in responding to planning consultations**

* PIWG members liked the flowchart that JM presented but would like to see a simpler version that could be used by non-specialists.
* **ACTION:** JM to produce a simpler version of the flowchart.

**4. Major development / EIA screening**

* PIWG members considered that the Local Plan site allocations in Winchcombe and the proposed development on one of these allocation sites should be considered as major development and that the proposed development should require an EIA; they are
* PWIG agreed that any development of over 100 dwellings in the AONB should be considered as major development, regardless of the size of the existing settlement.
* **ACTION:** JM to send recommendations regarding the Winchcombe site to Tewkesbury Borough Council.

**5. Planning protocols**

* PIWG members suggested that any planning protocol between the Board and the local planning authorities should be more collaborative.
* **ACTION:** JM to review and update the consultation criteria and the planning protocol.

**6. External Funding Working Group challenge**

* Suggestions from PIWG members, regarding securing more external funding, including utilising George Lambrick’s expertise on a contract basis with local planning authorities.
* Overall, PIWG considered that this issue had been adequately addressed and did not think that it was necessary to have it as an ongoing agenda item.

.

**7. Update on work programme relating to PIWG Terms of Reference**

* **ACTION:** JM to develop a programme and timescales for new / updated Position Statements.

**8. Next meeting (date to be confirmed)**

* **Date of next meeting: provisionally 1 or 2 July 2019** (JM to confirm) – might be subject to change, depending on timescales for new Board members joining PIWG.
* Agenda items:
* Review of planning decisions for planning applications that the Board commented on in 2018/19.
* Consultation criteria / planning protocol.
* Programme / timescales for new / updated Position Statements.

**9. AOB**

* Attendance by additional Board members
  + PIWG members don’t want other Board members to be put off from attending; they just need to provide advance notice of their intention to attend.
  + **ACTION:** MV to raise this issue at Executive Committee.