

## **Feedback on consultation with LCC in October 2016.**

I promised a note following yesterday's meeting with Ian and his team. So, a few thoughts and my best stab at some follow up actions.

I thought the event was good – and the very fact that Ian had pulled in a number of his team reflects his view that the Walton Plan and our team are important to him. I thought we were treated well and respectfully and that Ian's group were attentive, clear and helpful, and there was evidence of some preparation in advance of the meeting.

It felt like we covered our agenda quite comfortably (testing the policies and presenting our questions...) and for the greater part we received some clarity – and some choices. So, do we want aspirations as well as requirements to feature in the plan (and we *thought* yes, because that's what we heard the village asking for...but we recognise that the language is important – '*seek to*'..); do we want a more detailed contribution to the housing proposals, or a more general overview (and we thought *more specific* – on some, at least); do we keep things in as policies or take them out (and we erred on keeping them in – whilst recognising that others might insist they come out).

We got clarity on a number of the more technical issues – so, the coal yard is *brown field*; the rural versus green belt distinction (with the latter having the higher protection level.....) etc. etc.....

For me, a few key points,

- The absolute importance of the clearest line of sight from vision statement through policies to projects.
- Once the plan is accepted it is a City Council plan (as well as a village plan), thus, the strong interest and concern on their part – to get it right.
- The vagaries of examiners – some keep it in...some remove it.
- A focus on the vision – uniqueness, relevance and is it a sufficiently firm basis for the consequent policies.
- A focus on the consultation – it feels like we have got this right and Ian wanted assurance (through Abbie) that it was presented at its most powerful.
- The nearby housing aspirations (TATE) should not become a distraction – though clearly we should ensure suitable protection as far as possible, within the plan, against any risks that might arise – in our case traffic consequentials.

For our part, we made it clear that,

- Small village – keep the planning bureaucracy in perspective
- Determined to get this job done and at pace, given the beginnings in 2013.
- The voice of the village matters.
- There are particular village hotspot issues – public transport; path connections; traffic through the village (potentially increasing with TATE etc).

So, some actions fell out of the meeting

- Data and our summary conclusions to Abbie for an additional verification and views on presentation. (*Richard and Melvyn (a selection of pictures?)*).
- Continued work on the policies (*Brodie and Richard*).
- A proposal on policy options on 'business'. (*Abbie*).
- A follow up on transport issues (*Melvyn and Gillian MacLeod*).
- A note on existing green space allocation. (*Ian*).
- The housing allocation – a package of work, potentially deliverable by Ian and his team – at cost. He will require our project plan to help with timescales – and he will, thereafter, provide a costing and delivery timeline. (*Brodie and Ian*).

We had a private meeting at the end of the LCC discussion – to take stock and to line up for our internal meeting of 10<sup>th</sup> – not least our position on consultancy.

Brodie Clark.