



Chair (pro tem) NDP Working Party

From: Chair (pro tem) NDP Working Party <chair@ndp.chelveston.org.uk>
Sent: 24 June 2013 19:48
To: 'mommersteeg'
Cc: 'clerk@chelveston.org.uk'
Subject: NDP-0026 - Response to [NDP-0017](#)

Pieter,

Thank you for your constructive comments. I accept that the matter is closed and my responses are simply building on the useful points you have made below:

1. The need for free and open dialogue is certainly uppermost in our minds in formulating the Terms of Reference and we will do everything in our power to promote community involvement at every stage – well beyond the membership of the working party.
2. I would be delighted to have another volunteer from Caldecott subject only to the caveat that Mark would need to review the declarations of interest they made using the same tests as have been used to turn down two other volunteers. Melvyn is of course a Caldecott resident and will be tasked with getting Caldecott heavily involved. Any further volunteers would be subject to the ratification of the full Parish Council, either in the meeting on the 8th July or using Standing Order 83 by email.
3. For the avoidance of doubt, there will be **NO** draft NDP produced without consultation, this has always been my intention. Every chapter and section of the plan will be created collaboratively with as many people who wish to be involved. The working document will be published on the web for all to read and comment on and there will be many meetings at which interested residents will be able to comment and debate it. As we interate towards a consensus, we will eventually get to the stage of the NDP Working Party voting formally on the draft. This will then be submitted to the full Parish Council for ratification before an event more active Parish wide consultation occurs. Once we have done this, the revised Draft will be again subject to a vote by the NDP Working Party and the full Parish Council before going to the inspector for scrutiny.
4. I accept the points you make below that any perception of a change of heart on your part would not reflect the reality of your positions in 1994 and 2003.

I look forward to working closely with you.

Cllr Adrian Dale
 Chair (pro tem) of the NDP Working Party
 Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Parish Council

 EMail: chair@ndp.chelveston.org.uk

Tel: 01933 622624

Mobile: 07850 570007

Paper: 21 Water Lane, Chelveston, Wellingborough, Northants, NN9 6AP, UK

From: mommersteeg [mailto:mommers@careerd.freeseve.co.uk]

Sent: 24 June 2013 19:10

To: Adrian.Dale@creatifica.com

Subject: Response to NDP 0017

Adrian,

After my basic response, I have taken into account the note Background to the formulation of the terms of reference (ref: [NDP-0023](#)) and commented where appropriate in italics.

- 1 The setting up and composition of the NDP

- Restriction of membership; there are no government guidelines or restrictions on membership *other than the standard rules of conduct applying to Government and local authority bodies.*
- other village/towns appear not have not taken this approach and restricted land owners or developers
- whereas conflict of interest should of course taken into account, but these should be targeted to the specific areas of conflict

The Parish Council has taken a view that 'landowners' in general should be excluded essentially because of practical /organisational considerations. The Council is entitled to take this decision *but in view of the Council's restrictive interpretation of the guidelines, I feel it is rather limiting and may lead to some restriction on community involvement. It does, however, re-enforce the importance of free and open dialogue.*

2 Composition of the 'residential' members of the consultative committee.

- As a result of the Councillors' decision to exclude all landowners, there is **no** resident member in Caldecott on the consultative committee. (I draw a distinction between Councillor members and proposed 'resident' members).
- Caldecott will, or should form, an important part of the Chelveston, Caldecott and Chelston Rise community's future.
- It was no secret that I had volunteered to be on the consultative committee (Caldecott). The decision not to take up my offer and the appointment of the residential members of the working party were taken at the same meeting. Caldecott should be given the opportunity to put forward a candidate. This is an important issue

3 Format of meetings

I question the preparation of a draft NDP prior to any consultation. In addition, that contributions be limited to written submissions responding to a draft plan does not seem to me to be in the spirit of an open exchange of views on our community's future. I appreciate we have the figures of the questionnaire but members should be exposed to the reasoning, for and against, particular suggestions, notwithstanding the fact that they may have no part in the decision making process. *I note however from the subsequent email that opportunities for discussion will be put in place.*

- ## 4
- As regards your comments about my personal views, I would normally not bother to respond. But as they now appear on the public web site, I feel obliged to respond. Firstly, my position has been consistent and clear for the past 20 years as evidenced by letters I have written to EN Planning in 1994 and 2003. asking for the village confines to be extended along Caldecott Road, (which in turn would facilitate selective development). So there has been no 'change of heart' and my views have been in the public domain.
- Secondly, I did chair the village appraisal in 1994 which from memory came out against large scale development. That was my view too. 'Vigorously and effectively' are emotive words which I may query. Notwithstanding that, firstly, I do draw a distinction between large scale development and selective development. Secondly, the surrounding area has changed significantly in the past 20 years so references to voting preferences, including those Councillors involved in the village appraisal, are not in my opinion material. One last point, in your email you imply that I may be perceived to have undergone a 'change of heart' and might be open to the 'accusation of being pre-determined on the question of whether any development should go ahead' I think my documented views in 1994,2003 and now 2013 answer that point.

However, my possible appointment to the NW P is no longer an issue. I accept the decision made and now consider the matter closed.

Regards,

Pieter