

Notes of the NDP meeting held Tuesday 15th May | 2018 at High Chimneys commencing 15.00hrs

Those attending :-

Barry Turner(BT) (Secretary and Chair), Dylan Griffiths(DG), Peter Everton (PE)(Financial, Alan Coles(AC) and Keith Sullivan (KS) Liz Beth (LB) + Liz Nichols (LN)and Ben Guzman(BG)

Apologies received from ;- Allan Knapp (AK)

There were no declarations of interest made . BT explained to LN and BG that declarations of interest were necessary (in line with Parish Council Protocol) for recognised members of the working group and that it would be necessary in their case should they decide to become members.

The notes of 18th April meeting were agreed

There was no Public Forum, but potential group members LN and BG attended having been invited to participate as a result of declaring a willingness to get involved . Other members of the community had expressed a willingness to help but were unavailable for this meeting but may attend in future .

2018/78 Plan Status BT reported that there are a number of issues which are impacting on the plan . The agenda circulated for this meeting included an ‘aide memoire’ which reported how far we have got with the NDP and what we need to do now. This reflects the status reasonably well and is attached for further reference. BT emphasised that we need to develop a time phased plan to support a grant funding application, this needed to be realistic to avoid falling foul of the ‘Locality’ grant funding rules /controls. This year is the start of a new funding round and the old rules have been changed.BT does not want to seek funding until the picture is clearer. One issue discussed related to the time a grant request covers (it used to be 6 months) .LB advised that she thought it was now 12 months which would give more flexibility in the phasing of the plan .
Post meeting note – The change to 12months is confirmed , in our case the cut-off point would be the end of the financial year March 2019 . It was agreed that a draft time scaled plan would be prepared Action BT/LB.

2018/78 Assessment of Sites from version 4 of Report. BT reported that Version 4 reflected the granting authority view that the earlier version contradicted the NPPF in matters relating to the green belt . This is technically true but given the current thinking on Green Belt matters both regionally and locally and proposed amendments to the NPPF sites 7,8 and 9 will remain sites for consideration in our plan .

2018/79 Interpretation of Assessment Reports A Power Point presentation(attached) providing an indicative interpretation of the individual site assessments of the sites with the greatest potential for development was presented. This was not a definitive analysis but the purpose was to stimulate debate on each site. The full report for each site and the corresponding FRA needs to be understood to make sense of this.

Each Site was discussed in some detail (also refer to attached presentation of the full version 4 report to provide a better picture)

Site 2 Plus . This site notionally includes a portion of site 1(all in one ownership) . Site 1 was not recommended largely due to flooding and access concerns but in discussion with the land owner consideration of existing parking problems was considered. It was felt that by providing a means of access to the rear of existing properties some community benefit could be achieved . Generally speaking this site and the logic used was not challenged.

Site 13 . Given the desire to maintain the 'linear ' nature of the village where most dwellings bound the carriageway a smaller portion of the site which is intersected by Westend Lane has been used . Generally speaking this site (in three ownerships) did not stimulate much debate.

The above sites are ranked highly in terms of flood risk and favourably in respect of other planning considerations .

All the sites below are impacted by the Green Belt (see minute 2018/78)

Site 7 is in 2 ownerships . The 'Lagger' portion of the site has been the subject of planning discussions but the site assessment report is unequivocal in its dismissal of the site in itself being acceptable for development. The remainder of the site , in different ownership, has some potential and this is reflected in the statement ' the north west corner of the site could be appropriate to consider for development. This would not strictly be 'linear' development . There are also problems with access to consider particularly if the site was to be developed independently of the 'Lagger'. There is a potential opportunity if a proposal combining the two areas which make up site 7 could be put forward which mitigates access issues and the unsuitability of the 'Lagger site' (as a separate entity). Notwithstanding this the Green Belt remains an issue for consideration at this time .

Site 8 This site in 1 ownership whilst the best in terms of flood risk has a number of negative issues . Access and terrain are probably the most significant . Development of this site in truth would not be along linear lines, also the cost of developing the site would possibly compromise house prices and the type of dwelling which would need to be developed . A full understanding of the Version 4 assessment comments relating to this site in particular which is also in the green Belt is essential .

Site 9 This site also in 1 ownership whilst again in the green Belt offers the opportunity for the sort of development the community feedback suggested was needed. The site lends itself to 'linear' development.

It was not possible to reach a consensus on which sites should be promoted, potentially it could be all of them although 2 sites would not really comply with the linear character of the majority of the Village or the Parish . The use of the word 'linear' was questioned and in fact the definition of it describes settlements where the buildings are constructed in lines, often next to a geographical feature like a lake shore, a river or following a road. This having been said, for the NDP it describes houses on the edges of road and not houses grouped behind other houses bounding a road . It was agreed that the Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) would help inform a debate, the discussion was adjourned until this is available from Aecom .

2018/80 Housing Needs Assessment This is expected by the end of May.

2018/81 Action for further site owner consultations It is important that sites taken forward into the plan are 'deliverable'. Discussions with land owners so far have been of an informal nature but the willingness of owners to release land for development will need to be formally stated. Discussions cannot proceed until we have a better understanding of what sites will be promoted.

2018/82 Policies to support plan objectives. LB explained that we are in a unique position in so far as SGC have no intention to allocate a dwelling requirement in the new local plan. The implications of this are that any dwellings we propose are positive planning ./ This provides the opportunity to require a higher proportion of affordable homes and the ability to influence tenure etc.

LB strongly advised allocating sites for ordinary Market housing. This would overcome depending on the number of dwellings proposed for a site the possibility of not getting any affordable housing as exception site policy provides the opportunity to be more prescriptive/creative along the lines of 'exception site plus'. This would use policy CS19 (exception sites outside the development boundary) but also specify market housing or housing for specific categories (e.g. 'The Elderly') . We can assess this more objectively once we have the HNA.

LB further advised that the Village Character Assessment would help to justify tighter design guidance . Planning policy cannot go in to too much detail or be over prescriptive e.g. the type of housing required.

2018/83 Planning Gains Benefit This subject was not debated and will be held over until the next meeting .

2018/84 Village Character Assessment . It was agreed that LB , PE and AC would meet on the 5th of June to commence this work . A base map with a scale of no more than 1=1250 would help . BT to seek this from SGC.

2018/85 Ongoing Plan/Funding (see also minute 2018/78 above). The 12 month timescale is less restrictive than the old 6 months .

There was no other business discussed due to the time .

Next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday 17th July and will be in the Memorial Hall commencing 14.00 hrs , Agenda to follow.

Note on receipt of the Housing Needs Assessment report a meeting will be called specifically to discuss the results and to establish how it can help inform the allocation of sites .

Plan Status .(aide memoire) 6th May2018

How far have we travelled ? , what do we know ? , what evidence have we got ?.

We have gathered a substantial amount of evidence :-

- Parish Plan Documentation presents initial picture
- Feedback for Spring 2017 Questionnaire underpins earlier feed back
- Feedback for January 2018 engagement event firms up on previous feedback and supports the draft vision and objectives we have set.
- SFRA2 Assessment prepared and in its final form.
- Detailed independent site assessment prepared and now in final form V4.
- Initial contact with Landowners of sites with potential did not identify any of the sites. identified which owners would not wish to be considered.
- Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) being prepared .

What do we need to do now ?

- Receive HNA , and understand what it is saying .
- Understand the limitations described in V4 of Sites Assessment and firm up on the scope/detail of potential sites.
- Commence preparing the basic information required for regulation 14 .
- Using the basic information liaise with SGC re SEA and HRA (note despite the modest nature of our plan proposals there are indications they will require this documentation to be prepared .)
- Undertake a Village Character Assessment to underpin the style /density / materials used etc. for any proposed development .
- Draft Policies which are robust and descriptive to support the vision and objectives
- Develop regulation 14 document (basically the draft plan).

There are a number of unknowns currently impacting on our ability to make progress of these the Joint Strategic Plan has now had Inspectors appointed to examine it for its

compliance with statutory requirements and soundness . The findings will have a bearing on the New Local Plan and our plans have to conform to and not contradict these plans . This does not mean we cannot move forward but does mean that we have to work closely with SGC and cannot fully quantify timescales . I am advised by SGC that Charfield and Pucklechurch are also undertaking Neighbourhood Plans but their situation is different insofar as they are more likely to be allocated a development requirement whereas we have to justify ours (see the new local plan consultation document for more details) .