

Notes of an informal meeting held 20th June 2018 of the Neighbourhood Planning Working Group to discuss the Draft Housing Needs Assessment report prepared by Aecom .

Those attending Barry Turner (BT) , Alan Coles (AC) ,Dylan Griffiths (DG) and Keith Sullivan (KS)

Apologies received from Peter Everton

The document being discussed was revision 4 May 2018 .

A number of e-mails have been circulated since receipt of the initial (Revision3) document largely due to concerns that the report does not reflect the flooding and current SGC/national policy constraints we know exist when discussing possible development in the Parish . This being largely down to the fact we are situated in a flood Plain and there is an impact from the Green Belt . The report has been written using NPPF Planning Policy Guidelines , reference to para 16 makes it clear that further work is required (some already complete) to determine the local constraints which will have an influence on the recommendations the assessment makes .

A large part of the Parish is classed as being in the open countryside and as such is currently subject to Core Strategy Policies which have a bearing on Development in the Green Belt and open Countryside. We have also to be mindful of the work being done on the New Local Plan but this is not adopted and therefore cannot be used to resolve issues at this stage in its development . We therefore need to recognise existing SG Policy in our planning activities so that the basic conditions are satisfied and will not be a constraint when our plan goes for independent examination .

Dialogue with Aecom will hopefully resolve this and the report amended to reflect the development constraints on the wider parish . For the purposes of discussion at todays meeting this is not an issue .

We are fully aware that development is within a specific area generally adjacent to the existing settlement boundary and that some of the sites which have potential for development are situated in the Green Belt (sites 7,8and 9). Sites 2 and 13 are not in this position.

We believe that at this stage in the process we should discuss **all 5 sites** when we have our informal discussion with SGC prior to formal regulation 14 submission . In the meanwhile it is intended to have another public engagement day to gauge reaction . Whilst sites 2, 13 and 9 appear the best options we have not got formal agreement from the land owners that they will release the land (this is something we have to do to be sure) . Obviously this needs to be firmed up prior to formal Regulation 14 submission , but maybe by then we will know the direction the NPPF has taken.

On the subject of Housing Numbers Types and Tenures, concern was expressed regarding the inclusion of Social Housing in the mix . It is well known within the community that the social housing provision of some of the developments in Thornbury is causing concern due to the anti-social behaviour of some of the tenants . The concern is that social housing is not within our control and we cannot dictate the type of tenant we would like to see get the tenancy . The principal of Intermediate Housing (including shared ownership) was discussed at some length with differing

points of view being offered by those present .It was felt that the referendum would on the subject of social housing hang in the balance .

The pros and cons of the two sets of figures that have been produced Amended Aecom Table (LB e-mail) and the numbers derived from the percentages mentioned in HNA report (BT email) after much discussion it was felt that some discussion with SGC was required to establish their stance on how an appropriate mix can be achieved attractive enough to persuade a builder/ builders that it is a good proposition . It was agreed that flats and maisonettes did not fit in with the character of the Village . It was felt that circa **70%** of the dwellings should be modest Market Housing and circa **30 %** for intermediate/social dwellings with a preference that they were intermediate

Based on the figure of 31 houses this would split 21.7 Market and 9.3 social /intermediate .

It was agreed that the informal discussions with SGC should be against the back ground of these numbers .

New Development ,In or outside the Settlement Boundary ? - Given the discussions we have had on this, the arrangements which give the greatest opportunity to control what development finally takes place are most preferred (could also have an effect on cost of land) . Based on the advice Liz has given it would be appropriate that the developments stay outside the Settlement Boundary .

Date of next meeting Tuesday 17th July , Agenda to follow