

**Notes of the NDP meeting held Tuesday 28<sup>th</sup> January 2020 at High Chimneys commencing 14.00hrs**

Those attending :-

Barry Turner(BT) (Secretary and Chair), Keith Sullivan (KS), Alan Coles(AC) , Chris Jennings(CJ)and Dylan Griffiths(DG)

Apologies received from / minutes to be sent to, Liz Beth (LB), Ben Guzman(BG), Ann Martin(AM), Andy McGrath.(AMcG), Liz Nichols (LN) , and Peter Everton (PE)

**Declarations of Interest** . None declared

No members of the public were in attendance.

The minutes of the meeting held 19<sup>th</sup> November 2019 were agreed.

**2020/127 Introduction** - the scheduled meeting for 21<sup>st</sup> January was postponed due to BT being unable to attend due to a medical emergency . To try and recover the work intended for that date,this meeting was held with core members of the working group attending using the agenda circulated for the meeting that was postponed.

**2020/128 Short Term Work Schedule** . BT distributed a draft schedule of the work necessary to be done for Regulation 14 and 15 to be satisfied. **See Appendix 1 accompanying these minutes** . This had been produced for the postponed meeting and so the target dates may have to be moved back by 7days . Given the length of time it has taken to get to where we are currently, this is not a major issue.. It is more important to get this stage right than do things in haste and there is quite a bit of work involved with this stage.

**2020/129 Regulation 14 (pre-submission version) of Plan** – the draft of the pre-submission version of the plan had been circulated to group members for comment , it was also reviewed by Liz Beth . The responses have been considered and most will be incorporated without further discussion. A small number of contentious points still need to be addressed .

A page by page review was undertaken .

Nothing of significance was identified until para 4.1.8(page 15) . Reference to Policy 2 – Housing Mix . It was felt that given the small number of dwellings now being proposed that 10% for custom build would not be practical . It was agreed that the intent was to encourage smaller houses but the wording should reflect a more practical allowance and that percentage was not the best way of doing this . It was agreed that percentage should not be used and that the intent was to be smaller dwellings with some allowance for custom build. This should be reflected in the site specific policies (Policies 4 & 5).

**2020/130 Policy 4 (page 17 ) Development in West marsh Lane** . The site size restriction introduced in recognition of heritage asset concerns restricts the number of dwellings that can be accommodated . A review of site size compared to desired density indicates a maximum of 8 dwellings at an average 30 dwellings per hectare. **See attached Appendix 2**

This is the maximum density felt appropriate given existing village character. It was further agreed to include a site location map for this location.

The type of dwellings which would be appropriate in this area could be varied in keeping with the existing housing stock, which comprises Detached, Semi Detached and Terraced properties. It was agreed that the intention to promote smaller / affordable housing needed to be reinforced. After some discussion it was agreed to refer to the Government Technical Housing Standards as an indicator of what was envisaged. 90m<sup>2</sup> is quoted in the policy as this is considered adequate for 2 storey dwellings with 2 and maybe three bedrooms

Biodiversity was also discussed as it was felt that the 10% improvement to biodiversity was not a practical approach to the subject. National Policy Guidance to protect and enhance the natural environment is quite clear and the aim is to encourage a net gain in biodiversity. It was agreed to reflect this within the site specific policies rather than use a percentage. How this is achieved in practice will depend on development proposals which come forward and advice from the relevant SGC Experts.

**2020/131 Policy 5 (Page 18) The Westend Lane site** is really 4 plots of land in different ownerships. It is possible in the fullness of time if this plan is 'made' that plots could be merged. It was agreed that we have to approach this area with the logic they will stay separate, particularly until or unless we establish something different. The review (Appendix 2) indicates that because of this the total dwelling that can fit on the 4 individual sites is far less than the 10/12 envisaged in the 'SEA Determination' version of the Plan especially if the 25 dwellings per hectare referred to in policy 6 – G1 is to be observed. By increasing the density to 30 dwellings per hectare it is possible that 10 dwellings can be accommodated dispersed across the 4 plots. It was agreed the plan should reflect up to 10 dwellings. It was further agreed to include a map showing the 4 plots at this location.

Again (as for policy 4) the subject of how big the dwellings should be was discussed. The Village Character in this area is very much different than in Westmarsh in terms of the existing housing stock, it was again felt that using the Government Technical Housing Standards was an appropriate way of quantifying the typical size envisaged. By using 100 m<sup>2</sup> it is describing a 2 storey 3 bedroomed house. Most of the existing housing stock is much larger. It was felt that the immediate community would not be prepared to accept smaller housing at this location as it would be very much out of keeping with existing. It was agreed to use 100m<sup>2</sup>.

Biodiversity, the same comments as applied to policy 4 should be used.

**2020/132 Heritage Assets** (pages 28-32) It was felt that using 5 pages to describe the location of heritage assets in the neighbourhood area was overkill. The problem is that the Parish (and Designated Neighbourhood Area) is large but the village is small in comparison, the proposed sites are small even when compared to the village settlement boundary. To make hard copy more legible it was agreed to restrict the page displayed in the plan to that which would be legible and to provide a link to the larger map so that those who wished to view it could do so electronically. This seemed the most sensible approach to the matter.

**2020/133 Preparing for Regulation 14 Consultation**. Appendix 1 pages 2-3 provide a summary of what is generally required. Additionally it is planned to hold an engagement

event similar to those we have staged each year since the inception of the NDP . This will be an additional opportunity for the community to understand and provide feedback .

It was broadly agreed what is required and that draft material should be produced ready for the next Working Group Meeting scheduled for the 18<sup>th</sup> February despite the weeks delay already incurred it remains the target to achieve this .

The engagement day is proposed for the 28<sup>th</sup> March all the working group members attending the meeting confirmed their availability to assist on this date . **BT to make a booking .**

**2020/134/ Plan Publicity and documentation .** Reference Appendix 1 . it was agreed to seek to place a laminated copy of the plan in the Anchor , the Village Shop , the Memorial Hall and possibly Thornbury Library.

A discussion regarding the Schedule 1 consultees concluded that if we can establish the addresses all should be contacted , to provide an opportunity for them to respond albeit that some will not do so . It was further agreed to include the Site Stake Holder Group and the LSIDB.

Action 5 of Appendix 1 refers to SGC assistance in circulating the information in Action 4 . BT has had discussions with SGC to see if circulation of the information necessary to satisfy Regulation 14 could be achieved by using SGC postal services. This is an ongoing matter with no current conclusion . It would however simplify distribution BT to follow up and report at the next meeting.

#### **2020/135 AOB**

**Finance** - The Groundwork Grant funds ring-fenced by the Parish Council stand at £2,102.14 . This is after payment to Liz Beth for the extra site selection report she produced . There are some expenses to be claimed. The Parish Council have some funds earmarked , essentially to offset the unexpected cost of Liz Beth's report. It is not anticipated that there will a significant overspend for which further additional funds will be required.

There was no other business discussed .

Next meeting scheduled for February 18<sup>th</sup> at 14.00hrs in the Memorial Hall - Agenda to follow

**Policy 6**

**G1- Development should be low density and primarily of a linear nature to match existing rural village areas . The density of new development should not exceed 25 dwellings to the hectare unless the dwellings are small and include affordable housing , in which case a density of 30 dwellings to the hectare is acceptable .**

Interpreted using the above factors provides for:-

**Westend**

Density at 25 dwellings per ha (400m<sup>2</sup>)

Plot A 0.100 = 2

Plot B 0.087 =2

Plot C 0.110 = 2

Plot D 0.700 = 1

Total 7 dwellings

Density at 30 dwellings per ha (333m<sup>2</sup>)

Plot A 0.100 = 3

Plot B 0.087 = 2

Plot C 0.110 = 3

Plot D 0.700 = 2

Total 10 dwellings

**Westmarsh**

Density 25 dwellings per ha (400m<sup>2</sup>)

Plot 0.24ha = 6

Density 30 dwellings per ha (333m<sup>2</sup>)

Plot 0.24ha = 7