

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW STEERING GROUP (NPRSG)

MINUTES OF MEETING MONDAY 2ND DECEMBER 2019 Vine Room, Village Hall

IN ATTENDANCE: Parish Council

Sheena Overington (SO), Andrew Jackson (AJ), Steve Rollinson (SR)
Louise Davies (LD)

Community Members

Keith Charman (KC), Jill Sutcliffe (JS)

SO opened the meeting at 7.00 pm.

1. **Apologies:** All in attendance.
2. **Declaration of Interests:** There was no change to the interests previously declared and recorded.
3. **Minute of the Last Meeting:** The minutes of the meeting held on 4th November 2019 were approved as an accurate record.
4. **Local Plan Review:** Despite chasing again, no update had been provided by Toby Ayling at CDC. However, Valerie Dobson, Principle Planning Officer, had emailed on 25th November 2019 – read out.
“I do know how you feel and all I can say is as I have before that there is really no urgency with the NP as the numbers may well change both before we submit the plan next year and also even through the examination. I know that is not helpful in terms of precise times but it does mean that there is really no urgency to complete the work for a reg 14 for some time. If you do this too early and for example the examiner changes the numbers then you would have to do it again.”

It was noted that the original timetable had been suggested by CDC. The Parish Council had therefore agreed to progress with the Neighbourhood Plan review in order to retain local control on site allocation and avoid CDC allocating land as suggested in the email dated 22nd November 2018 from Mike Allgrove, CDC Planning Policy Manager; “However, there is not a need for such a compressed timetable for the neighbourhood plans prepared to meet the parish housing requirements as the Council will be able to allocate land in a site allocations plan that follows the Local Plan Review if insufficient progress had been made (ie, the Council will need to allocate land if either Reg 14 or Reg 16 milestones not met). Concern was expressed that it was now CDC advising delaying the NP review process despite the examination deadline remaining as July 2020, which was contradictory to the original advice.

The original CDC deadline to start the Reg 14 consultation was January 2020. It had been indicated that housing allocation numbers would be confirmed in November 2019,

but no details received to date. Valerie Dobson had concluded her email indicating that advice to Parishes should have already been circulated, so it was agreed to wait for this circulation and write further, if considered necessary.

5. Community Questionnaire: Circulated in advance of the meeting along with comments received from one Parish Councillor which were considered and incorporated as felt necessary. The following was agreed:

- Top box to be included potentially with a cartoon character image!
- Include “These are the current objectives in the WGNP. They”
- Number 23 leave in – reasons discussed and agreed.
- OA5: 32 – insert “rural” and remove “of open green space” to remove confusion with green spaces.
- ED1: ‘ant’ missing on important.
- EN4: Take out words “structure and features of local distinctiveness” to reduce explanation.
- IN3: Remove “considered” in explanation.
- Inclusion of the ‘new’ biodiversity section was discussed and inclusion agreed by majority.

For approval at the Parish Council meeting on 10th December 2019. Copy of final questionnaire to be forwarded to AirS on 6th January 2020.

6. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA): AECOM confirmed that the Scoping Report had been sent to the three statutory bodies (Historic England, the Environment Agency and Natural England) on 7th November for a 5 week consultation period; the outcome was expected soon.

SO had since contacted AECOM to ask for clarification on the flood risk Sequential Test in relation to the Farnagate fields having re-read the Environment Agency’s comments in the first SEA screening opinion provided by CDC. AECOM advised that “In terms of the sequential test, the idea of this is to steer development to locations with a lower risk of flooding. Only where there are no reasonably available sites in Flood Zones 1 or 2 should the suitability of sites in Flood Zone 3 (areas with a high probability of river flooding) be considered, taking into account the flood risk vulnerability of land uses and applying the Exception Test if required. The long and short of it is: if the sites are within Flood Risk Zone 2/3, then you will need to apply the sequential test to satisfy the relevant agencies that there are no other options.” Although it was unlikely that the Farnagates fields would flood, development could impact on the River Kird. SEA information to be circulated.

Action: LD

7. Site Selection:

a. Review of consultation result charts: AJ had been unable to prepare but would do so for the next meeting on 6th January; content and presentation were confirmed.

Action: AJ

b. AECOM Technical Support: During an inception telephone call on 19th November 2019, bespoke support had been discussed to address both local gaps and site

access. The report subsequently sent to AECOM to confirm the details had been circulated. With the use of Terrafirma, AECOM felt that concentrating on accesses would allow the site selection process to be progressed; agreed. LD advised that if this was not authorised by Locality, with the delay, it was unlikely that Chapman Planning's validation of the selection process would be required before 31st March, so a further grant variation could be submitted to engage an independent Highways Consultant or pursue with WSCC.

c. Green Gap Assessment:

Independent Assessment: Minutes of the meeting held with Alison Galbraith of Terrafirma had been circulated. KC confirmed that the remit had been clearly discussed. However, her subsequent initial thoughts and identified green gaps were slightly confusing although it was interesting to note that she had identified other green areas in excess of the 'bow ties'. Although the rationale for providing better definition by using the field hedge boundaries was understood, Alison to be asked how the inclusion of the additional gaps could be substantiated and defended. The current policy had stood up to challenge and there was concern that although this was providing the required review, it could potentially weaken current policy; inclusion of some additional areas was thought unnecessary. The following were noted:

- Field south of the church excluded, although part of existing gap – allotments included, why?
- Additional areas noted around the village perimeter, but why had the flood plains south of the A272 not been included if further green areas were being identified?
- Inclusion of new area, Glebe Fields, could be open to challenge.

SO to follow up with Terrafirma and obtain clarity on outcome of review.

Action: SO

Local Gap Assessment: SO provided details of the local review content for "Windmill Hill". Although lengthy, this did provide local evidence in support of the review. Agreed that she should complete reports for all 5 gaps.

Action: SO

JS highlighted the CPRE campaign to protect Green Gaps. She would build up evidence to support local inclusion. She referred to the importance of hedging as wildlife corridors and would forward the Ecological Networks map to SR. **Action: JS**

- d. Next Steps: It was agreed that access, green gap assessments and SEA outcome were required to inform the site selection process. As such, Chapman Planning could not be engaged until all work completed, which was likely to be after 31st March 2019. To validate the selection process, Chapman Planning would require: Site Assessment Report, Consultation Results, Terrafirma Report, Access Report whether AECOM or other and SEA.

8. **Any Other Business:**

- a. Next Ad Vincula Article: To purely focus on the importance of the questionnaire and completion. **Action: SO**

9. **Date of Next Meeting: Monday 6th January at 7.00 pm**, in the Vine Room. KC sent his apologies.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.50 pm.