

Notes of a meeting of the CVPC NPSG
held at 8pm on Tuesday, 14 March 2017
in the Meeting room of ZCC

Present: Cllr. Julia Ambler (Chairman)
Cllr. Simon Ambler
Cllr. Peter Kenaghan
Mr. Brian Whyatt
Ms. Sarah Callaghan
Mr. Tony Gower Jones
Mr. Richard Hellier
Ms. Kerry ten Kate
Mrs. Carol Leversha (Note Taker)

1. Apologies

Tina Collins, Andy Hillyer and Cllr. Dr. Indra Sinka.

2. Minutes of last meeting

The notes were accepted.

3. Declarations of interest

Standing declaration from Mr. Tony Gower- Jones in relation to possible changes to realignment of the settlement boundary.

4. Matters arising &

5. Ecology progress

Mr. Hellier was invited to speak. He said there were some errors in the HWT document. He has something called magic. If this had been taken off a data base they have not visited the site. He was advised that HWT had said this was a desktop exercise. KtK said the document was a first draft and they wanted to get together with RH to put in the data layers. They are contacted to parish scale maps. A larger one showing the SPA and KtK gave the reasoning behind this action. Landscape connectivity is important. RH said the Hart Valley has got into the planners vocabulary over the years. The main corridor is the valley and we get an overspill there is a buffer from the SPA and we have had all 3 birds within the parish on occasions. Our parish is on the margin between the chalk down and TB heathland and sand. Designated sites are useful. He has tried to look at other NPs and sought those which had ecology but even then, it was quite modest. He was going to write something that it is a key characteristic of this parish. JA said the actual plan needs a few key bases of information and these are backed up with the appendices. TGI said RH is to do the evidence which supports the brief statements in the Plan. RH said he needs to relook at the policies as they may need a

refresh. He has checked with HBic which has sent him all the records he has made over the years. It is chaotic – his records go in a kilometre square and do not identify the sites themselves. They do have dates on them. What he has been doing is using a few indicative species to illustrate the quality of the land. It might be worth picking a few key species (skylarks) how they use habitats – JA said we have to show that sightings are a population of indigenous species that live there and the dates of sightings are critical. RH said Gobird in Hampshire is the place to enter data. KtK said the HWT are happy to put that into the maps. RH said data has to be used very carefully – he thinks it would be better to have two categories of important birds - farmland and woodland. He has all the printouts and queried whether we needed to go into that detail for a NP. JA said we did and referred him to Albany Farm. RH said he could easily do the sort of evidence recording we need. KtK said we could probably work with RH – we need to have some data to show that this is current and and say “btw we can go back over the years to support that”. TGJ said the data stuff is there and there are loads and loads over the years. RH said he only selected the coloured records. TGJ said it was interesting that the map only referred to today’s records. The landscape units he has identified are good to describe the biodiversity. As he was writing the text for this area he thought it would be useful to include the Watery Lane as a character area. It is a compartmentalised parish. TGJ said which of the species was the most valuable. Skylarks with linnet lapwing – red listed (farmland) marsh tit, spotted flycatcher and woodpecker (woodland). TGJ said he would take the table and make it into a graph. RH said NPs do not seem to focus on ecology.

ACTION: TGJ will produce several types of graph for review about the birds.

KtK said we could then put on the flora. RH said he had not recorded the flora at all because of his fear that the landowner would destroy it. KtK said we can get over the concern about identifying sites of orchids but we can give people evidence as to the sighting. JA said draft landscape area drawing – mostly Cross Farm. JA said she had a graphic designer who would take whatever had been done by RH and would overlay the drawings and type in the handwritten note. RH said he was happy with this.

ACTION: RH to give JA an updated drawing for producing in electronic format.

RH said we have an intimate small-scale landscape and JA said her contact can put the rough drawing on the correct landscape outline. Much debate and explanation in relation to what would be produced. JA said her contact was happy to come and meet the Group. RH then went through some of the outputs. Our most important woodland is not (did not capture)..... KtK said we need to take a decision as to how we identify them – do we do site specific or a roving population and this is one of the areas they use. JA pointed out that the Plan Inspectors are not ecologists and to the layman it is “here I see this and here and that there and these are red listed birds”. She would like to see pictures of the birds themselves – blue for occasional sightings and red for regular siting’s. RH said we have 3 assemblage’s woodland, farmland and wetland. We have the breeding and then the wintering populations. Farmland – skylark and woodwing. What is easy this time of year is skylarks sing and you get two or 3 in the air so you can see where there are breeding. JA said she wanted 3 overlapping plans with small pictures identifying the birds. One thing he would say is he has no evidence of breeding skylarks.

ACTION RH will produce 3 drawings of rough assemblages and send them to JA for her contact to produce electronically.

We need photos beside the site and a date. RH said he has had 99 species in his back garden. TGI identified that he had seen two lesser spotted woodpeckers in his garden last week. He will endeavour to photograph them if they return. KtK said one of her big challenges is how to put different land values SANG is about encouraging human use it is an amenity thing. Land uses in a NP, development, sang and conservation. RH said our most threatened landscape is valuable flora. KtK asked where do we want to zone our land where are the crown jewels and how do we show this on maps. One map to zone them or here is a map which shows the layer’s views, footpaths, amenity – we really want to know what we want to do. RH said he would like to integrate but KtK said zoning is more important. KtK said we need our vision for the parish and these are the land uses and this is how we want it to be used in the future. JA said we need national planning reasons as to why an area should not be developed.

KtK said we have discussed maps which are diagnostic – these are the birds and hen the cultural uses baseline footpaths view this is how people enjoy the land.

KtK then said this is our vision for the future with a map showing where we demarcate – conservation areas, amenity areas (fenced footpaths)

and to satisfy NPPF requirements identify sites. JA said the two sites put forward are not ones we would have chosen. KtK said then stay silent. National habitats and managed habitats – bounded areas where we wish to exclude species people, dogs and cats. RH said there are a lot of desire lines where people walk because there is no fencing. KtK said are we agreed we can do another map showing where we (missed) ???. RH said Hillyburrow is a SANG but we could probably do something when it comes away from the developer. KtK said if we want to protect our plot we can use the net gain argument of the NPPF. JA said when the initial consultation was done the Vision & Objectives were done round a table and the consultation said this is what we believe - do you agree. KtK said she was happy to help with this. JA said the second consultation was an open question one. KtK said we could use one of the policy headlines of the NPPF. JA said we need to continue to tweak the ones we have and use generic so that we can interpret them to our advantage. We have lots of comments but we need to interpret it as net gain from them. KtK is happy to help with that. RH said we have ancient woodland – Zephon Common is interesting. JA said pick out what we know e.g. Netherhouse Copse etc. and then add Zephon Common as enjoying a lot of the same characteristics. KtK said it is important to identify ancient woodland.

ACTION RH will have a quick stab at (missed this bit).

KtK said if a developer comes along and we have to have something which has a negative impact we get them to quantify the impact and that we want to be a net gain parish. What kind of uplift – it has to be the same metric – like for like or for better. RH said the skylark population if lost would be lost for ever. RH said the ridge of Cross Farm was very important he has seen up to 40 snipe and woodlark at evening time. Key habitats – lesser spotted woodpecker uses ancient orchards. If we want net gain we need dense hawthorn hedgerows. Wetlands would guarantee a lot of wetland birds.

ACTION: RH to do a map of our Crown Jewels – hands off.

ACTION: RH said what would be ideal is for him to produce these drawings in a week for people to comment – agreed Tuesday 14th.

JA said we will now revert to Working Groups. We meet in a week's time to review RH drawings then we can move them forward. We have Cross Farm Ridge, the Tump and Hillyburrow. JA said if you look at the Conservation area they are all listed as views into and out of the parish.

Amenity would have the views; another layer would be birds – biological and Crown Jewels. We need the data captured and then we can decide how many layers we want.

KtK said ultimately we need a kind of vision map to show our uplift. JA said we need to evidence it from the consultation. JA said experience shows that most of the SANG does not get used, she likes the one on QEB. RH said he is talking to Natural England about reviewing SANGs. JA raised one other area – we have a small amount of our grant left and need to spend it by the end of this month and she wants to send off the plan to John Slater and she asked if we can tidy it up so we have something to send to him.

ACTION: Divvy up the Plan amongst people to check over sections. KtK said she suspects the policies need to be looked at again.

Green – housing – social ones – JA had done the census data and used data shine to show the age population of the three main settlements.

KtK and RH will look at the Green Policies

JA built environment policy

TGJ will look at the Transport Policies

JA wondered whether the V&A need another working group to thrash these out. KtK suggested that JA, she and PK meet at 7pm on Thursday and make a start on it.

JA wants to send the document out by a week Friday to John Slater to ask if we are still working in the right direction. JA said she was owed holiday and would take time out to action this.

ACTION: PK JA KtK one hour this Thursday evening 7pm at KtK's and again Friday morning at PK's 9.30 am for V&O working group.

Next Tuesday 14th March a working group at 8pm here at ZCC

6. Review of CVPC NP Progress and strategy for completion

Covered in above dialogue.

7. Next meeting dates

Tuesday 11 April book hall. Apologies from TGJ.

8. AOB

John Slater is happy to skype into a meeting. PK said he was happy to host.

The meeting closed at 9.45 pm