

**Notes of a meeting of the NPSG held
at Zebon Community Centre,
on Tuesday, 10 January 2017
at 8pm**

Present: Julia Ambler (JA) Joint Chairman
Simon Ambler (SA)
Brian Whyatt (BW)
Sarah Callaghan (SC)
Andy Hillyier (AH)
Tony Gower-Jones (TGJ)
Tina Collins (TC) Secretary
Carol Leversha (CL) note taker
John Slater (Consultant)

Apologies

Apologies from Richard Hellier and Dr. Indra Sinka. David Jackson attending HDAPTC on behalf of CVPC.

Minutes of last meeting

Accepted.

Declarations of interest

None.

Matters arising

None.

Consultant's report

JS said if you look at NPs around the country you will see they are quite similar and the same goes for the Inspectors' findings/reports on them.

JS had looked at our NP and caveated it by saying there is the basis of a sound plan going forward. What has been done to date is not wasted. It can be built up and we can get there. There will be some difficult issues to grapple with and having sat down and gone through the Plan before Christmas and again having revisited it yesterday his views (from the information he received today) may also change his thinking. What he will do is tell the story as he was going to and then revisit it (tweak it) in the light of what comes from this meeting. You are preparing this Plan in a difficult environment because you do not have an up to date Local Plan. Ideally there would be an adopted Plan which would have a housing figure for CV to accommodate and the Plan would allocate sites. JA said it has always been HDC position not to allocate figures. JS said you can bring forward a NP in advance of a LP but you need to work with the LA sharing information and whatever. You have to satisfy the Examiner that you are meeting your assessed needs. This is going to be difficult for CV because the amount of development taking place or seeking to

take place within the parish is not there to meet the Parish need but to meet HDC need. It is difficult to work the traditional way that he would have been saying to some of his areas. Ropley have been given a figure in their LP but they have asked for more development for providing affordable housing. But this does not work for CV. TGI said if Hart go for urban extensions then we are stuffed and do not need a NP. JS said HDC could dump a lump of housing on the Parish but by having a NP we could decide where, design, type of dwelling and everything else. CV can work with the grain of the LP to get the max benefit out of it. TGI said we are designing a NP based on a presumption that an urban extension is not going to happen. JS said there have been another couple of NPs in Hart working on the same environment which have go through. That may be the way of picking the brains of what worked there to tell the story. He understands that part of it is that they plan may be reviewed in the light of the LP. The next element is the issue of timing (he thinks) the LP is going public in the next few months and as this group rightly say they are not looking at giving a number but looking at dividing the districts number across a number of sites. You could take the view that if the plan says something about a local field

JA said there are two SHLAA sites in the parish and both are in the local gap. The question – talking today the gaps were taken out of the plans by the Inspector but if as a result of development there is no gap at all and there is coalescence but if a small gap remains that is sufficient. The issue for the plan is are you going to leave that battle to the LP and as a Parish make the representations in respect of the LP and saying don't allocate Grove Farm. There are choices to make TGI said his view is that we will fight that and the NP needs to be made on the view that we will have a gap. Grove Farm will have a smaller gap and Cross Farm is pretty similar. TGI said we would want to protect the southern gap of Cross Farm. JS said how realistic and pragmatic are you going to be and how much do you want the NP to frustrate the LP because if you designate if a site is allocated a gap in an area that will in time will be a strategic site in the LP. TGI said the NP group view is pragmatic and both sites will be fought at the planning application and appeal stages – he did not believe the NP would be in a position to do this. JS said the NP could say it would to allocate any land for development and we recognise there are plans and will leave the allocation to the LP and if we are to do that then the Planning Policies should say is if that development is to take place we want a predominance of smaller units – maybe more numbers but smaller dwellings. That would be something to be sorted by the LP and any development taking place in the parish needs to be like this and then say we are particularly “gaps are difficult things” they can be used to restrict the supply of land. If you

look at them as part of the conservation area that is something for them in their own right. JA said the only sites were those mentioned. JS said if wanted to be pro-active we could activate the Community Right to Build and best to do it in parallel with the NP. Alternatively, we could choose to allocate a particular site. SA said consultations have been done without allocating sites. SC asked if we could say how much we have grown in size over x number of years as has been done with Rotherwick. JS said the problem is that the new developments have produced families which now have children needing homes. It is not like a north yorks village with a small community. It feels as an area that you have almost got a village centre and pubs and then two huge housing estates which favour urban neighbours. One of JS questions is what are we looking for the plan to deliver – do we want policies for the housing estates in terms of extensions which is something which the current plan does not address. Have we actually done any work doing a character assessment – the answer was yes for the old village. JS said we need to treat the areas separately. TGJ said on-road parking, garage conversions are an issue for ZC but NHM has less green space to protect. JA said the way the village lies it is effectively surrounded by ridges and Cross Farm will dominate the scene. JS said that is part of the discussion that you do it on the basis of impact on conservation area because there is a positive requirement to enhancing and preserve the conservation area. SA said he understood that the Cross Farm application falls into another category because it is an older persons complex. JS said the legislation stands for the conservation area. In terms of the type of the application it can be viewed as meeting a need that has been identified and we are getting housing numbers identified rather than a care home. Those with front doors will count against the housing numbers because those occupants will be downsizing. What it does is provide housing numbers without putting pressure on the schools. JS said the issue is if the application is granted then the NP can do nothing about and it was confirmed that both will be dealt with before the NP is finalised. JS said what you could have is design issues for the development. JA said what concerns her about Cross Farm is that the design is standard across all development of this sort and not in keeping with the surrounding area. JS said the word is that the NP only becomes a material consideration when it has gone through examination – if a NP is in the public domain then it is something to be waved in front of the planning cttee and if it gets turned down and goes to appeal it may be that the NP is further forward. Any development built from materials compatible with the village design guide. Once PP is granted if it is outline and the NP comes in before it becomes reserved matters then the NP has strengths. JS said outline might well set out numbers and design. TC asked whether we could stipulate the

height be two storey or could we stipulate distance from listed buildings. JS said do not qualify by metres – say appropriate distance. SA said if the NP is made then it is effective before reserved matters are approved. TGJ said outline on Watery Lane we had requested parking standards – once our NP is made it is more important than the LP. Access to public transport is one of the issues we are trying to build in. JS said you need to evidence it “no public transport” “high car ownership” as long as you can justify it then it will stand. JA said to return to where we are at the moment – we are doing the writing – what is good what is not good is what is needed from JS and he said he is happy to go through the plan now and the bits he has picked up.

1. Consultation done last summer – is that telling us anything we can use?? If you are writing stuff up do it half an eye that you need to do a consultation statement and do it so it can be lifted and slots in. How has the plan changed in view of the public comments how have the community been able to shape the plan, eg have we included local gap and green spaces in the plan which we may not otherwise have done?
2. TC said when we started the Plan we were expecting to be allocated numbers but this had not happened.
3. Energy policy – there was statement given to HoC on 25 march 2015 by Eric Pickles basically NPs cannot put technical standards about housing construction. If there is an energy policy lose it. TGJ said could we have a policy about solar panels or small wind turbine JS said we could do the former. The policies are the DP policies which will go to the vote and you can have lots of other aspirations called “community desires/supports” but you cannot have a policy.
4. Policy on wildlife – it needs to have a focused approach – policies that seek to protect all wildlife in the parish do not meet the test. He can give us the words – it is a graded approach. SSSIs are a higher grade. He has a policy which can be cut and pasted. TGJ said we are a river valley which has a lot of species and habitat JS said if these are endangered then we can have a policy. JS will point us in the right direction.
5. Aspirations for types of shops – to the planning system a shop is a shop.
6. Are there ambitions for a community hall for the village. If you had then within the lifetime of the plan you could put it in.
7. Has there been any work done on landscape assessment?? JS said this is very important in order to protect the setting of the conservation area. The best he has seen was Blewbery in Oxfordshire.
8. Identifying key viewpoints. Public vantage points and entry points into the village show on map and photographs.

9. How do you differentiate between aims and visions and objectives. If the objective is to deliver the vision he cannot see the relationship. What he likes to do is say a vision for the plan in 2030 we will deliver that by the following objectives which will be vision objections policy justification – merge the aims and objectives – object is to retain the rural nature of the village through strict policies on how to do this.
10. Identification of local green space – JS said we need to do this and use the criteria in the NPPF but you can also ... – the policy for local green space is as good as the green belt – you could say the only development would be for playing fields. If there are big areas that is against the NPPF what we want is to refer them to the settlement and conservation areas. In relation to the local green spaces on Zebon copse you might want a policy to protect them. TGJ said could we use Zebon as an example and others should emulate that.
11. JS said the big issue is how we deal with settlement boundaries – he agreed that any site which has planning permission should be included within the settlement. We do not need a separate consultation on this.
12. JS said we need to talk about programme and the next time we go out is before pre-submission. JS said when you have a settlement boundary you should have a policy it should say development within the boundary is acceptable. JS said what he thought we should do is say we will revisit whether we need to identify any further sites so that there will be clarification when the LP goes through. TGJ said there are many large properties in the village which could accommodate some development. You can have policies which deal with the principle of “garden development”. JS said we could have a policy which resists garden development in certain areas – do coloured drawings.
13. JS said the settlement boundary is probably a Northumberland one -but you do need to have a policy which talks about development which needs to be in the countryside. Playing fields, golf course. BE01 you need to look at this carefully, leaving yourself open for more development – remove. Sustainability of communities that is for a rural area – TGJ said we do not have a sustainable community.
14. Housing need – we have not identified – remove.
15. BE02 – change to “development criteria”. Talks about the main settlements in the village which is not a bad one. Talks about reuse of previously developed land – could allow housing on commercial sites.
16. Hancocks Farm - 2 or 3 houses there currently – if the farm went up for sale and there was not a need for the farm buildings could there be conversion or new build or is there a new need for employment.

17. Energy policy is BO3. Take out the energy. JS said that there would be lots of backwards and forwards dialogue – this is just to flag up the big issues.
18. Self build – what are we trying to achieve? Are you saying within the settlement area where we would allow someone to build. The purpose of self build is to help new people with a local connection to do selfbuild. The way a lot of areas have done it is to identify sites where you would not ordinarily allow it otherwise. Sympathetic to self build adjacent to the settlement boundary. JS will help with this.
19. Windfall – remove or tie in with the settlement boundary.
20. Local gaps and key views – work needs to be done on identifying -JS said the discussion earlier is keeping the gap to protect the landscape setting of the village not coalescence. JS will read the inspectors reports which have taken them out in Hart.
21. Exceptional land uses in identified local gaps – that is not development remove.
22. Ah – have we identified non-designated heritage assets – Yes. Must ensure the policy protects them in a way commensurate to their importance. Do we want to review to add or remove locally listed buildings?
23. Wildlife corridor policy is fine. These need to be evidenced and identified. Planning officers at Hart need to be able to identify these. You must come to the mindset of someone shaping the development rather than not.
24. Protected green spaces and Local Green space both need policies. It is not your usual bit of open space in the housing layout.
25. Flooding policy – you are putting in about minimising flood risk – if you are outside a flood area you do not need to address this. TGJ said there are two major flood areas which he described in detail. We have inability to take the surface water away as well as flood plain. JS said the examiner will look to the Env Agency for areas which are not identified as risk. The management of surface water is the issue which causes flooding. JS said we require all new development to be designed with SUDS. All development shall be submitted with details of SUDS. If we can demonstrate that there are areas where the higher threshold than the national requirement and can identify them. What would the policy say

Carol gave apologies at 9.45 and left it to Tina to capture remainder of JS views.

26. Traffic – we need to be more specific about how it will relate to the parish. Traffic assessments are not required as we are not allocating sites. We could state that a higher than average car ownership is likely as we do not have any public transport and therefore higher parking standards are required. We cannot do anything about including speeding and speed limits.
27. Character assessment – to be reviewed to determine whether this should be improved. We need to ensure that different each area of the parish is covered.
28. Design statement – not necessarily required but could include boundary treatments, materials, etc. We could state that any development over 10 units should have a variety of design styles in order to preserve the variety of designs already as they are a feature of the parish and particularly the old village. Each period has contributed its own design and this should be continued to should the best of current design and use of appropriate building materials. Each building should be designed with regard to its location and setting and should enhance its location. We are looking for excellence of design and not monotonous pastiches.

Next steps

The Local Plan is due to be published in about 2 months' time. We should, therefore, look to publish about 2 months after that. This will be the pre-submission plan and will be available to the public and statutory bodies. Prior to publication a copy should be sent to Hart to determine whether an SEA or HRA is required. This requires a 6 week consultation. After this we have time to synthesise any comments and amend the plan to incorporate them. This document becomes the submission version. At this point we need to include a basic condition statement stating how the document relates to national and local policies. This plan is then submitted to Hart for Regulation 16 consultation. Following this is the examination and all documents and representations need to be available – at this point there are no more amendments allowed. The examiner then issues a report and then (assuming the examiner passes the Plan) Hart will call a Referendum.

The meeting closed at 10.15 pm

Signed Date:.....