

MINUTES OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN MEETING

HELD ON MONDAY 13 FEBRUARY 2017

Present: Julia Ambler (JA), Simon Ambler (SA), Tony Gower-Jones (TG-J), Sarah Callaghan (SC), Andy Hillyer (AH), Brian Whyatt (BW), Kerry ten Kate (KtK), Peter Kenaghan (PK), Carol Leversha (CL)

Apologies Dr. Indra Sinka

Minutes of last meeting

The last meeting had been a one to one with the new Consultant Mr. John Slater to review the work done on the NP to date.

Declarations of interest

Mr. Tony Gower Jones has a standing declaration in relation to anything to do with the possible realignment of the settlement boundary which might impact on his property.

Matters arising & Review of CVPC NP Progress and strategy for completion

JA gave the background to how we had arrived at where we now are. John Slater was the consultant we have now engaged and he is a Planning Inspector in his own right. He has looked at our Plan and advised where it would fail were he reviewing it. All rural developments must use Hart guidelines but trying to minimise the problems of this, that and the other is not part of the NP. Do not do any non-statutory consultation but go to the Reg 18 consultation and speak to people then it goes to Hart for acceptance to go to referendum and then it gets looked at by an Inspector and after all that the probability of it being refused is highly unlikely. We have to get to a point where we are as a drafting cttee so that John says yes or no to it. KtK said we could write it tonight but we need data. IS is supposed to be doing the data section but has many conflicts on her time currently.

Our second consultation was about green spaces which was an area we needed to know and IS has that data. KtK asked what data – we need spatial explicit area and the maps. RH data is useful there is 100% for the local gap and green spaces. SC said all RH drawings will be by hand – TGJ said that was okay as the data does not go into the Plan and KtK said she has looked at some other NPs and they have them as appendices. KtK said in terms of the gaps - getting the data and presenting it and putting into sets – is there any budget for CAD or GIS to do this? JA said we had about £13K and we have £1700 for pay for Slater and we have spent £1210 so far on him and the balance will be spent with him by the end of March. KtK said we should try to use desktop publishing and having it look nice at the end and not having hand drawn drawings. KtK said we might be able to retro engineer. KtK has written to Hampshire and Wildlife Trust who have offered help where possible. CL reminded all that Terry Gadsby used to write a bird watch for the CVA newsletter.

KtK said there is a certain level of hierarchy with this and we are lucky to be within the SPA. You are allowed to put in amenity value e.g. people love the deer. Identifying sites gave a greater value to the Plan. SA said the Environmental section is needed for the NP and Reg

18 Consultation and the Planning Application. KtK said we need to say we want any development in our parish to be a net gain (which is in the NPPF) so we get amenity where it belongs and conservation where it belongs. So no hiding behind one phrase which things get hidden behind.

TGJ said now is the time to comment on the Watery Lane application about such things. KtK said she does not think SANGS are what we want for a net biodiversity gain TGJ said we had met with Hampshire Planners whether it is too late now for Watery Lane. JA said we could still put it forward. John Slater was pleased with our embryonic policies. KtK said we need to put in our plan where we would like SANGs.

KtK said we need a wider plan of the whole area how would we deliver conservation and amenity areas. KtK said we need a landscape assessment and we are close to SPA and if we can show our landscape we can show the corridors - we need an area map of the big connectivity. Show the value of your land and that you are aware of it. HWT can help. We need SANG and Conservation land as well.

Action: Get a big map and then get RH to draw in the arrows and the legend.

Big map of the Parish with a bit of the SPA to show the arrows – get DJ to overlay and then hire someone from HWT. We need some printed maps that RH and others can draw on. Hart could do A1 size and JA said she might have another route to getting an A1 size. We need one centred on the village and one on the wider area.

Plan for Crookham – TGJ ordered one on line and will be reimbursed when invoice received.

ACTION: KTK will get a specification and quote for assistance from the HIOWT officer – she will ring up her contact.

JA said she had extracted bits from the Hart website – there is something about Cross Farm and it would be useful to know what the evidence base is for this.

ACTION: CL ask Andrew Ratcliffe if we can now have this as the application is live.

ACTION: KtK mentioned the Hbic data base. KtK said we are entitled to data from the Hampshire Biological Centre.

Draft Maps

Landscape Assessment – where we have aerial maps and CVO1 which is Cross Farm and Landscape assessment criteria and that is where we need put everything and if necessary put in folders. Scale of plan exactly mirrors Parish boundary.

ACTION: SC to upgrade her map to cover the parish boundary.

Drafting chunks – we need to have lovely photos in our plan – put them all somewhere – dropbox may be too small but SA said he would sort something out in this respect.

ACTION: SA to review dropbox capacity

ACTION: Parish boundary needs to be drawn to RH's attention – SANG boundary needs to be shown – JA said we could narrow down the SANG area and the remainder be another designation e.g. Conservation. This will need to come out of the landscape assessment. Text needs to show coalescence.

JA said the Consultation process is correct in the first part and we need to add the further consultation. KtK said we need to show what the consultation shows us. It is to show that we went through a process. We need to identify 2 or 3 red buttons which we can press again and again.

The next bit is the result of the overview of what the Community specified and is what came out of the first consultation – what do we want to keep or lose – integrated energy policy – not NP policy it is National Policy – KtK said she had seen some NPs which had good sections and we might want to use them so developers have to consider them. There are things it is legitimate to do at a local level – we can say this is a local view. We can rephrase “wishes” to a more acceptable form. Mention the limitations of public transport.

ACTION: Section 4 – who will do that (IS we hope) ACTION by next meeting of SG if at all possible.

Consultation

Overview of parish – TGJ said he had been careful to define the old village settlement and CV parish when we are talking about the whole of the parish. JA said this largely where it needs to be. Need a whole bunch of photos – a 1990 house sitting next to a 1700 house there is a blend of architecture – Hampshire Treasures Map could we do thumbnails along the map of the village. Eclectic mix – TGJ referred to page 15. JA said that is where she wants the map which may need to be an appendix.

Profile of community – this is Plan-et version from the local population stat. KTK said we might want to maintain the distinction between the old village and the parish. Put the village in because it has a higher proportion of older persons and has a smaller population.

ACTION JA Three breakouts – Census data 2011 –

ACTION JA 5.3 local infrastructure needs to be updated – JA said she would have a look.

Section 2 – Our Vision

JA said she had only improved the wording – it has what the consultees said what they wanted – it is not known whether they were weighted. JA said the reason they were put in in this order was to make it look quasi pro-development but it does not mean the village support it. Preserving the local village etc. were streets ahead in terms of what people wanted.

KtK said to look at another couple of Vision Statements – query about influx of people – is there anything to stop a comment everyone wants to retain the character of the village and the challenges are to allow for the influx of growth which goes against what we have in the NP. JA said the objective is where we need the NPPF to be our friend. JS was complaining about objectives and vision being mixed up and JS asked what is the difference between aims and objectives. KtK said we just need the vision to be a vision and then it is not an aim.

Where it says Aim, we change to Vision and the Objectives to achieve it with bullets.

ACTION: JA will have a look at these.

JA said we may have to look at the Transport again. On the main stuff of the road transport “are the roads big enough” that is LP decision not NP. NPPF says unless there are serious issues you must accept. Definition of “serious” is open.

Settlement boundary - map is required to move the settlement boundaries around existing and new developments – Watery Lane, Brambleside and Knight Close – redraw it round what we have or know we are going to have. Because we have no development outside the settlement boundary we can defend that.

ACTION: JA ask DJ if he can help and what he can help with and then find someone else to help as well.

KTK asked if we had to provide a narrative for each of the policies and JA said yes. There are lots of different types of evidence. Justification and Evidence is the weakest. Maybe we can go back to JS and ask if he can give us some help and show us where we can go to find it.

ACTION: CL send the Notes to JS via Julia – JA get him to give us the type of evidence we need to look at.

At this point it was agreed to defer the meeting to Tuesday 21 February same venue and time.

Meeting adjourned at 10.25 pm

Resumed meeting 21 February 2017

Present: Indra Sinka (IS), Julia Ambler (JA), Simon Ambler (SA), Sarah Callaghan (SC), Kerry ten Kate (KtK), Peter Keganhan (PK), Carol Leversha (note taker)

Apologies: Mr. Brian Whyatt and Andy Hellier.

It was agreed we should get our plan to the point of consultation.

ACTION: KtK will book HWT for the work proposed. We need a formal proposal as to what they will do (note it will not be fieldwork) send to JA as Chair of Finance and IS as Chair of NP. Book for 2 days – advise as part of the same exercise as to whether to come back at a different time of year and perhaps do some fieldwork. Hbic will give us help PDF and KtK has asked for data sets so we can integrate into the work HWT and RH are doing. SC said RH has reverted to his previous position that he will provide the data so long as it is only he who is doing it. KtK said if it is done chronologically she can explain as we review it this evening.

Page 26 – Section 2 KtK has changed the language to show what the parish would like in 2032 – this is a question of style – people may think it is way out or not. Happy, healthy, fabulous in 2032.

Built environment –taken out aims entirely. She has not looked to see if the objectives together will deliver the vision.

Do we have the raw data from 2015 – KtK said we could take the best from all consultations. However in terms of setting the vision and objectives the form did not lend itself to this. KtK said it would be helpful to have a para saying we have done this consultation on this date etc. SA said we had done a follow up to the Parish Plan and the refresh had not altered dramatically. IS said it would be good to have a table of the kind of information we have and when. This could be an appendix. We have to list the evidence we have. SA said if

other groups have done consultations in the parish we could use those. KtK said the point is that we can justify things – can we use people’s comments on planning applications and SA said we can. KtK said we could use parameters to measure responses and JA said we would have to show we are pro-development not anti. PK said so “instead of its too high” you would say “residents were concerned that development should not be too high”. KtK said one idea for policies is we could share these out. JA said the way it is done by others is that you start off with an introductory blurb, then your policy and then the justification for your policy. E.g. redrawing the settlement boundary so that new development takes place within the redrawn boundary which covers new developments. “JA said current policies have been borrowed from other NPs and need to be brought into line to reflect our NP.

Review of green policies

JA asked are these an adequate basis for us and what evidence do we need to support them. RH’s work is critical to this. Also the HWT input and Hbic

ACTION: Great crested newts – KtK will ask her HWT buddies.

JA asked how about concentrating on the Justification for each of these policies and then ask how they fit together.

ACTION: JA & KtK will go through one together. JA said she had done page 31 – into spatial strategy which says we are going to do settlement boundaries etc. JA said look in the NP in dropbox and look at the Rotherwick policies.

PK asked if we could use rationale rather than justification as he thought it sounded defensive. **It was agreed that we would use “rationale” in place of “justification”.**

Action: JA asked IS to drop all the other current editions down and only leave the current one.

Page 31 – spatial distribution of development should read 2011 to 2032. SC produced some work from RH which if Members thought was useful he could refine it down. JA said we need words round it to explain what it is all about. There was an analysis for Cross Farm. KtK said we need to get the NP style boundaries and we can then decide what would be good overlays to put on it.

Action: If we know what the ten top things are from HWT then that is all he needs to evidence for our purposes KtK will ask them. RH help needed to show where we can gain in our landscape for biodiversity/conservation. We need to show the impact on the Conservation area – IS said could we get John Slater to help us. We should also do undesirable features – IS said “would affect the conservation area because of the height of buildings etc” JA said view points its impact on SSSIs - we need a detailed analysis to identify the “crown jewels”. IS said we need to build a 3D version KtK said if we could zone the land: conservation, crown jewels and hands off and justify it. JA said that is where you need the evidence. Particular areas where we have the sensitivity. She wants a photo looking up the hill from Crondall Road to the top of the hill at Cross Farm. **Action: PK said he would be happy to attempt to take a photo from Doug’s but he is worried that it might not reflect the height. Andrais, JA & SA will get together and take some photos.**

Action: JA asked KtK to embed the NPPF words she had identified and just leave it abandoned in the area and JA will sort it out.

Action: PK was asked if he could tackle Annex A in relation to the White Paper “fixing Britain’s broken housing”

JA will look at the census data to split up and find the age distribution across the village NHM and ZC and it was suggested that we use the data from the Parish Plan. KtK asked can she give HWT any information she thinks is appropriate for them to use in a new dropbox – this was agreed.

JA will keep going on the design stuff and work on the rationale for the policy and see if she can get some of them drafted and then look at the evidence base. KtK said don't we just want to do a common sense draft and then check against the consultation responses.

Action: KtK will do the "green ones" bearing in mind John Slaters comments which are in the first set of Mins she had given KtK.

Action: JA will ask TGJ and BW to work on what is left of the traffic policies.

Photos objectives necessary, mapping between objectives and policies with IS IS will work on to-date consultations and then match policies and rationale.

Action: KtK to ask for ToR's and deliverables from HWT.

KtK asked about deadlines – do we have desktop publisher – and was advised that Tony Clarke is going to help us with that. We probably will have copy for June/July.

Second half of May for consultation. This copy will reflect changes from consultation.

JS said we should have a made plan by the end of 2017.

Action: CL ask TGJ to do a new timeline to reflect what forecast deadlines are now.

Middle of April for data from HWT. Map and commentary on language.

Next meeting dates

Second Monday in the Month – 13 March 2017 – we need to set up working party groups outside of these meetings.

AOB

Meeting finished at 10.00 pm.