

MINUTES OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN MEETING

HELD ON TUESDAY 11TH JULY 2017

Present: Julia Ambler (JA) (Chair), Tony Gower-Jones (TG-J), Peter Kenaghan (PK), Tina Collins (TC), John Slater (JS), Carol Leversha (CL)

Apologies: Indra Sinka, Simon Ambler, Kerry Ten-Kate, Bryan Whyatt

Review of Draft Report by John Slater (consultant)

Prior to the meeting JS, PK and TG-J undertook a comprehensive tour of the Plan area and areas of particular importance were highlighted.

JS reported that the plan is making progress and that this should be viewed as the pre-submission consultation document which will be available for comments from interested parties. When finalised it will need to be publicised and available for comment for a 6 week period. We will need to log all comments and respond and amend the document if necessary. The plans are clear and set the scene well.

We need to state why we are creating a Neighbourhood Plan, tell the story of how it came to being. He suggested that one of the main reasons could be to enable us to influence development in our area rather than be pressurised for continuous unsuitable development imposed on us.

Conservation Areas – we need to mention all three (including the small area of the Dogmersfield Conservation Area which is in our Parish.

We need to state that the Plan may change in order to remain compliant with the emerging Local Plan. We also need to state why Cross Farm is not in our NP despite currently being in the Local Plan.

Built Environment – We could include a statement which could say that “any development within or adjacent to the Conservation Areas should be no higher than adjacent properties in order that there is no dominant visual effect on properties in the Conservation Area. Any new building shall preserve and enhance the setting of the Conservation Area and listed buildings.

There should be a similar statement for both Netherhouse Moor and Zebon Copse highlighting their individual features regarding size, scale, variety and quality of properties. E.g. good quality, respectful of neighbouring properties and the amenity of neighbouring properties.

This should be done for each of the separate character areas and could also include Crondall Road as a separate character area as it comprises generally large detached properties blending into a more rural outlook.

The Built Environment Character Assessment is different to the Landscape Character Assessment.

There followed some discussion regarding the allocation of sites as the Parish has now been allocated 100 homes for this plan period. In order to do this we could have a “call for sites” and then assess any sites put forward together with current proposed sites. We could suggest that any proposed sites should have no adverse effect on the Conservation Area and its listed buildings, be in linear form and be consistent with current development. Some work needs to be done on how much and what type of development would be appropriate, location of this development and why one site would take preference over another.

Natural Environment – this section is too long. We need to state what is relevant to the Plan and what areas are no-go areas for flora and fauna. This should be broadly in line with the planning designations. We need to state the profile of the parish, listed buildings, countryside and fragile areas under pressure for development. Any evidence should go in the Appendices.

Vision – this should include the Dogmersfield Conservation Area, otherwise it is OK. The Vision will be delivered by Objectives and these objectives will be met by delivering these Policies.

Settlement Boundaries – this is essential. It is important to have a settlement boundary. We may choose to put the boundary around any other allocated sites.

Sustainable development – this can be outside the settlement boundary and could state “preserve and protect all historic assets”.

BE02 and BE03 - Design principles and Design criteria. Only one set of policies is needed – Design policy. E.g. “All development shall be appropriate to the relevant character assessment area.”

New character assessment needed for Netherhouse Moor.

BE04 – cycleways – remove d.

CP01 - Community/Historic Assets e.g. village shop, WI Hall, pub, etc. This allows a planning control of it if it was put forward to change. It was agreed that as the village shop is a community asset the PC would raise this at their next meeting and apply to Hart for listing. Non-designated Historic Assets, eg locally listed buildings, etc. The list from Hampshire Treasures to be included as evidence.

NE01 – there are 2 policies, strategic gap and protect key views. We need to clearly show the view from one point to another using a “cone of visibility”, eg from the WI Hall to the Tump. We should select appropriate views and get photos. JS suggested we look at the Highgate, London NP to see how they have shown this.

NE02 – planning applications which affect the historic environment will be required to provide a positive contribution. This section should be rewritten in a more positive way. Check Hampshire Treasures listing to see exactly what is included.

NE03 – we cannot protect all wildlife to the same extent. The level of protection should be commensurate with its status eg SSSI (Basingstoke Canal) should have higher status than other areas. JS to send relevant policies for us to view/amend.

Local Green Space – eg, The Crescent, Jesset Drive/Brandon Road, area near Zebon Centre.

Open space/protected open space – there will be a general presumption against development. The badger protected area needs to be listed under the Ecology section.

JS suggested that a map covering the NP area could show all these areas.

NE04 – we don't know who the landowner is.

TM01 – Car Parking – land use policy. We need evidence if we are to use a different parking policy to that in the Local Plan. This should be in the Built Environment section.

Section 4 – appendices, etc. Appendix for community aspirations, some may need only to be in outline.

JS reported that we only need to print out the Plan itself for consultation, all appendices should be available on the website.

JA distributed Indra's preliminary results of community consultations. JS stated that these should be combined into a consultation statement and should tell the story as to how it started, questions and responses, etc. This shows engagement. We should also indicate how policies have changed/evolved due to community involvement.

JS reported that we need documentary evidence from Hart as to whether or not we will require SEA screening.

The meeting closed at 10.00 pm and the remainder of the agenda will be covered at a later date.

Signed:
Chair

Date: