

Dorstone Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group

held on Monday May 19th. 2014 at 7.3pm at DVH

No	AGENDA ITEM	ACTION	WHO
	<p>Present: Colin Thomas(Chairman), Simon Gaze, Mary Hession, Alistair Phillips, David Phillips, Tim Rogers, Tony Usher, Sarah Cattrell, Richard Burt, Cathy Gethin, Chris Hendy, Sophie Robinson, Claire Rawlings (Consultant)</p>		
1	Apologies for absence:). Sue Atkinson, Russell Goodwin, Sam Banks, Penny Platts		
2.	Notes of the Meeting held on April 30 th . 2014 were accepted		
3.	<p>Matters Arising</p> <p>(a)Colin reported that agreement had been reached with Claire on the basis upon which she would be charging for her services..</p> <p>(b) Item 4.1. Colin reported that he had received a letter from Russell confirming his personal interest in land shown on the SHLAA Assessment Plan Ref HLA/109/001.</p>		
4.1	<p>Draft Settlement Boundary</p> <p>Simon reported on the feedback from Parishioners who had visited the NP Tent on Plant Day. It was useful to explain the settlement boundary issue to Parishioners and in general they seemed reasonably happy with the current form, perhaps with some minor amendments.</p> <p>Following the village walk around and the lengthy discussion at the previous meeting, a further detailed discussion took place on the possible options for a new settlement boundary. Members agreed that a settlement boundary was an essential policy tool for controlling future development. Various options were then discussed:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To leave the settlement boundary exactly as it was previously drawn with the exception of including Castle Barn which had been built since the boundary was drawn. This had the advantage of simplicity and reflected built areas and perimeter roads. It also avoided any potential conflicts with landowners whose land was either included or excluded from a revised settlement boundary 2. To make relatively minor alternations to the settlement boundary by including, as well as Castle Barn, Sycamore House and Orchard End as well as a small parcel of land in Chapel Lane adjacent to Coopers Hall, with the revised boundary following the garden line from Cooper Hall to the road. This again followed the road lines of Chapel Lane and the road into the Village and the road to Snodhill to the edge of the Village Area. <p>After a discussion a vote took place which was initially tied 5-5 and</p>	<p>Consolidated document to be revised to reflect this.</p>	<p>Colin</p>

	<p>the Chairman used his casting vote to adopt Option 2 as the draft settlement boundary. This would be used as the basis for consultations with Parishioners and could be revisited if there were many objections.</p> <p>The issue of declaring certain areas within the Settlement Boundary as open areas, which would not be subject to development, was discussed. On balance it was agreed that to follow this route would by default identify potential development sites, which was contrary to the agreed policy of using a criteria led approach rather than identifying particular sites. It did however emphasise how importance of the wording to the policies setting out the criteria.</p> <p>The issue of the number of houses within the Village Area was raised with the Herefordshire Rural Strategy paper showing 98 as against the locally calculated figure of lower 70's depending on inclusion of houses currently outside the settlement boundary. It was agreed that a check would be carried out to determine the actual number and discussions would take place with Sam to agreed the accurate figure.</p> <p>Again it was stressed that a clear policy had to be prepared for new housing development outside the Settlement Boundary area, i.e. for the rest of the Parish. This would be reflected in the next draft.</p>	<p>Check out map to determine number of houses</p>	<p>Colin</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Overview of Draft Consolidated document, circulated previously Tim said he was be forwarding comments within the next week.</p> <p>Claire went through the second draft highlighting various points which are summarised in Appendix A to these notes.</p>	<p>Comments to be forwarded to Colin</p> <p>Redrafting to reflect points made</p>	<p>Tim</p> <p>Colin + Claire</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Affordable Housing Claire and Colin had held a meeting with Hayley Crane of Herefordshire Housing. Claire had prepared a note of the meeting which had been previously circulated. Key points were</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was unlikely that a Housing Association would be able or willing to develop a site within Dorstone owing to land values and there minimum required scale of around 5/6 houses in terms of management. • Therefore Dorstone's affordable housing needs were possibly best met through delivery of social rented schemes in early Peterchurch and Kingstone. • To ensure flexibility is built into the NP by making references to the exceptional Policy H2 which allowed for possibly sites for affordable housing on the edge of the settlement boundary where land values might be cheaper, • Financial contributions towards delivery of affordable homes 	<p>Claire to prepare draft policy note on affordable housing</p>	<p>Claire</p>

	would still be negotiated for future schemes in the area...		
7.	<p>Next Stages/Timescales</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Colin/Claire reported on the recent Tattenhall decision re-interface between local NPs and approval of local Plans. The High Court decision went against the developers and had ruled that NP's had to be judged against the latest approved Local Plan, which in Herefordshire's case was the UDP. At the same time the Court had stated that appropriate recognition had to be given to the any new Local Plans in the preparation of NPs. It was now unlikely that Herefordshire's Local Plan would be approved before early 2015, and this was still ambitious. It was agreed to ask Sam for advice on tactics in this regard. In the meantime the revised timescale set out at the last meeting would be followed. The Second Draft Plan would be amended to take account of comments made and further sections would be drafted setting out background, evidence and consultative processes used in preparing the Plan. The Annual Parish Meeting would feature the progress made on NP and also a Parish Council Update would summarise progress to date. Neighbourhood Forum members would be circulated with the next Draft version of the Plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting with small businesses and farmers to discuss latest versions 	<p>E mail to Sam</p> <p>Re-drafting</p> <p>Presentation</p> <p>Circulate 3rd draft when prepared to NP Forum members</p> <p>Arrange Meeting</p>	<p>Colin</p> <p>Colin/ Claire</p> <p>Colin/ Simon</p> <p>Colin</p> <p>David/ Sue/ Simon</p>
7.	<p>Date of Next Meeting Monday July 7th 2014 – 7.30 Village Hall</p>		All

Signed.....

Appendix A – Summary of Claire’s comments and subsequent discussion at the Meeting

1. Plan objectives were largely covered by the overall Vision statement previously circulated. Consideration to be given to whether there was also a need for clear objectives, partially covered by the sub-vision statements. – **Action – Colin to examine when re-drafting and discuss with Claire.**
2. Careful consideration to be given to the Location and Development Criteria policy on p5:- **Action – Colin & Claire to redraft**
 - a. Affordable housing needs to be covered – **Action Claire to prepare policy note.**
 - b. Location criteria point 5 needs some more justification in terms of protecting the potential character of the location
 - c. Generally insufficient reference to Conservation Area status and its importance in terms of new developments
 - d. Development criteria – a village design statement incorporating point 1 would be helpful in giving developers a clear idea of expectations.
 - e. Some “tensions” between the list of preferred features and the use of more modern technologies and improved building techniques which are more energy efficient and sustainable – eg. Non-wooden energy efficient Aluminium/PVC windows which look like wood.
 - f. Residential amenity issues need to be included
 - g. Wording of point 4 on additional buildings on existing sites needs some care – **Claire to research other plans to see how they dealt with this issue.**
 - h. New housing outside Village Settlement boundary needs to be updated to reflect recent change in Government policy concerning conversion of agricultural buildings without planning permission.
3. Renewable Energy:-
 - a. Needs reference to Conservation Area
 - b. DNP Policy statement and DMP Energy policy 1-3 – consider merging
4. Tourism – make sure that policy statement concentrates on land use issue – no reason however why other issues should not be listed under community action. –
5. Infrastructure – need to strengthen the link back to new developments – how can new development lead to infrastructure improvements.
6. Small businesses – generally fine but may need reference to the type of small businesses that may be attracted,
7. Conservation, Heritage & Landscape – again impact on conservation area needs to be expanded.
8. Flooding – reference needs to be made to a requirement on developers to carry out a flood risk assessment and drainage strategy – including the provision of sustainable Urban drainage solutions in new developments –

how a site after development can effectively deal with water in the same way as a green field site.

9. Community facilities – consideration needs to be given for the enhancement of village facilities arising from money from CIL – priorities need to be identified.

**Main action, other than those stated, are redrafting of second draft –
Colin/Claire**