

Minutes of Steering Group Meeting – Neighbourhood Development Plan
Monday 4th April 2016, 7.30pm in St Peter’s Hall

In attendance:

Rob Hunter	Peter Gratton
Roger Townend	Roy Coldrick
Richard Gardiner	Rachel Underwood
Sarah Beggs	Paul Plowman
David Smith	Steve George
Barbara Gratton	Keith Hardie

1. Update

- (a) Terms of Reference and SLA – No objections were received to these. They are now with the Parish Council who will hopefully approve them at their next meeting in May. They will then be sent to Herefordshire Council (“HC”).
- (b) Treasurer – Keith Hardie kindly agreed to be treasurer.
- (c) Other volunteers – **KH** agreed to see if he could get contact details for Dennis Hitchings.

2. Logo for Peterstow NDP Documents

RU suggested a logo to go on all of the steering group documents to make it clear what has been generated by the group. **RU** will send her design to **ALL** for approval / comment. **RC** has IT experience and can help with the production of the final version.

3. Ross-On-Wye Neighbourhood Development Plan

We received an invitation for someone to attend the Ross NDP team’s workshop on 12th April. No one can attend. **SB** to ask Pat to decline on our behalf.

4. Herefordshire Council’s Community Infrastructure Levy Consultation

This sets out the proposed levy HC can charge on new developments in the area, which money can then be used on infrastructure etc. We can all respond as individuals and we can put in a response on behalf of the Peterstow NDP group via the Parish Council. Peterstow is classed as Ross and Rural Hinterlands, so, for example, for a development of less than 11 dwellings in Peterstow (but not single dwellings) there would be a levy of £200 per sq. m charged to the developer, of which we would be able to get 25% (£50) if we have a plan in place. This money would go to the Parish Council who would decide what to do with it, such as spend it on a permanent speed camera, other facilities etc.

It was agreed that we didn’t need to put in a response on behalf of the group.

5. Main Issues affecting the Parish for Inclusion in NDP

We need to identify the bigger concepts that might need to be included in our NDP so that we can help to direct people to think about what they want in the Parish. These will then feed into our questionnaire.

Some ideas put forward were as follows; the vision for the parish / its objectives (e.g. what level of growth do we want), housing (what type, where), businesses (do we want to expand local business in any way), green spaces, recreation / facilities for the parish, highways, footpaths, drainage / flooding, services (mains gas, fibre broadband etc.), environmental / conservation (we already have numerous special wildlife sites to consider), potential settlement boundary (we can specify where we want development to be focused. Historically, it used to be confined mainly to the village envelope, but now we can specify a settlement boundary ourselves), village design statement (we can include a description and analysis of any distinctive aspects of the village and outline a design guidance for future development), tourism (we have 2 camp sites already, do we want to promote more tourism) and heritage (we will need to state which buildings are listed etc.).

RU will copy Bridstow's questionnaire for us all to consider to see if there are any other issues relevant to Peterstow because Bridstow's questionnaire is very detailed and has good questions. Over the next week or 2 we **ALL** need to look at this and any other NDPs / questionnaires for relevant issues.

6. External Consultants

BG and PG reported back on the parish councils they had contacted to find out which consultants they had used and their views on them, cost etc. Some parishes had spent a lot of money on the process and had applied for lottery funding (A4A scheme) to supplement the HC funding scheme. It was agreed that we would try to operate within the £9,000 funding available from HC because the Parish Council doesn't have huge funds to supplement the NDP and it takes a lot of time and effort to get lottery funding. Also, it was striking that many of the parishes contacted were already 3 or 4 years into the NDP process and still hadn't completed it, so it was obviously a long process anyway.

Fownhope, Bridstow, Eardisley and Western-under-Penyard have all used Data Orchard. They designed the questionnaires and provided an independent external analysis of the responses (it was thought that this latter stage was important to stop any feeling that the interpretation of the questionnaires was influenced by the views of the steering group). Data Orchard also have Bill Bloxsome as part of their team. He is a town planner who used to manage HC's conservation team and he was retained as an independent planning consultant. Positive comments received about them.

Little Dewchurch used Worcester Research to provide analysis and feedback on the 1st public questionnaire (but not to design it, or to be involved with the 2nd questionnaire). They also used CR Planning Solutions for consultation with HC and other agencies. Wellington used Kirkwells, but have not responded yet to our approach. Burghill used Gloucester Rural Community Council for questionnaire analysis, although Data Orchard were a close second, but had other work at the time. They used Kirkwells for drafting the plan and they recommended them. RH thought HC had suggested that they were expensive.

RG was given the name of David Nicholson by a contact of his. Mr Nicholson used to be a senior planning officer at HC and has set out the aspects of the NDP that he could provide assistance with. He has helped 3 parishes with their NDP.

SB had researched the list of consultants provided by HC, but had not contacted any yet. There was a company based in Cheltenham with planning and transport expertise and Place Studio (based in Bristol) who are being used by Ross.

The consensus was that we ought to employ one consultancy to deal with all aspects that we need help with rather than employ separate consultants to cover different areas. SB suggested that if that was the case, we ought to try to find a consultancy with as broad a skill base as possible (perhaps a team rather than an individual on their own). In any event, we want to check that the consultants are not simply subcontracting out elements themselves as this could increase the cost.

It was agreed that **SB** would draft a letter to be sent out to approx. 6 of these consultancies asking what services they could provide that would be needed by a parish like ours, whether they were available to do the work and the likely cost. Any suggestions of other issues to include in the letter to be sent to SB by the end of the week – **ALL**. We could then draw up a shortlist of approximately 3 consultancies who would be invited to one of our meetings to do a pitch.

7. Draft Project Plan

SB had circulated a very rough first draft of a project plan. Everyone is to consider this and provide any comments or suggestions within the next couple of weeks and in particular, to think about how long each stage should take – **ALL**. We can then go through this at our next meeting.

8. How to Engage with the Community

Suggestions for methods of communication were as follows; Peterstow Times, Parish Council website, village website, village noticeboards, information to community groups to disseminate, flyers / invitations delivered to premises, open days, large parish meetings, questionnaires, stand at the village fete and social media. It was not thought that we have any groups in the parish that are difficult to access, although **PG** will contact local farms to see if they have any non-English speaking employees

who would be eligible to vote in our referendum. It was thought that in order to vote, you had to be on the electoral register, although it was noted that Bridstow had sent their questionnaire out to all those individuals in their parish who were over the age of 16.

RT will start to accumulate data from HC about the demographics of our parish as this will be needed for our plan in any event.

9. AOB

We have not yet applied for any funding from HC. We need to supply estimates of some sort, so will wait until we hear from the consultants first. However, **PG** ought to bill the group for the use of the hall in the usual way.

The next meeting falls on a bank holiday, but everyone happy to attend on that date, Monday 2nd May 2016 at 7.30pm in St Peter's Hall.

Meeting closed at 8.30pm.