



Minutes of Steering Group Meeting – NDP  
Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> June 2017, 7.30pm  
St Peter's Hall

In attendance:

Roger Townend	Rob Hunter	Keith Hardie	Brian Roe
Sarah Beggs	David Smith	Steve George	Peter Gratton
Bill Bloxsome			

Apologies: Paul Plowman, Rachel Underwood, Barbara Gratton, Richard Gardiner

**1. Declarations of Interests / Previous Minutes**

BR disclosed a view on the shop development recently publicised in the village and was seeking a meeting with the owners. Depending upon the outcome of such a meeting, BR could have an interest in that development and asked for that to be on record. However, it was noted that the shop site development is a separate issue and does not form part of the NDP. There were no other changes to the interests previously declared. The minutes of the last meeting were approved and signed by RH. Members were reminded that if they have put forward a site for development, they will have to leave the room when the suitability of the site for development is discussed.

**2. Site Assessment Criteria**

BB had sent us some suggested criteria against which our potential development sites could be assessed. We went through these to see which ones were most relevant to Peterstow. One show stopper is the site's effect on environmental designations (such as SSSIs etc). **BB** doesn't think that we have any SSSIs in our Parish, but will check this. Most of the Parish is within an AONB, however, and therefore major development will not be allowed unless it has a public benefit. Major development isn't defined and we will need to take a view when we review the sites. A development of 35 houses was ruled out in both Bridstow and Fownhope (the latter being much bigger than Peterstow). We must also keep in mind the fact that the residents stated in the questionnaires that they didn't want developments of more than 4 houses.

Another show stopper is whether a site fits the requirement to be within or adjacent to the built-up area of the settlement. Sites in Winter's Cross may fall foul of this because they are outside the settlement. If we want to include Winter's Cross as a separate development area or include sites there, we will have to speak to HC. BB suggested that we arrange a meeting with our NDP planning officer about this. In essence, there could be 2 ways that people can get planning permission in our plan. We can define a settlement boundary and within that area people will be able to get planning permission if the proposed houses meet our criteria in terms of numbers (less than 4), access etc. We can also allocate one or more sites for housing. If these sites have less than 5 houses, then strictly speaking we don't have "an allocation" and in any appeal against a refusal of planning permission, our NDP might carry less weight. Having said that, it doesn't prevent us having a site with less than 5 houses and calling that an allocation if we justify our reasons for doing so. However, back gardens can't count as sites, but sites with a frontage can.

The other major show stopper is whether the proposed site fits sensitively into the setting and character of the settlement. We will need to define the character of the settlement and give more weight to the conservation area. BB felt that the way the settlement had developed so far favoured development on the south side of the A49. We can also consider the effect sites have on the natural, built and historic environment. We don't have any major environmental issues in the Parish in terms of particular habitats, but the built / historic environment will be important. Although we don't have any locally important buildings which aren't listed, we need to take care of the setting of our listed buildings such as the church. There might also be features on a site which are important, such as trees, which we can recommend ought to be protected by tree preservation orders.

We need to ensure that the proposed development protects the privacy and general amenity of existing properties and that it won't suffer noise and air pollution or contamination itself. It was noted that during the foot and mouth crisis lots of animals were buried here and therefore contaminated land might be an issue. It is understood that animals were buried on the field on the other side of the Yew Tree pub towards Bridstow and on the field between the church and the Red Lion pub.

Sewage treatment and land drainage / flooding are both relevant issues in the Parish because of the high water table. This has caused Wells Brook to become polluted and might affect how many houses are allowed on sites. There are no other infrastructure issues, however. There are not many brownfield sites in the Parish (which would be given preference over greenfield sites) and we will have to check what classification is given to any agricultural land offered for development. Whether sites are south facing (which would assist with energy conservation), is probably not an important factor as even east and west facing homes have some benefits in this regard.

Whether a site creates benefits in terms of community facilities, encourages greater use of facilities, or indeed restricts their use are all unlikely to be material criteria. Similarly, whether a site can accommodate on-site community facilities / open spaces. However, we might want to include policies requiring dwellings to have good sized gardens.

Criteria relating to safe vehicular access from a site, the effect a site will have on the highway network and the effect of traffic on residential amenity are all important criteria. We will need to seek the advice of Highways England about safe vehicular access from a site. We have awful access onto the A49 from many lanes and this is 1 of our top 3 issues. The effect a site will have on narrow lanes is also important, especially where there is agricultural traffic using the lane too. What effect a site will have on residential amenity is something that we can judge ourselves, rather than Highways England. Sites with traffic-calming benefits is not really a relevant criteria in our Parish, although we are hoping to obtain speed indicator devices.

We have 16 more houses to find to meet our target. The questionnaire results show that the Parish thought this figure was about right. We can have various combinations up to that number, but a site suggesting large numbers of houses is likely to go lower on our list of priorities, given the preference for single plots and plots of up to 2-4 houses. As for providing a range of dwelling types and sizes, this might be achieved based on the suitability of different sites for different types of housing, but we will have to see how this works out. Affordable housing is not really relevant in the strict sense of the word as we are unlikely to have sites of more than 10 houses, but there was a wish for some smaller houses that would be within the price reach of first time buyers.

### **3. Review of Sites Offered for Development**

BB had circulated 10 sites that had been submitted as part of our call for sites exercise. We also had another site that had been put forward to HC when they carried out a strategic housing land availability assessment, which had been passed to us because we are preparing an NDP. It was agreed that the best approach was to discuss each site as a group and assess them against the criteria relevant to our Parish. Where development has an adverse effect, we need to consider if that effect can be mitigated. We will do this as a tick box exercise initially and see if we can sort the sites into those that seem more favourable and those with more difficulties. We will then need to carry out further investigations into those sites and BB can carry out a final assessment against the criteria we have identified as being relevant to Peterstow so as to rank the sites in order of priority. Some of the sites might need further clarification which **BB** can do, although **KH** agreed to check if the land at Old High Town is being offered.

We reviewed one site from the list and assessed the merits of that site. To ensure equal treatment, information on all sites will be published when the review of all sites is complete.

### **4. Village Fete Planning**

As we are short on time and **RU** is not present, we will ask her to send out a short email letting us know how the preparations are going and what help is needed.

### **5. AOB**

HC have commenced a consultation on the Rural Area Site Allocation DPD which is intended to provide a planning policy framework for those areas that are not preparing a NDP. Whilst this doesn't affect us necessarily, one of the options being considered is whether to include in it Parishes that have not reached Reg 14 draft plan stage by the beginning of 2018. Whilst it is hoped that we will have reached this milestone before the end of 2017, it is a good reason to keep up the momentum and to keep HC informed of our progress via our NDP planning officer. **SB** will raise this with her at the meeting referred to above.

It has been discovered that last year the owner of Yew Tree Park obtained a Certificate of Lawful Use for the siting of caravans without condition or limitation on the field adjacent to the current park homes site, as caravans have apparently been sited there for many years. It is thought that it is the owner's intention to put more park homes there which will contribute to our housing quota.

The public meeting where the plans for the proposed shop site development were displayed was well attended. People were generally in favour although there were some strong objections from neighbours, mainly concerning flooding (sewage / drainage) and traffic / road safety. It was noted that 6 houses in addition to the shop unit was more than the Parish wanted in any housing development when asked in our NDP survey. However, this development does not form part of the NDP and is likely to proceed to a planning application in the usual way in the coming weeks. As with the park homes, any houses built on this site will count to our housing quota.

**SG** has found some information about RTAs in Peterstow as reported in the press. He is going to try to get hold of any evidence of accidents where the emergency services attended. It is known that there was at least 1 fatality outside the shop, probably around 1997.

As we still have a lot of sites to review and given that there is more than 5 weeks until our next regular Monday meeting scheduled for 7<sup>th</sup> August, we will have an additional meeting on **Thursday**

**20<sup>th</sup> July 2017.** That meeting will start at 7.00pm and take place in St Peter's Hall, Peterstow. **PG** will confirm that the hall is free on that date. **BB** will attend that meeting and we will continue with our site assessment. We also need to consider what policies we want to include in our plan relating to business. In the meantime, **BB** will start work on a first draft of our plan which we can then tailor ourselves to meet the specific requirements of the Parish.

There being no other business, the meeting closed at 9.30pm.