



Minutes of Steering Group Meeting – NDP  
Monday 4<sup>th</sup> September 2017, 7.30pm  
St Peter's Hall

In attendance:

Roger Townend	Rob Hunter	Keith Hardie	Paul Plowman
Sarah Beggs	David Smith	Steve George	Peter Gratton
Barbara Gratton	Bill Bloxsome	Pat Newton (PC)	

Apologies: Richard Gardiner, Brian Roe, Rachel Underwood

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

There were no changes to the interests previously declared. The minutes of the last meeting were approved and signed by RH.

**2. Meeting with Herefordshire Council**

SB and RH had met with Karla Johnson from Herefordshire Council ("HC") to feedback on our progress, discuss next steps and to discuss potential settlement boundaries. With regard to the latter, we asked KJ whether we could have a second settlement boundary in Winter's Cross, in addition to Peterstow village. However, KJ didn't think that would be possible because it isn't part of the defined settlement area for Peterstow and therefore any planning application in that area would be governed by policy RA3 of the Core Strategy. Our options, therefore, were to have just the one settlement boundary in Peterstow village, or include Winter's Cross as a second settlement boundary and see if HC reject it at Reg 14. If they don't reject it but comment adversely on it, we could proceed to examination and see if the examiner strikes it out. KJ agreed to get a 2<sup>nd</sup> opinion from the HC policy team on this point.

KJ subsequently informed us that a 2<sup>nd</sup> settlement boundary in Winter's Cross was likely to be rejected by HC for the following reasons:

- a) It wasn't identified in the Core Strategy as a settlement area itself;
- b) It is some distance from the defined settlement area for Peterstow; and
- c) It is likely that Peterstow will be able to meet its housing target from the sites available within our defined settlement area and therefore no extenuating circumstances exist for extending the area or creating a 2<sup>nd</sup> one.

It was therefore agreed that there was no point including a second settlement boundary at this stage, only to see it rejected at Reg 14 and then the NDP having to be amended to delete it. This would be a waste of time and grant funding. However, we would make reference in the NDP to the fact that it had been the wish of the residents of the Parish to have some development outside of Peterstow village and that as sites had been put forward for development in Winter's Cross, this would have been named as a separate settlement boundary in the NDP had we not been constrained by HC. The NDP has to be reviewed every 5 years and if we are not meeting our housing target, HC might reconsider this issue and allow there to be a settlement area in Winter's Cross, particularly if reference to it has been made in the NDP.

### **3. Review of Call for Sites**

BB presented his findings following his assessment of the sites offered for development and the order in which he ranked the sites in terms of their suitability. There was then a discussion about the number of sites that should go forward into the NDP to ensure that our housing target was met, yet at the same time respecting the view of the residents of the Parish that the current target of a further 16 houses was about right. A question was raised as to whether the additional park homes planned for Yew Tree Park would count towards our target bearing in mind that they had come about not as a result of an application for planning permission during the plan period as such, but due to the grant of a certificate of lawful use of the land for the siting of caravans. As this certificate might have related to the use of the land for caravans prior to the plan period, the park homes might already have been taken into account when HC set our housing target and therefore cannot be included now. **SB** agreed to seek further guidance from HC on this issue. Therefore, a final decision on the sites to be included in the NDP was deferred until then.

### **4. Review of Settlement Boundary**

As the settlement boundary is to be restricted to Peterstow village, it was agreed that we would adopt the old settlement boundary and amend it slightly to incorporate the sites being included in the NDP. Although we could add other areas where development has already taken place, we have to be mindful of the areas we will create where windfall development will then be permitted. We also need to make sure that we aren't left with any awkward areas where the land doesn't then have a reasonably beneficial use. The final version of the settlement boundary will be drawn once a decision has been made about which sites are to be included in the NDP. Once the new settlement boundary has been drawn, no further development will be permitted adjacent to the built-up area of the settlement, so we do not have to worry about further extensions to the boundary (provided HC has a 5-year plan).

### **5. Review of 1<sup>st</sup> Draft of NDP**

The current version of the draft NDP is the original with everyone's comments incorporated. This obviously throws up inconsistencies which will have to be ironed out. In particular, there is a lot more detail about the questionnaire results in both the sustainable energy and business sections. We have to be careful that we do not place more weight on these sections than the others because this would imply that they were issues that were important to the residents of the Parish when this wasn't the case. Indeed, the opposite could be said to be true. BB advised that questionnaire results wouldn't usually be set out in detail in the NDP, or as an appendix to it, because it would make the document very long. However, the questionnaire report would be made available at the same time as the NDP for people to refer to if wished.

We proceeded to review the proposed changes. It was agreed that we would add more detail about the purpose of NDPs and the process up to the adoption of the plan, including about the referendum (**BB**). **BB** will check whether the church is grade II\* listed or simply grade II and we will include the war memorial as a site of historical importance. **BB** will add some more detail to para 2.16 as most of what was there has been deleted and therefore what is left doesn't make much sense. Para 2.21 ought to be renamed "Economic Activity and Environment" and the 1<sup>st</sup> version offered was preferred by the group. References to polytunnels and low carbon energy generation should be deleted in paragraph 3.9 covering opportunities for employment because the Parish didn't want to see these developed on a commercial basis. Para 3.12 will be reworked by **SB** to explain in more detail that we had wished to include Winter's Cross as an area for development but were constrained by HC. It was agreed that the order and content of the vision and objectives

(and therefore the chapters of the NDP) should reflect what was approved by the PC and published. To change them would be to change the weighting of the issues.

Policy PTS2 is no longer required and the reference to development not being totally restricted in para 5.14 can be deleted because there are no other green spaces to be protected other than the common and there can be no development on the common (**BB**). We do not need a policy on sustainable design, but might want to include something which covers the design of buildings generally. **BB** will work on this. We must be careful how we word the obligations placed on the PC to ensure that they are deliverable. We might not be able to say that they guarantee to do certain things, rather that they will use their best endeavours, especially with regard to traffic issues which are often outside their control. It was agreed that we would include the reference to internal road layouts in policy PTS10 because whilst we won't have any large sites with internal roads, it could be said that the lane extension into the shop site would, for example, constitute an internal road.

**BB** will work further on section 7 once we know what sites are to be included and make sure that any site-specific criteria are included. He will also include a requirement that new houses will have adequate gardens, be low density and of a type and scale which fits in with the surrounding properties, maintaining adequate gaps. We do not need policies on housing development in Winter's Cross, meeting housing need, or affordable and intermediate homes. It was agreed that we would not make reference to provision of youth and recreation facilities as the Parish didn't want this. This can be looked at again when the plan is reviewed in 5 years if the demographics of the Parish change. **RH** will check with the PC at its next meeting that it is happy to undertake the requirements placed upon it in para 11.6. However, we won't commit them to pursuing the enabling actions and Parish projects set out in appendix 2. Instead they will continue to support initiatives for the benefit of the Parish as these arise and provided they are achievable.

**SB** will now incorporate all the changes into a further draft which will be distributed to the group with a view to finalising this at our next meeting or shortly thereafter. It can then be presented to the PC for approval at their next meeting in November. Once the steering group have signed off the NDP, we could ask HC to start preparing the SEA and HRA as these take about a month and will need to be submitted at the same time the NDP is submitted for Reg 14 consultation. This way, we can proceed to Reg 14 as soon as possible after the PC's meeting and preferably before Christmas (although if the consultation period goes over Christmas, we should extend it from 6 weeks to 8 weeks). We will need to have another open meeting as part of the Reg 14 process so that we can publicise the NDP and so that people have the opportunity to discuss it with us. We can plan this at our next meeting. However, if people want to comment on the NDP as part of the Reg 14 process, this must be done by them in writing.

## **6. AOB**

A proposal had been put forward to the group for a smart hydrogen economy on one of the sites offered for development. **BB** advised that the NDP could not specify that a housing estate could be used for a particular purpose and after discussion about the other problems associated with such a proposal, it was decided that the matter should not be taken forward.

The next meeting will take place at **7.30pm on Monday 2<sup>nd</sup> October** in St Peter's Hall, Peterstow. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 9.00pm.