



Minutes of Steering Group Meeting – NDP
Monday 12th February 2018, 7.30pm
St Peter’s Hall

In attendance:

Sarah Beggs	Rob Hunter	Keith Hardie	Paul Plowman
David Smith	Barbara Gratton	Peter Gratton	Bill Bloxsome

A member of the public (Keith Barnett) also attended to observe the meeting.

Apologies: Roger Townend, Richard Gardiner, Steve George, 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. Review of Regulation 14 Responses and Recommendations of Data Orchard

We received a fair number of responses which is a good thing because it shows that the community are engaged in the process. BB has divided them into 5 broad areas as follows:

1. Shop site – The main issues here were visibility re access from the site, drainage and conservation. As for safe visibility, the owner has achieved the standard required by HC by moving the position of the shop slightly. Highways England haven’t raised an objection in their response to our NDP but have yet to comment in response to the planning application submitted. As for drainage, this is a problem for most areas in Peterstow and we have dealt with this by including policies that require developers to show drainage can be dealt with adequately and won’t make the situation worse for existing properties, and where possible will improve things. If the developers can’t show this to the satisfaction of the planning department of HC, planning permission won’t be granted. BB has suggested that this site can accommodate 4 houses, but the planning department might suggest a lower number on this site. This is why we have provided flexibility in our Plan by exceeding the number of houses required. With regard to conservation, Historic England have objected to the removal of the old building. However, as it isn’t a listed building, this can be counter-balanced by other issues. The planning department will have to consider whether the loss of a building of local interest should be accepted if it enhances the whole site overall and ensures the continuation of the shop and post office. Historic England have suggested a heritage statement be produced and this is in line with our Plan which encourages these to be produced where relevant. As for the size of the site, the Village Policies Map is not completely accurate. This is partly because of its scale and the fact that information was obtained from the Land Registry which itself had inaccurate information. When we progress to the next stage, HC will produce more detailed maps and we will ensure that the site is accurately reflected. It doesn’t affect the ranking of the site. It was decided that there was no reason to wait until the outcome of the planning application before deciding what to do with this site. It was agreed that the site should be retained in the Plan as an allocated site. It is within the settlement boundary and is a brownfield site which needs improving visually and therefore it remains a potentially suitable site for development even if the current planning permission isn’t granted. Furthermore, if it is

removed as an allocated site in the Plan, it will reduce our numbers and might require us to include an additional site which is less suitable. However, some minor changes are proposed to the Plan to reflect the comments received.

2. Highgrove & Old High Town – These 2 sites threw up similar issues relating to highway safety, drainage, visual appearance and whether they are outside the settlement boundary. With regard to the latter, Peterstow currently doesn't have a settlement boundary, but the proposed boundary reflects an old one which has been adjusted slightly to include the allocated sites. Historically, development has been permitted within or adjacent to the settlement boundary, and all proposed sites are within or adjacent to the old boundary. If the NDP is approved, settlement will only then be permitted within the boundary and not adjacent, so there isn't a risk of creep. As for highway safety, HC who is responsible for the lane leading to these 2 sites has not objected to the scale or location of the developments. There will inevitably be more traffic to accommodate in Peterstow with the need to develop more houses and these sites are not dissimilar to many others in terms of road safety. It is a relatively short stretch of road and several passing places are driveways, there are other passing places. The additional number of journeys also wouldn't be that high. Highways England haven't objected to these sites and one of them was included in HC's SHLAA report as being suitable for development. The issues relating to drainage are the same as for the shop site, but again, the Plan has been amended to make the developer's obligations clearer. The green at High Town is intended to remain as a green and this has now been made clear in the Plan. The Plan has also been amended to reflect the fact that measures might need to be introduced to stop the area being used for informal parking. We considered whether we could ask the developer of the new site at Old High Town to create extra parking spaces to alleviate some of the pressure that currently exists, but this would only be possible if the new site requires something from the old site in order for development to be possible (e.g. access), or if this was given in exchange for granting the developer something extra, such as an additional house, which is unlikely to be popular. It was discussed whether the number of houses on the Old High Town site can be reduced to reflect local concerns. The site of Old High Town is made up of sites 12b and 12c and it was discussed whether it could be limited to just site 12B. However, this wouldn't reduce the number of houses by much and HC's density ratios are higher than ours. Furthermore, planning permissions might suggest lower numbers of houses on the allocated sites than we have proposed and therefore it is a good idea to have a small surplus. Nevertheless, it was agreed that we ought to try to reduce the number of houses here by at least 1. As for the visual impact of the development of Old High Town, the current development is already very visible and so the requirement for landscaping for the new development will improve things. It has not been possible to require affordable houses to be built in the Parish; this is only possible on sites of 11+ houses and the Parish residents clearly stated their preference of sites of no more than 2-4 houses.
3. Excluded Sites – An objection was raised to the fact that no sites have been included in Winter's Cross. However, we have already taken HC's advice on this and they have stated that it can't be included as a settlement. They reviewed what areas ought to be defined as settlements a number of years ago and Winter's Cross wasn't included. Therefore, if we included any sites in this area, our plan would not be in conformity with the Core Strategy. The owner of site 11 has stated that he is happy to work with us to identify a potential development on the site however large or small, but a large development there would

amount to major development in the AONB and even a reduced site would have adverse effects on the landscape and conservation area. Finally, the owner of site 1 queried why a figure of 25 houses was suggested for his site and it has been explained that this was based on density ratios suggested by HC, modified to reflect the location and topography. Furthermore, even if the current owner didn't have a wish to build that many houses, if we included the site in the Plan it would mean that any future owner of the land could seek to put that many houses on it and this would have an adverse effect on the conservation area and the setting, including the setting of the church which is a very sensitive site.

4. Park Homes – Some submissions have been made querying whether we can include the proposed park homes in our housing target on the basis that they have already been taken into account in our housing numbers, that the likelihood of them being put forward within the plan period in the numbers quoted is tenuous and that it contravenes the requirement for a high level of design. However, we have taken advice from HC who have confirmed that they can be included in our target, the owner is actively promoting the site and 2 sites have already been laid out. We have also included in the Plan a requirement for appropriate landscaping. Having said this, there is a possibility that the examiner might not agree with their inclusion, in which case, we would fall short of our housing target when looking at our allocated sites. We haven't, however, included in our Plan any housing that might come from windfall. **BB** will look at past applications and work out how many new houses we are likely to get during the Plan period in any event in the usual course of planning applications. We will then include these in the Plan as they will contribute to meeting our target. It was noted that a lot of windfall had taken place outside the settlement which balances development between that and the village where the sites we have included are located.
5. Views – HC have advised that we might want to map the views we wish to protect under PTS5. It was agreed that we would do this and that we ought also to include the view of the common itself. **BB** will do this for us.

3. Next Steps

It was agreed that we would accept **BB**'s proposed changes. He will send us an amended draft of the Plan for us **all** to review before submitting it to the PC for their consideration / approval. The PC will need the draft a week before their meeting, so it would be helpful if everyone could provide any comments quickly. After this the draft Plan will need to be submitted to HC under Regulation 15. They will then update the SEA / HRA and prepare our maps for us. We will need to submit a basic condition statement and consultation statement with our draft Plan. **BB** can produce these for us. We do not need to contact all those people who made representations under Reg 14 directly, but their comments and our responses will be included in our consultation statement and will be available for people to view with our other Reg 15 documents. HC will then organise a further consultation under Reg 16 so that everyone will have a further opportunity to comment. If HC are happy, the Plan will then go forward to be examined by an independent examiner who will consider the Plan, the evidence base and all the comments made.

4. Update on Finances

We have approx. £1,500 left of our original grant but KH has managed to secure an additional grant of £6,000 on the basis that our NDP qualifies as a complex plan given the number of detailed site assessments we have carried out. Therefore, the PC will not have to fund any shortfall. Our current grant period will run until 31st March, by when we will have used the £1,500 plus a small

amount of the new grant. This will take us to Reg 16 and leave us with the remainder of the new grant to carry out the work required after Reg 16.

5. AOB

KB commented that the main problem with the Old High Town site is flooding, which has been an ongoing issue. There is a soakaway under the green area which doesn't work. It was explained that any developer will have to comply with our NDP policy on drainage so that the new development doesn't make the situation any worse and if possible, will improve matters. However, we can't require a landowner to do something which isn't necessary for him to get planning permission on another piece of land. The PC could, however, raise the fact that there are issues with drainage that the landowner hasn't resolved on another piece of land when commenting on any application for planning. Having a Plan will put us in a stronger position to ensure that drainage will be dealt with adequately in future development.

The next meeting will take place at 7.30pm on Monday 5th March 2018 in St Peter's Hall, Peterstow. There won't be a lot to do then, but we will have a short meeting to discuss what happens next and the likely timescales.

There being no other business, the meeting closed at 8.49pm.