



Minutes of Steering Group Meeting – NDP  
Monday 6<sup>th</sup> August 2018, 7.30pm  
St Peter's Hall

In attendance:

Sarah Beggs	Rob Hunter	Keith Hardie
David Smith	Roger Townend	Peter Gratton
Bill Bloxsome	Richard Gardiner	Barbara Gratton

A member of the public, Andrea Windsor-Collins, was also present.

Apologies: Steve George, Paul Plowman, 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 Draft Response to Reg 16 Representations**

The representations made to Herefordshire Council (“HC”) during the Regulation 16 consultation have been passed to the examiner and the Parish Council have been invited to give their response to them. A draft has been prepared by BB and circulated to the group. Once agreed, it will be submitted on behalf of the PC by the clerk. RG was reminded that under the code of conduct, as he has a financial interest in one of the sites put forward for development, he would have to excuse himself from the meeting whilst the response to his representation was considered.

When discussing the draft response, there was a concern that we do not want to be thought to be pushing for the recent development proposal for the village shop site when about 14 residents objected to it. However, we are not saying in the NDP that a particular planning proposal ought to be permitted, simply that the site was one where development might be suitable. What precisely can be built there would be up to HC planning department, as would the number of houses. BB had allowed for 4 based on the current density of houses in that area. However, HC might specify that fewer houses can be built on the site, or they might allow more.

Similarly, we are not agreeing with the fact that the shop is not viable, merely acknowledging that this is the view of the owner as set out in his recent planning application. However, by including the shop / post office in the NDP as a key community facility, we are ensuring that a planning application which involved its permanent closure wouldn't be permitted unless the owner could show that it isn't viable. This is a planning issue where the applicant would have to prove that certain strict conditions had been met; namely that it had been advertised for sale for a prescribed period of time without success etc. It doesn't mean that the shop can't be relocated / replaced, though, although this is another matter for HC planning department to decide when presented with any detailed planning application.

We discussed whether it was correct to say that a regeneration scheme could improve visibility on the shop site. Certainly, the application that had been submitted included increased visibility

splays compared to those currently on the site and even if they were deemed to be insufficient in that particular development proposal, visibility could be dealt with to the satisfaction of the planning department in an alternative scheme. Furthermore, Highways England hadn't raised an objection in principle to the site being included in the NDP as a development site. After taking a vote, it was agreed (with 1 person dissenting) to keep the draft as it was, but to change reference to the shop to "shop and post office".

There was a discussion about whether a solution to the village's drainage problems ought to be found before any development can be allowed in the village, but it was agreed that this is outside the remit of the NDP and would be difficult in any event as there is no funding for this. Drainage is a planning point and it is for each planning application to show to the satisfaction of HC planning department that they have dealt adequately with drainage issues. We have covered drainage in PTS6 by requiring all development proposals to present clear technical evidence to show that they will not create drainage problems and this applies to all allocated sites as well as any future planning applications elsewhere in the Parish. The reference in our draft response to us having "addressed" the drainage issue simply means that we have answered this point, not that we have resolved all drainage issues in the village. It was therefore agreed (again with one dissenting vote) to leave the draft as it is.

We have been advised by HC that the proposed new park homes, if built within the plan period, will count towards our housing quota; HC consider such properties to be permanent dwellings. Therefore, there is no reason to change our response to the Reg 16 submissions in this regard. This was agreed by all members, bar one.

There was a discussion about the settlement boundary and why it hadn't been expanded. The approach that had been taken was to adopt the previous settlement boundary and extend it to include a site already under construction and two of the allocated sites which are adjacent to the built-up area of the settlement. There is no requirement to have all the allocated sites in the settlement boundary.

It was agreed that no changes needed to be made to any other part of the draft response.

### **3. AOB**

- a) Finances – we have now received our grant of £1,750. This takes us to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2019 and covers any work that is required during the examination period as well as all publicity for the referendum. HC pay for the cost of the referendum itself.
- b) Next Meeting – there is no need to plan any future meetings at this stage. We will call a meeting as and when required.

There being no other business, the meeting closed at 8.20pm.