

LITTLE BIRCH and ACONBURY

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – STEERING GROUP

Notes for Meeting on 15th February 2017

Present: From Little Birch; John Jones, (Chairman), Andrew Maden, Denise Rees, Susan Jones, Ben Roberts, Mike Morley, John Dillon, Sandra Cameron, Margaret Scrivens, Steve Naylor, Mandy Naylor, David Palfreman **and from Aconbury;** , Mike Leigh, Roger Wiikinson, Owen Cockram, Tim Riley, Isabel Riley, Alan Barker, Jennifer Jones, Sam Johnson, Mike Johnson. Robin Derham

Also present: Sophie Glover (Clerk). Dr David Nicholson (Consultant)

Meeting started at 7.00pm

1	Welcome and introduction The Chair welcomed every one to the meeting. Apologies George Micurkik, Elaine Godding, Gillie Guest.	Actions
2	Feedback from Dr Nicholson on the draft report that he has submitted to the steering group. DN gave an introduction to his draft report. He clarified that he working for you as your consultant, and was not working for Hereford Council. MM challenged him on his involvement in writing the core strategy, but DN explained how this would be an asset rather than a hindrance to the process. DN checked that the two parishes were expecting to have their housing development in their own parishes. JJ was not comfortable confirming this but DN said that until he heard otherwise this would be what the NDP was working towards. DN clarified that one parish could take all of both parishes building requirement. He explained the difference between Aconbury as a village and as a parish. He said that there had to be an explanation as to what Aconbury village looked like. RD said 'who said Aconbury had a village, it was a parish'. DN said that there was tight planning guidance on building in open countryside, it was generally prescriptive. However, in villages planning was encouraged, hence the need for NDP's. Little Birch: dispersed pattern of settlement, little clusters of dwellings. This makes identifying the village particularly tricky. In the paper DN has tried to identify the areas that are not open countryside, and then has suggested criteria. Policy 1 and 2. He ran through the options that he has identified. Options are all open for discussion, this is a draft document. Policy 2 looks at 'residential development on land withing or adjacent to the settlement of Little Birch as defined in Policy 1' (full description on Pg 21 of the draft document). DN suggested that if the NDP said we did not want building sites of over 5 dwellings, then this would be taken out of the plan before it gets completed. RD asked why we could not just put what we want in our own plan. DN	

	<p>explained that we can achieve the same ends by using criteria in the document. MM asked if the independent examiner was truly independent? DN explained that this was the case.</p> <p>JJ suggested that the group listened to our expert. RD said that he felt that DN was doing a great job for the group.</p> <p>SC questioned what the additional policy was that was referred to at Maryland. DN explained that it had come up in an earlier survey, and as a possible building site it needed to be discussed on its own merits.</p> <p>Aconbury: DN said that he realised that in listing three settlement areas, he had stirred up the parishoners. He looked at the village boundary as on Pg 20. He then went to plan 3 on pg 13. He had identified them as they seemed like relatively settled areas. He discussed a separate way of doing this, writing a policy for Aconbury hamlet, and taking any other development in the area as RA3 ie barn conversions and very restricted development only.</p>	
3	<p>Questions from the floor</p> <p>Aconbury:</p> <p>ML: was extremely concerned about the ringing of area 2, as this seems to be the most likely area for development. He questioned how flexible 'open countryside' was in this respect. He and others from this particular area were very against the possibility of cramming houses in one small settlement area. DN said we only had to worry about showing that the minimum requirement was able to be met...and this might be done by saying there is the village of Aconbury hamlet, and the rest is open countryside.</p> <p>RD how would Herefordshire Council see this change in 'open countryside'? DN : the NDP would outline this.</p> <p>TR: we felt that if there was only to be planning allowed in the marked areas, that would be very prescriptive.</p> <p>DN suggested the alternative, scrap areas 2 and 3 and leave the rest as open countryside.</p> <p>RD; most people would be happy about allowing organic growth. The concern is that large land owners might do speculative development in the area.</p> <p>RD asked if DN would be happy to scrap the settlement areas and go with the 'open countryside' route – DN said that he had already said this.</p> <p>ML; asked if DN could outline the RA3 rules for the meeting, and he did so. RD asked DN if he had a feeling about what the Duchy might be thinking of, he said that he had no contact with the Duchy and would not do so with out going through the group.</p> <p>The chair summed up that there were many people present tonight from Aconbury as there was such a strong feeling of concern about the draft report..</p> <p>AB; we are on a historic site, we should be given special consideration due to the fact that we have Aconbury Fort in our parish. He asked if there was a possiblilty of having the percentage growth reduced due to the historical nature of the area – he was informed that this would not happen.</p> <p>DN asked if generally Aconbury people were in favour of the 'open countryside' route. Most seemed in favour, but TR was unconvinced.</p>	

	<p>DN said that there were only 4 houses to look for allocation, drawing a tight line round Aconbury village, and letting the rest happen through RA3 might be the way forward.</p> <p>RD suggested that there should be a vote one this.</p> <p>ML; it is an important decision for Aconbury, if its residents had known that there would be a vote, they would have come to the meeting. It was suggested that DN goes away and redrafts the draft document, and then has a 'drop in consultation' that every one could come to discuss. ML said that Aconbury Parish meeting was due on April 6th, he wanted to put this to that meeting. The steering group thought that this was unnecessary, this was a steering group decision.</p> <p>Little Birch;</p> <p>JJ read out what the planning office had put as a description of Little Birch.</p> <p>He feels that DN's options A and B should be put together.</p> <p>DN asked if they wanted to be more permissive to housing (option A and B) or less (option A).</p> <p>JJ said that we should ensure that we are not spoiling others enjoyment of the countryside.</p> <p>MM; said that he did not like criteria 1, why do we need 2 houses together? This was backed up by others, who asked DN to look at this particular point. DN it is there to say what a cluster is.</p> <p>MM also had concerns about 'open countryside', there is no definition of where and what it is. DN said that we will write a policy to show exactly where it is.</p> <p>MM's final point, was every one in the parish consulted? Including the far south? As there is a possibility of housing down there. He was very happy with the rest of the policy that DN had written.</p> <p>DR; said that in another parish where she had previously lived, the NDP had been returned with the question 'why is there no call for sites?' DN said that there were examples of NDPs had been successful with out call for sites as long as they had shown how the minimum housing targets have been reached.</p> <p>SN; option A and B excludes Crows Nest Lane, why? DN its outside the village. Following a group discussion, JJ Proposed that Crows Nest Lane should be included in the village, the consensus went with him. SN also said the road was not 'unadopted', a number of Little Birch residents said that it was definitely 'adopted'they asked DN to clarify this.</p>	
4	<p>Identifying the way forward</p> <p>DN suggested that he goes away and creates another version of the document to circulate round the steering group, and then to use in a consultation event – if this is the way that the steering group and Parish Council want to go. There was a discussion about the necessity of a consultation event, and DN directed that the PC needed to make the ultimate decision about whether or not to have a consultation event. Then all of the people in both parishes will have the opportunity to turn up and have their say. ML said that meetings were well publicized in the Parish Magazine which all households had, so there was no excuse for people not knowing when meetings were happening and the importance of them.</p>	
6.	Date and time of next meeting	

	With Dr N on the 19 th April at 7pm.	
--	---	--

Meeting closed at 8.40pm