

LITTLE BIRCH and ACONBURY

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – STEERING GROUP

Notes for Meeting on 19th April 2017

Present: From Little Birch; John Jones, (Chairman), Naomi Powell, Kyra Powell, Susan Jones, Ben Roberts, Alison Clarke, Mike Morley, Elaine Godding, Sandra Cameron, Margaret Scrivens, Steve Naylor, David Palfreman, Chris Atkinson, John Wilson, Rachel Wilson, Cathy Sadler, Gareth Powell **and from Aconbury;** Owen Cockram, Mike Leigh, Robin Derham, Alan Barker.
Sophie Glover (Clerk). Dr David Nicholson (Consultant)

Meeting started at 7.00pm

1	Welcome and introduction to the meeting The chair welcomed all to the meeting. The clerk reminded those present to declare a DPI if it was relevant to any one who had not already registered their interest.	Actions
2	Feedback from Dr Nicholson on the updated report that he has circulated to the steering group. Dr N reminded the meeting that the last meeting had had a full and wide ranging discussion about the draft report, and any changes suggested had been made in the newly issued report. He also cleared the reasoning behind there only be one area in Aconbury that was going to be outside the RA3 designated area.	
3	Questions from the floor RD: Thanked Dr N's attention to the changes that had been made for Aconbury. RD suggested that the Aconbury figure for development should be made as 4 not 5 – Dr N suggested that we go back to HC to check if this would be ok. ML confirmed that 29 properties were the number that the questionnaire was delivered to. RD: On table 2, the passivehouse new build, Old Holloway, is down as not started, and yet it is almost complete. Table 4: Shows 5 commitments, but the two tables above have 7, he questioned why – Dr N, it excludes replacements. RD: potential windfall properties; the old chapel was discussed, as it was purchased with a view to it becoming a dwelling, but not for 10 years. JJ: 2.3 He would like Little Birch to be included. Dr N explained why that could not happen. He was saying that in 3.3 we needed to be clear about the difference between 'settlement boundaries' and 'open countryside'. Dr N outlined the difference for the meeting. Explaining why there was no settlement boundary for Little Birch, but we still need to explain where exactly the definition of Little Birch would lie. ML said in 5.6 it says that the boundary is a matter of judgement. ML asked who decided what was 'open countryside', Dr N said it would fall to the planners when applications were submitted, and they would look to the NDP to reach a decision. EG said she was concerned by the 'vague' nature of this definition. She felt that there should be a more specific definition of the	

'small clusters' of buildings. DR N said the only sure way to do this would be to draw a tight boundary around the existing dwellings and any potential building plots. He said the NDP should give the planning officers clear definitions of what buildings should look like in the parishes so that they have something clear to work towards. She feels that the report rather contradicts itself, JJ agreed with this...he quoted from 3.3 to show this. EG was keen to define exactly where clusters should be developed, naming them and to what extent they could be developed. Dr N, said that he had looked at that idea, but felt that these would be settlement boundaries. He felt that the more details we put in the plan, the less well it would age, it will have to cover many years yet to come. SN said that his interpretation of the residents' responses, was that they wanted a scattered pattern of development, not to have them put in settlement boundaries. He suggested that rather than defining areas of settlement, perhaps we should define areas NOT for development. Dr N explained that the core strategy had outlined Little Birch for development, so the NDP had to define where Little Birch was. Dr N, there is a difference between Little Birch parish, and between Little Birch Settlement. BR asked if a 'call for sites' might not help us to achieve clarity as to who wanted to develop in the coming years. He asked what we would lose by having a call for sites? Dr N said that we only needed 9, and with planning already granted and others in the pipeline, we did not need a call for sites.

He asked if developers or land owners were asking the Parish Council where they could build? No, but BR was keen to keep the door open for all parishioners to be involved. RD felt that a call for sites could set neighbours against each other.

EG thanked Dr N for clearing this up, she felt that many of her questions had been asked. She still felt that a call for sites would give the NDP more scope for agreeing or disagreeing with potential planning.

Dr N said that he had felt that Little Birch had not wanted growth, above the minimum Core Strategy requirement, but JJ said that some development was being encouraged.

JJ asked Dr N for his advice on whether or not to do a call for sites, He advised not to do one as LB was already on track to hit the minimum development. He feels that we are heading in the right direction. He clarified that the way forward involved lots of discussions with the community. He suggested that we could use the report to talk to the parishioners.

ML: In all your experience, wouldn't you think that if someone wanted to do a building project, they would have already come forward - would Dr N agree? Yes, in general he would agree, but you never know who might have their own reasons for keeping quiet about a possible build. ML suggested that many parishioners did not feel that they lived in a village, they might agree that they lived in Little Birch, but in open countryside.

JJ: 'I have just put in for planning permission on a plot on Mense Lane, but there are plots along that lane that could fit 5 houses.' RD felt that the report read well, and was a sensible way to proceed. Dr N said that Policy 2 was designed to prevent this sort of large scale development.

JJ: 3.5 described the circular route around Little Birch, he wanted to include Mense Lane.

3.6: he asked for the bus route to be mentioned that goes round the circular route above.

	3.7; Sunnybank Farm is on New Rd, Sunnybank Cottage is on Mense Lane.	
4	<p>Identifying the way forward</p> <p>JJ summed up that we would not be going for the call for sites. Dr N said we have 2 choices, one is to go for a draft plan, the other is to go for consultation.</p> <p>ML had a copy of the Little Dewchurch draft plan, at 34 pages. He asked how long our draft would be? Dr N thought about 20 pages.</p> <p>Dr N to ask the NDP team to look at providing their first environmental report.</p> <p>Chair asked the meeting if they wanted to go for consultation before asking Dr N to do the draft plan. BR thought that we should have an open afternoon for this consultation: JJ asked for a vote on to consult or not.</p> <p>For consultation: 2 Any one undecided; No</p> <p>Show of hands for proceeding to the next stage ie the draft plan: 20</p> <p>It was decided that the steering group should recommend to the PC that Dr N should be commissioned by the Parish Council to write the draft plan .</p> <p>He explained that the housing report was a foundation report for the final plan. It was this draft plan that he would be working on next.</p> <p>Next meeting of the steering group would be to agree that draft plan. He felt that this could be the end of July.</p>	<p>He did, and they issued it in Feb.</p> <p>Clerk to inform the PC</p>
5.	<p>Finances for the NDP</p> <p>Dr N to advise the clerk how much grant she needs to apply for in the next funding bid.</p>	
6.	<p>Date and time of next meeting</p> <p>Weds 26th July at 7pm</p>	

Meeting closed at 8.30pm