

# **SNDP**

**Minutes of the meeting of Staverton Neighbourhood Development Committee  
held on Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> April 2017 at 7:15pm, at the Village Hall, Croft Lane, Staverton.**

**PRESENT:** Jo Gilford                      JMG   Chair                      Ian Weaver                      IW  
Tony Golver                      ToG                      John Golding                      JG  
Karen Edwards                      KE                      John Vale                      JV

## **APOLOGIES**

Jay Holliday

### **1 GOVERNANCE**

#### **1.1 Declaration and nature of interest**

None received

#### **1.2 Consideration of dispensation requests received**

None received

#### **1.3 Standing Order 3R**

JMG advised the SO did not allow for a blanket operation of this rule and that if anybody wanted the votes to be registered on an individual basis i.e. whether the committee member was for, against or abstained then the motion would have to be quoted each time.

#### **1.4 Clarification of Standing Order 7a**

JMG advised that advice had been sought from ENCALC in relation to SO 7a.

ENCALC had subsequently advised that it was the Terms of reference for the Group that would determine what the group could or could not do. The TOR had been circulated prior to the meeting with the following highlighted:

## **ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES**

Regularly report back to the SPC for endorsement of decisions taken;

## **DECISION MAKING**

The SPC will approve the Submission Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan prior to publication for consultation

The plan-making process ultimately remains the responsibility of the SPC

## **2 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

### **2.1 Meeting held on the 28<sup>th</sup> March 2017**

ToG proposed and JV seconded that the minutes be approved as amended, all in favour one abstention due to them not being at the meeting

## **3 MATTERS ARISING**

### **3.1 Training in Code of conduct and Standing Orders**

Awaiting dates from the clerk

### **3.2 Volunteer for taking of minutes**

JMG and the group thanked M Nightingale for volunteering to take the minutes

### **3.3 Acronyms to be removed from the draft SNDP**

JMG advised JH had completed this task with the help of ToG.

### **3.4 Housing Needs Survey**

KE had sought clarification in relation to the following from the DDC's Housing Needs Officer, KE would circulate DDC's response to the group but reported that:

*1) Are the outputs from the Housing Needs Survey (HNS) Advisory or Mandatory in terms of our Neighbourhood Plan e.g. would we have to increase/decrease the numbers in our plan if the HNS figures were higher/lower than those we are currently working to in our plan?*

The figures are not mandatory but if not used the Committee would need to substantiate why.

*2) What is the definition of a local connection to a person living in the Parish. Do you have a list? For example would having a friend in the Parish count as a local connection? What is the definition of close family?*

A local connection would be, mother, father, grandparents, children.

*3) What process does your team take to distinguish a housing need vs those who would just like to move to Staverton?*

For there to be a local connection.

*4) Are the committee given an opportunity to discuss the results with you following the HNS report, if required?*

Not normally.

JMG had also circulated an extract from the Weedon Inspectors report advising:

### **Policy WB13 Meeting Local Housing Needs**

Applying to sites of five units or more, this policy seeks to ensure that schemes include housing to meet local needs. On the face of it this is a policy which ensures that provision is made for affordable and local housing.

The threshold of five units reflects JCS Policy H2 which sets out site size thresholds for affordable housing. However, PPG outlines certain circumstances where contributions from affordable housing and tariff style planning obligations should not be sought from small scale development. This follows on from a Written Ministerial Statement that indicates contributions for affordable housing should not be sought from developments of ten units or less and which have a maximum combined floor space of no more than 1, 000 square metres. In designated rural area, a lower threshold of five units or less may apply. There is no explanation of whether this applies in this Parish and therefore no indication of why five units is an appropriate threshold.

In addition, there is no explanation of local needs housing or how this might be determined.

Given the latest Government policy on affordable housing provision detailed above, this policy does not take sufficient account of national policy and does not explain what local circumstances might justify a departure from it. As a result the policy does not meet the basic conditions.

### **3.5 Meetings with Landowners**

JMG confirmed site meetings had been undertaken for:       The Beeches

Site near the school

Braunstan Lane

SilverBirch

Dialogue had also been entered into by way of letter/email with the landowners of the Croft site.

### **3.6 Percentage completed column to be inserted in project plan**

Outstanding – to be completed for next meeting

## **4 BUSINESS ARISING**

### **4.1 New Member**

JG proposed and ToG seconded that JMG reply to the person who would like to join the committee and advise them that they did not qualify to be a member as they did not live or work in the Parish.

#### **4.2 Housing White paper – Fixing our broken Housing Market**

JMG reported that Cllr Bob Patchett had attended the Parish Council meeting and advised there had been a ‘White Paper’ in the last few weeks which would impact on any neighbourhood plans being prepared especially those who were identifying sites.

JMG had sought advice from T James at DDC and circulated the response:

The white paper has been published for consultation. It contains some proposals for Neighbourhood Plans but these would only take effect once the changes have been brought in through new legislation or changes to National Planning Policy. The document also isn't clear on when changes that affect Neighbourhood Plans would be introduced and there isn't any guidance on the impact on plans progressing through the process but clearly the stage a plan has reached and its ability to respond to changes in legislation, or not, will be an important factor as to whether it would be reasonable to expect a Neighbourhood plan to respond to them.

Overall whilst clearly change is likely, at present there is a reasonable degree of uncertainty as to the potential impact of the proposals and when these will come into force.

You can access the document here <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/housing-white-paper>. The main proposals for Neighbourhood Plans are set out on pages 82 and 86

JMG had also circulated the questions being consulted on:

#### **EXTRACT FROM WHITE PAPER**

The White Paper sets out a range of measures to further support neighbourhood planning, and strengthen the ability of communities to influence the design of what gets built in their areas. Many of these involve changes to national planning policy, which we propose to amend so that

#### **Question 12**

Do you agree with the proposals to amend the

National Planning Policy Framework to:

a) indicate that local planning authorities should provide neighbourhood planning groups with a housing requirement figure, where this is sought?

b) make clear that local and neighbourhood plans (at the most appropriate level) and more detailed development plan documents (such as action area plans) are expected to set out clear design expectations; and that visual tools such as design codes can help provide a clear basis for making decisions on development proposals?;

- c) emphasise the importance of early pre-application discussions between applicants, authorities and the local community about design and the types of homes to be provided?;
- d) makes clear that design should not be used as a valid reason to object to development where it accords with clear design expectations set out in statutory plans?; and
- e) recognise the value of using a widely accepted design standard, such as Building for Life, in shaping and assessing basic design principles – and make clear that this should be reflected in plans and given weight in the planning process?

### **Question 13**

Do you agree with the proposals to amend national policy to make clear that plans and individual development proposals should:

- a) make efficient use of land and avoid building homes at low densities where there is a shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs?;
- b) address the particular scope for higher-density housing in urban locations that are well served by public transport, that provide opportunities to replace low-density uses in areas of high housing demand, or which offer scope to extend buildings upwards in urban areas?;
- c) ensure that in doing so the density and form of development reflect the character, accessibility and infrastructure capacity of an area, and the nature of local housing needs?;
- d) take a flexible approach in adopting and applying policy and guidance that could inhibit these objectives in particular circumstances, such as open space provision in areas with good access to facilities nearby?

### **Question 14**

In what types of location would indicative minimum density standards be helpful, and what should those standards be?

### **Question 15**

What are your views on the potential for delivering additional homes through more intensive use of existing public sector sites, or in urban locations more generally, and how this can best be supported through planning (using tools such as policy, local development orders, and permitted development rights)?

It was agreed to keep Question 4 on the agenda for discussion next time.

## **4.3 Project Plan/Meeting Schedule**

The workshop to review DDC comments on the 22<sup>nd</sup> April and the meeting to invite DDC to discuss the comments received regarding the plan on the 25<sup>th</sup> April were confirmed.

## **4.4 First Draft SNDP**

### OBJECTIVE (1), (2) AND (3)

At the workshop the group had discussed how a neighbourhood plan should read positively to support local development and how although the group had tried to write the plan positively, on reflection after re-reading the core objectives section it was felt the wording could be improved upon.

JV had taken the task away to re-write the objectives into a more positive style but to retain the original outcome interpretation. The re-written objectives had been circulated prior to the meeting.

Four voted in favour and one abstained KE to adopt the revised objectives. Motion carried.

### DESIGN GUIDELINES

Whilst reading the SNDP JV had noted that although the Parish had raised comments and considerations in relation to the traffic on the A425 there had been nothing reflected in the plan to improve safety and noise levels and enhance living in the vicinity.

JV proposed and ToG seconded that the plan be amended as follows:

At the end of paragraph 6.8 the wording - We would therefore support the reduction and enforcement of speed limits on the A425 within Staverton Parish to improve Safety and reduce noise vibration. – be added

Policy VDS4 be amended to read: Heavy traffic should be signed away from the village and entry and speed restrictions considered.

Goal 7 have the bullet point added: To support reduced speed limits on the A425 throughout Staverton Parish

All in favour motion carried

#### **4.5 Consultation Statement**

JMG reported that a workshop had been held to go through the document line by line, all were in attendance with the exception of KE.

JV proposed and IW seconded that the consultation document be submitted to DDC. KE abstained, motion carried.

#### **4.6 Site Assessment Statement**

### CONFIRMATION OF DELIVERABILITY FROM LANDOWNERS

Response letters from the landowners/developers following the site meetings had been circulated to all the committee. The only site that had not responded formally was the SilverBirch site. JMG had telephoned the owners of the SilverBirch site to chase a response and had a verbal response to report that would be confirmed via email.

All sites had confirmed they were able to deliver development on their site as per the SNDP draft policies.

All sites had confirmed they were able to deliver as per the Housing Needs Scenarios put to them with the exception of SilverBirch who had advised the proposal to have just five dwellings would not be economically viable for them.

TG proposed and IW seconded that the site assessment statement be submitted to DDC excluding anything after preferences, four in favour one against KE motion carried.

#### **4.7 Housing Needs Statement**

ToG proposed and IW seconded that the housing needs statement as drafted to-date be submitted to DDC for informal consultation. Four in favour, one against KE, motion carried.

#### **4.8 Village Confines Map**

Deferred until next meeting

#### **4.9 Submission of first draft to DDC**

JV proposed and ToG seconded that the SNDP be submitted to DDC for informal comment four in favour, one against KE, motion carried.

#### **4.10 Technical Support – Locality funding**

#### EXPRESSION OF INTEREST/APPLICATION

KE confirmed she had submitted an expression of interest on behalf of the group

#### DIAGNOSTIC CALL

This had still to be facilitated

#### BRIEF FOR CONSULTANTS

KE volunteered to put together a brief for the consultants.

### **5 CORRESPONDENCE**

#### **5.1 EMMA NELSON - SITE ALLOCATION**

EN had emailed ToG to say that: she was under the impression that the sites for housing had been agreed on following the village survey. However, I see there was a site meeting outside our field this evening.

ToG was tasked with sending a reply advising:

The production of the SNDP plan is proceeding steadily, as part of the process, the committee have to meet with all potential landowners and their developers to assess the deliverability of

any sites identified in the draft plan, and that consequently a meeting was arranged with the landowner's agent on the 5th April outside the field. It was suggested EN also be advised that the SNDP meeting minutes are published on the Parish Website [stavertonparish.com](http://stavertonparish.com) which enables the residents of Staverton to be kept up-to-date in relation to the activities of the committee.

## **5 FINANCE**

ToG confirmed he had submitted a new grant application and sent back the monies not spent in relation to the previous grant.

## **6 DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

**Workshop 22<sup>nd</sup> April**

**Meeting 25<sup>th</sup> April**