

SNDP Committee

Minutes of the meeting held at the Village Hall

On Thursday 7th September 2017

PRESENT: Jay Holliday (JH) Vanessa Lee (VL)-Minutes

Tony Glover (ToG) Karen Edwards (KE)

John Golding (JFG) Jo Gilford (JoG)-Chair

John Vale (JV) Ian Weaver (IW)

1. 1. GOVERNANCE

1.1 Declaration and nature of interest

None

1. 2. MINUTES

2.1 Approval of the Minutes of the meeting held on 29th August 2017. Amendments were made to 4.1 Site update and 4.1.2 Silverbirch. All in favour of amendments. IW proposed and JH seconded, KE abstained, motion carried.

2.2 Commercial sensitivity of draft and adopted minutes

Discussion took place on the reasons for minutes not being put on the Staverton website. As these have been up until now commercially sensitive should they be presented blocked out?

JV proposed that minutes should be updated on the Staverton website after the special meeting between the SNDP and the Parish Council to be held on 12th September 2017. IW seconded – all in favour, proposal carried.

JoG is to send out all minutes to Parish Council by Friday 8th September. JoG proposed a message be put on the website to explain why minutes are not available at present, ToG to compose script. All in favour, proposal carried.

1. 3. CONSULTATION DOCUMENTS

3.1 Some mismatches were noted by JV between the questionnaire and consultation document. The data in the Questionnaire is correct, all documents should reflect this.

4 BUSINESS ARISING

4.1 Site update

JV, JFG and JoG attended a meeting with Tom James from Daventry District Council this afternoon to obtain further guidance on the procedure for selecting sites and obtain their opinion as a stakeholder on the site plans that had been produced by the various developers. JV and JFG informed the committee of progress made in discussion about the sites from the perspective of Daventry District Council. Tom James advised for a site to be excluded from a plan there would need to be sound planning based reasons

4.1.1 By the School

This was acceptable to the Daventry District Council. It met with the housing mix asked for by the SNDP and changes requested to include carpark, footpath and pedestrian access to the school had all been applied to the most recent plan.

4.1.2 Silverbirch

The plan for Silverbirch was also acceptable to the Daventry District Council. The plan had been adapted to include increased parking facilities. It met the requests of the SNDP. This site could limit future development. Devices would need to be put in place for the crossing of the road to attend the school.

4.1.3 Braunston Lane

The plan for Braunston Lane was also acceptable for development by Daventry District Council. The developers would deliver low energy houses. Tom James pointed out that with 5 houses two should be affordable housing. The proposed development plan causes a mismatch the housing requirement of the Village Questionnaire and Housing Needs Survey. Tom James stated that although the site was outside the confines of the village and went against HS24 this would not be an issue when applying for planning.

4.1.4 The Croft

The latest email from the owners shows they are not in a position to move forward. Tom James of Daventry District Council stated this development would not get approval as it fell within the conservation area and there was an appeal decision on it.

4.1.5 The Beeches

The latest plan shows 4 large bungalows. Previous planning has been rejected by Rachel Booth on heritage issues (impact of listed buildings). Highways consent has not been given as yet. Tom James states this development is unlikely to gain approval.

Discussion followed the report from JFG and JV supported by JoG when necessary.

KE asked should the Croft or Beeches come back to the SNDP would DDC back us in giving reasons for rejection of their site? JoG advised Tom James had listed three significant planning reasons for planning to be denied, these are to be made available for the committee.

Tom James advised a specific figure should not be included within the plan but that the wording should say “about” 5 or 10 houses. He confirmed by doing this could result in an application for about 5/6, or about 10 houses being approved. He felt that a plan that restricted development by having a number would not be approved by the inspector.

When developing the site policy state type and mix of housing, define border lines very well, define open spaces.

JH had evidence of a variety of Village Plans only based on policies, the committee were not making the site choice. KE supported JH who felt uncomfortable with the committee making the decision above the Parishioners.

JG pointed out that the Site Policy cannot be created until a site is selected.

IW – None of the committee were appointed by the parishioners so from a democratic view there should be a presentation to the Parish and they make the choice.

KE proposed - To not specify sites within the Neighbourhood Plan without consultation to the Parishioners first. JH seconded. Proposal failed 5 against, JG, JFG, VL, JV, TG, 3 for KE, JH, IW.

KE asked for the following comment to be recorded against each vote she was taking “as she was not in favor of including sites within the plan without consultation to the Parishioners first”

JoG asked for it to be noted that “those voting in favour were voting to include sites within the plan so that the Parish could influence where future building in the village would go, and that

- consultation had already taken place,
- a vote taken on the three sites,

- there had been an article in the Parish Newsletter asking for comments on all five sites of which only two responses had been received.
- the residents would have an opportunity to express their views further as part of the reg14 process,
- any comments received from the Reg 14 process would be taken into account and the plan amended accordingly.

5 SITE SELECTION

5.1 Agree and Confirm sites for ratification by Parish Council at Extraordinary Meeting on Tuesday 12th September 2017.

ToG proposed Braunston Lane and one of the larger sites. IW seconded.

JFG called for point of order – there are 3 sites and there should be a voting procedure where you vote on all sites and eliminate a site after each vote there being no seconder, proposal failed.

IW proposed – to not include the Beeches and the Croft in the site selection, for the planning reasons quoted by Tom James of Daventry District Council and the subsequent appeal decisions. Seconded by ToG. Proposal carried 7:1 KE abstained

Further discussion was held on both the remaining sites’ By the School ‘and ‘Silverbirch’ both offer what is requested from Village Questionnaire and Housing Survey.

A vote was held to determine larger site

IW proposed ‘By the School’ be included within the plan with a site specific policy that it delivered the type/housing mix as per the housing needs survey, community benefit and path indicated on the plan presented’, seconded by ToG, as the larger site selected. 4 in favour JoG, IW, ToG, VL, 3 against, JFG, JV, JH, KE abstained motion carried

The reasons given for rejection of Silverbirch site as the larger site were:-

Planning reasons:

- HS24 as advised by Mags at DDC: Land behind Windmill Gardens (Site B) would be assessed against HS24 as it is further out of the village. A recent appeal in the proximity (DA/2013/ 0646) raised concerns about residential development in the countryside and the principle of residential in this location was considered to be in

conflict with the local plan policies as it would extend the village into open countryside.

- The site would impact on the important views
- Highways issues with entry to the site being near the bend

Other reasons: Car Park not suitable for road safety concerns for children crossing to attend school

The site had not been the favoured site of the village residents in the vote held

There was considered to be a flood risk

The site was agricultural land whereas the site by the school was not active agricultural land.

The school site would take congestion of traffic away from Glebe Lane due to car park having relocated.

Actions taken away from the meeting

VL to circulate minutes from the meeting tomorrow to the Parish Council in order that they can see how the committee had arrived at the selected sites to be included in the plan

JV to circulate tomorrow his notes from the meeting with Tom James along with his notes of the briefing he had given the SNDP committee on the sites to the Parish Council

JFG to circulate tomorrow the latest four plans to the Parish Council

JG to circulate HS24 comments from Mags at DDC

JG to circulate planning reasons for not including The Beeches & The Croft in the plan

No further business the meeting closed at 10:15pm