

## DENMEAD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

### Meeting Notes – Meeting of the Steering Group

<i>Date of meeting</i>	Monday 10 <sup>th</sup> February 2014 at 7.00pm in The Old School
	Cllr Neil Lander-Brinkley (NL-B)      Cllr Kevin Andreoli (KA)
	Cllr Malcolm Davies                      Cllr Felicity Hull (FH)
	Peter Ambrose (PA)                      D/Cllr Patricia Stallard (PS)
	John Knight (JK)                         Neil Rusbridger (NR)
	Neil Homer rCOH (NH)
	Cllrs Richard Hallett, Jerry Harrison, Ken Scholey and Gary West - DPC
<i>Notes taken by</i>	Tony Daniells
<i>Next meeting</i>	Steering Group (SG) on Tuesday 18 February 2014 at 5.00pm in The Old School

---

#### 073/13NPSG    Welcome & Apologies

NLB welcomed everyone to the meeting, particularly members of Denmead Parish Council. Apologies were received from Cllrs Ian Reed, Paula Langford-Smith and Karen Forster. NLB referred to other members of the SG who had contributed in the past and had now ceased their active involvement. NLB reported that John Payne had withdrawn from the SG as he had an interest in one of the land holdings being considered in the Plan. The meeting formally noted the position.

#### 074/13NPSG    Notes of the last meeting of the Steering Group

The notes for the meeting held on 18 December 2013 and 21 January 2014 were agreed as an accurate record of those meetings.

#### 075/13NPSG    Presentation of the draft Neighbourhood Plan Pre-submission version (v3) – Neil Homer (rCOH)

NH advised that the draft NP was in effect the Pre Submission Plan that would be considered for adoption by DPC and then used to consult with residents. JK asked what the classification the draft NP was and it was agreed that this would be confidential until adopted by DPC and available for consultation to residents.

NH showed a slide presentation on the Plan. 9 slides available in the Parish Office)

1. Timetable – DPC would be asked to sign off the Plan at their meeting on 5 March. If any representations from the 6 week pre submission consultation led to a different path being taken then the 6 week consultation would need to happen again. Once the Plan was submitted to WCC, it would become their project with involvement from DPC. It would take between 5-6 months to be ready for Referendum.

To refresh the minds of those who were not involved with the preparation of the NP, he showed

- The designated NP area
- Referred to WCC's Local Plan part 1 and regarded this as being an advantage to DPC
- Referred to the evidence base already available from WCC. There would be a requirement to record the consultations held with the community and he would supply a template for this.
- The NP was primarily for policies related to land use. He referred to the six of these. Other inclusions of the NP more akin to a Parish Plan would remain.
- He then showed the Vision statement and the six objectives to be met through the NP.
- In answer to questions, it was agreed that
  - LPP1 included a policy on local gaps but it would be for LPP2, or in Denmead's case, the NP, to define the boundaries. NH would add this to the NP
  - No target figures should be associated with the objectives. For example, with objective 3, if the number of consented applications within the Denmead Gap was zero, then the NP could be considered successful
  - For objective 6, reference to environment/biodiversity was implicit in the last bullet.

2. Policy 1 This policy defined or changed the development boundary. Changes were assessed against landscape sensitivity with only those assessed by WCC as 'least sensitive' being considered; transport

access and those assessed by WCC as having an excellent or good proximity to village services and flood risk with only zone 1 sites considered.

3. Policy 2 allocated sites and allocated 4 sites with a capacity of 130 dwellings. Caveats could be included and planning consent would still be required. NH ran through the site proposals.
  - In answer to questions
    - The wording of i.d. to make it clearer where access would be from
    - Persimmon had confirmed at a previous meeting that improving drainage at Kidmore to make it usable as a pitch year round would not be a problem to them. NH advised that it would be better to receive funding from the developer and for DPC to complete the work.
    - Policy 5 related to Sport & Leisure but Policy 2 would also make onsite provision for open space
    - If the open space should be designated as a village green
    - There was a need for a plan to communicate the NP to residents during the 6 week pre submission period
    - Cannot include any means in the NP to stop loft conversions but it could be included in the VDS. A restrictive covenant was not a planning matter for the NP.
    - Allocation of the Baptist Church site should also consider onsite parking provision.
    - Persimmon would be asked to provide offsite parking for residents of Anmore Road.
    - The SHLAA site in Anmore Rd was not considered as it appeared to be land locked. NH considered that it could come forward at a later date.
4. Policies 3 covered housing design and had a link to the VDS. NH advised keeping the VDS up to date.
5. Policy 4 was specific to Parklands. Previous planning decisions for a care home and change of use were refused by WCC against DPC's wishes. This policy was included to get WCC to adopt a more flexible policy to Parklands. As the policy was site specific, there was no need to include the business park within the development boundary. To do this may lead to unwanted consequences in the future.
  - A third caveat should be included to provide onsite lorry parking
  - PS explained the difference between a care home and an extra care home. Given the number of employment opportunities this gave, it could be considered an employment use.
6. Policy 5 was for Sports and Leisure to support indoor/outdoor facilities at Denmead Junior School. The facilities would be available for community use outside of school hours and the policy should reinforce this. There was concern that funding for this may not be available in the short term, and that the proximity of the sports hall may be close to residents of Bere Road.
7. Policy 6 was to resist the loss of the public car park at Kidmore Lane.
8. Following on from the policies, there were three Proposals in the Plan
  - i. Green Infrastructure which would deliver new and improved assets. These were not considered planning policy but additions that the NP would like to see happen
  - ii. Denmead Village Centre to reinforce the importance of the centre to Denmead. The Local Plan save policies referred to this and said all that was needed.
  - iii. Infrastructure Projects which identified where to invest the CIL. Whilst there was no reference to open space, the development at Kidmore should make open space provision as outlined in Policy 2. NH would also include improvements to Goodmans Field in this proposal.
9. Other considerations at the meeting were
  - i. Land surrounding Denmead Village had a 'hope' value in that it may get approval for development. This made it expensive and difficult to acquire for recreational use by the Council. Long term, the CIL fund may be the best opportunity to obtain more land.
  - ii. The Strategic Environment Assessment was out for consultation to the statutory bodies.
  - iii. An extension to the Burial Ground may need to have a policy to allocate land. NH would add to the draft Plan.

- iv. NLB asked how the Plan appeared to those Councillors present. They were generally in favour of its content.
- v. Land allocated at Kidmere had to be developed as the NP wished and outlined in the Plan.

Remaining items on the agenda were held over to the next meeting due to time constraints. The next meeting was agreed for Tuesday 18 February starting at 5.00pm in the Old School.

(Copies to attendees)

The meeting closed at 9.35pm