

DENMEAD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Meeting Notes – Meeting of the Steering Group

<i>Date of meeting</i>	Wednesday 18 th December 2013 at 9.30pm in The Old School	
	Cllr Neil Lander-Brinkley (NL-B)	Cllr Kevin Andreoli (KA)
	Peter Ambrose (PA)	Cllr Felicity Hull (FH)
	D/Cllr Patricia Stallard (PS)	John Payne (JP)
	John Knight (JK)	Neil Rusbridger (NR)
	Neil Homer rCOH (NH)	
<i>Notes taken by</i>	Tony Daniells	
<i>Next meeting</i>	Steering Group (SG) on Tuesday 21 January 2014 at 7.00pm in The Old School	

062/13NPSG Welcome & Apologies

NLB welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were received from Cllr Malcolm Davies.

063/13NPSG Notes of the last meeting of the Steering Group

The notes for the meeting held on 3rd December were not available and would be distributed after the meeting.

NH referred to minute 052/13NPSG v(4) from the meeting held on 18 November. He would check with WCC to ask if a Habitat Regulations Assessment would be required.

PA asked if a Sustainability Appraisal Report would be needed. NH replied that some authorities were relaxed about requiring this but others were more demanding.

NLB updated the SG on other matters. These being:

- i. He had contacted WCC about putting information in the public domain via the WCC website without first agreeing this with the NPSG. The Plan should be seen to be that of Denmead and not that of WCC.
- ii. A final version of the Landscape Sensitivity Report had been received and was tabled at the meeting
- iii. WC Officers Gareth Williams and Steve Opacic will attend the SG meeting on 21 January
- iv. Some developers had expressed concerns over the lack of information on the website. This was due to the confidential nature of some of the discussions. NLB would write an update for developers.
- v. An application for 10 dwellings at the site known as Parklands had been refused by WCC but had now gone to appeal. D/C PS would speak at the hearing but needed to speak to DPC first. NLB would comment on behalf of the SG. The appeal would be heard on 12 February in Winchester.
- vi. An application for a single dwelling on SHLAA site 362. D/C PS should be made aware of any issues with this application.
- vii. NH considered that the Denmead NP had not been developed sufficiently to be material at the Parklands appeal. It should be developed sufficiently to be used for new application coming through the system. NH then gave guidance on when a Plan would be material. This would be when the plan had been submitted and the 6 week consultation period had ended.
- viii. The Baptist Church had contacted DPC to make them aware of moves to relocate the Church and redevelop the site to fund the proposed move. NLB would contact the Minister and arrange a meeting to understand their proposals more fully.
- ix. A press release had been issued with an update on progress.

064/13NPSG Positioning the Denmead Neighbourhood Plan

NH tabled a set of six slides which set out the pieces of the 'jigsaw' and how these might be positioned to achieve the aims of the NP.

- NH ran through the first slide which set out the spatial strategy.
- Slide 2 was an aerial photograph of the village with slide 3 giving an analysis of the village today
- Slide 4 gave a representation of how the village could be developed through the NP
- Slide 5 showed how the requirements for development could be achieved.
- The final slide summarised the development proposals and outlined the next steps to achieving this. This would be to develop the site east of Kidmere which could meet all the requirements without the

need to include other sites. The site to the east of Kidmere could be divided into small distinct sites, to remove the impression of it being one large site. NH considered that it was difficult to constrain a site and limit its full capacity.

JP referred to the results of consultations where residents opted for smaller sites throughout the village. NH understood this but thought it difficult to achieve in practice unless owners were prepared to accept a smaller scale development on their site. If a single site could be made to look like a number of small sites and developed over a period, it may be acceptable. It would also give the NP a stronger hand in negotiating with a developer

FH was aware of the groups who used Kidmore Field and if the Plan incorporated this area, many groups would need to be relocated. There were also drainage issues with the land. NH replied that there were also issues with other sites such as those at Inhams Lane. It would be difficult to make a case for Inhams without bringing in other sites as well. FH would like to see sports facilities located close to the village centre, but others views were that this did not have to be so. Sports users would go to where the facilities were. If Denmead had to accept development, then the village should benefit from this.

NLB referred to the Site Sensitivity Assessment. This showed the site 367 to be one of the least sensitive. Others agreed that the rCOH proposals for this site were a good option with the least impact. Other comments were the issue with getting this proposal agreed by the village at a referendum, and the difficulty in realising the site at the War Memorial Hall and relocating this facility, although there were plans in 2002 suggesting this. If phasing of development could be achieved, this may make this proposal acceptable. Whilst residents preferred small sites, NH stated that this may not be deliverable with the choice of sites available. The availability of a model to display what the development could look like might be useful in selling this option to the village.

NH advised that the Environment Agency had just released some new maps of flood plains. He also advised that the strategy did not depend on relocation of the Hall. He also referred to the Community Right to Build which had been used by others to achieve their objectives. If the Baptist Church site was to be considered than the Church needed to get information to the NPSG soon. Site 2469 should also be factored in if the Baptist Church site was considered.

Other points raised during the discussion were

- How to communicate the plan to residents to show that it did meet their wishes as far as possible
- If not accepted by residents, then development would still happen but maybe not in an acceptable form.
- DPC could not promote a 'yes' vote but individuals could
- The need to support reasons for inclusion and exclusion of sites, and promoting self-build sites in the Plan
- Commercial housing would still go through the planning process, and whether site 367 could meet all the housing needs.

At the conclusion of the discussions, it was unanimously agreed that the proposal should be taken forward. Southern Planning Practice and the Baptist Church would be invited to further discussions in January 2014.

As site 313 was adjacent to site 367 it was questioned if this site should also be included. JP had previously disclosed an interest in site 313 as the owner and left the room. It was unanimously agreed to include site 313 into consideration provided its inclusion did not cause the target numbers to be exceeded. It was also agreed to hold talks with the War Memorial Hall. Visits to Slaugham and Ferring would also be arranged to learn from their experiences.

The remaining items on the agenda (items 5 & 6) were not taken due to time constraints and would be deferred until a future meeting.

065/13NPSG Next meeting: **The SG will meet on 21 January starting at 7.30pm in the Old School. NH would join the meeting together with WCC Officers.**

(Copies to attendees)

The meeting closed at 12.01pm