



Minutes of Steering Group Meeting on 1st August 2018 at the Palairet Hall.

Members present:

Ian Hasell (Chair); Alice Tollworthy (Deputy Chair); George Hitchins (Secretary); Deborah Allen; Bob Chapman; Gordon Currie; Rex Eastment; Brenda Graham; Andy Linegar; Barbi Lund; Gill Morgan; Ian O'Brien; Graham Tickell; Michael Walker.

Also present: 21 members of the public

NPSG 18 – Opening Remarks from Chair

Chair thanked Members of both the Steering Group and Public for attending.

NPSG 19-Apologies

Apologies received from Rupert Foster.

NPSG 20- Minutes of Meetings of 3rd June

Minutes of 3rd June formally adopted. Proposed by Brenda Graham seconded by Gill Morgan.

NPSG 21- report on 3 'Public and Information Awareness' Days on Church Mead, together with analysis of initial feedback

An 'Information and Awareness' Display display had been held on the Mead to coincide with 3 village events (The Open Gardens day on 23rd June, the Artisan day on 15th July and the village cricket day on 22nd July). These had been a success with approx. 150 parish residents stopping to see the display and talk to SG members.. Approx 50 Initial feedback forms had been completed and analysed.

The three days drew in different groups of people and the results therefore could be considered to be from a broad section of the community. All those stopping to speak had been in support of the NP preparatory work underway. The comments could be used to inform questions for the upcoming parish wide questionnaire. A wide variety of views had been received. The parish questionnaire would need greater analysis than the initial feedback which had been a very useful way of drawing people in and engaging with them.

NPSG 22-Report from Working Group Leaders on Policy Intents and draft questions for the Parish Questionnaire

Housing Group

GC -detailed the objectives (as previously circulated) Core policy intent was that any development should be within the development boundary and this development should reflect the character of the village, protect the existing green spaces and heritage assets; and that affordable housing should only come forward to meet identified needs.

Two sites are potentially identified for allocated housing development- Bell Hill Garage and the former Roman Catholic Church both of which either have lapsed / extant permissions, or current planning applications.

Both of these can be classed as brownfield sites and it was therefore felt appropriate to designate them as potential housing development sites.

There is a perceived need evidenced by both the Housing Survey and Initial feedback forms for more affordable homes for younger people wanting to own their first home.

The LPPT1 housing requirement for NSP has been more than provided for. Govt policy might well change as might Housing need for the Village.

CA- 45 was indeed the minimum which was 15% increase in housing stock for the parish; what the village had provided was greater than a 35% increase. Increased requirements for housing was likely shortly as a result of change in Govt policy

LB referred to the protection site allocation gave in the case of a failure to prove a 5 year supply. This protection is time limited. Site allocation also allowed the NP to set site specific criteria.

Exception Sites. *Liz Beth* advised against an exception site policy which allocated a site(s) but considered that we would be wise to consider a criteria based exception Site policy; Mendip have a broadly based exception site policy.

GT was concerned that an exception site policy might open the door to a developer for a wider scheme. *LB* referred to the existing exception site policy in MDC LPP1. She referred to the entry-level exception sites being a brand-new type of affordable housing brought forward in the recent NPPF. She advised that any policy for an entry level exception site should be with no cross subsidisation from open market housing. However this could likely be amended if in the future the Parish Council supported a proposal which included some element of open market housing development. This form of affordable housing is brand-new .

BG asked whether it would be possible for exception sites to come forward only after the allocated sites within the village settlement boundary had come forward. *LB* thought this would be difficult as they were different types of development. Exception site land does not have development land value, sites within the development boundary do.

Action: Housing group to discuss with MDC

Local Green Spaces

SG should consider whether to support all MDC's proposed LGS designations (subject, to Parish Council comments made, in particular 001 and 004).

Clive Abbott reported that MDC were now expecting to submit LPP2 for examination in early 2019. Therefore it was unlikely to be adopted before early 2020.

There was some discussion about the merits of submitting the neighbourhood plan for examination before the local plan particularly in respect of the LGS designations. It was felt that particularly as some of the local green spaces proposed had not been OALS but had been submitted by the Parish Council there would be some advantage in the parish putting the LGS submissions to examination through the neighbourhood plan before examination in the local plan.

Should the neighbourhood plan successfully designate local green spaces these would not be changed at the local plan.

The possibility of consulting on further LGSs was discussed. The current proposal to put forward the 10 sites in Mendips Draft LPP2 would carry weight; additional sites might weaken the overall case.

Environmental Sustainability

BL: Climate change greatest challenge of the generation.

Two meetings of the working group; no intents as yet.

Objectives would be

- 1) that any new development should take full range of climate change mitigation into account
- 2) to support environmentally sustainable housing development
- 3) to ensure the location layout and design of any new development is planned to deliver the highest viable energy efficiency
- 4) to minimise vulnerability and provide resilience to impacts from climate change such as flood risk
- 5) protect and enhance local biodiversity and wildlife sites

AL- local infrastructure may need to adapt to support more
homeworking

NPPF supports community renewable energy generation schemes.

-

Economic & Social Infrastructure

BG : Group has met twice.

Three employment sites down the Farleigh Road (and possibly others- engineering works on Mackley Lane) need regularising and consideration of the possibility of limited expansion.

We could designate the existing buildings as employment sites. New NPPF allows neighbourhood plans to adjust greenbelt for employment purposes - possibly however only where it meets local authorities' strategic objectives.

Action: This to be discussed with Mendip

Improving broadband is proving to be the most pressing issue for businesses

Protection of Rural environment particularly important for tourism based business ; also better cycleways

Selling the village as a brand

Support for home working

Possible engagement with Bath Rugby tackling traffic problems in Farleigh Hungerford .

Any policy for medical or educational land-use should be based on evidence of need. We might want to consider this as an aspiration.

Transport & traffic

RE: Closely related to the work of other groups.

Parking is critical in terms of future development

Must ensure that policies stipulate maximum parking.

We should establish up to date car ownership, car parking , means of travel stats in the questionnaire.

NPSG 023- Report from Group Leaders on any correspondence received/meetings held with 3rd Parties

Survey of community and business groups in the parish is underway. *GH* reported on conversations with the owners agent of Bell Hill Garage. Restating support for the LGS designation had been very unwelcome to the owner.

NPSG 024- Inclusion of Aspirations in the NP

Aspirations to be included as appendix in Plan

NPSG 025- Mechanics, Process and timetable of Parish Questionnaire

It is legitimate to get more than one response per household; however in such cases the responses must be individually named. In assessing the base we could look at percentage of households completing a return ; separately we could consider total responses received.

The questionnaire to contain a maximum six questions per group- each group to set 10 questions max for presentation to a meeting of group leaders and Chair. Provisional date of 29th August.

Questionnaire to be trialed before launch. *LB* to review draft questionnaire and to have final ‘say’.

Action: AT to approach graphic designer in village to discuss layout/appearance of questionnaire.

NPSG 026- AONB

Next SG meeting to be 3rd September. Venue tbc

