

NORTON ST PHILIP NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

Minutes of a virtual meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group held on
Wednesday 24th March 2021 commencing at 12 noon.

Present: Alice Tollworthy (Chair), Cllr George Hitchins, Cllr Rupert Foster, Cllr Barbi Lund, Graham Tickell, Bob Chapman.

In attendance: Nicola Duke (Parish Clerk)

Public Participation – None.

NPS 056	Opening remarks from Chair The Chair welcomed those present to the meeting and outlined that she was chairing the meeting in the stead of Cllr I Hasell, who was now chair of the PC and had elected not to take the NPSG chair for this meeting in order to avoid any potential conflict of interest. AT clarified that the purpose of the meeting was to consider the modifications proposed by MDC to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan following the Court of Appeal judgement and to report to the PC with recommendations.					
NPS 057	Apologies Deborah Allen Ian O'Brien					
NPS 058	Minutes of Meeting 22nd November 2018 The minutes of the meeting held on 22 nd November 2018 were approved for accuracy and adopted (proposed Bob Chapman, seconded Cllr Foster).					
NPS 059	Consideration of Amendments to Draft NP prepared by MDC The scheduled of proposed amendments to the Draft NP as prepared by MDC had been circulated to members and were considered. Proposed amendments numbers 15 and 17 required discussion, the other amendments were noted to relate to matters of housekeeping. <u>Amendment 15</u> <table border="1"><tr><td>15</td><td>Policy 5</td><td>Delete para 12.3; “12.3. The emerging Mendip District Local Plan has also proposed these areas as LGS. Both Local Plans and</td></tr></table>			15	Policy 5	Delete para 12.3; “12.3. The emerging Mendip District Local Plan has also proposed these areas as LGS. Both Local Plans and
15	Policy 5	Delete para 12.3; “12.3. The emerging Mendip District Local Plan has also proposed these areas as LGS. Both Local Plans and				

		<p>Neighbourhood Plans can designate LGS and for consistency it is important both Plans show the same areas. Local feeling supported the designations and wanted to make them in this Plan. It was decided no other area required designation as LGS."</p> <p>Add new para 12.3 to read;</p> <p><i>"Paragraph 101 of the NPPF sets out an expectation that Policies for managing development within a Local Green Space will be consistent with those for Green Belts (set out in paragraphs 143 – 147 of the NPPF)."</i></p>
--	--	--

Amendment 17

17	Policy 5	<p>Delete:</p> <p>Development on Local Green Spaces will only be permitted if it enhances the original use and reasons for the designation of the space</p> <p>And replace with;</p> <p><i>"Development in an area designated as Local Green Space will be managed in accordance with national policy for Green Belts".</i></p>
----	----------	--

It was confirmed that the amendments had been made in order to comply with the Court of Appeal's finding that the LGS development policy had not been consistent with green belt policy. It was further confirmed that the PC's legal team had reviewed the proposed amendments and were content with them.

Following discussion, the Steering Group determined that the amendments were acceptable and should be supported.

NPS 060	<p>Consideration as to whether there has been any material change of circumstances relevant to the Draft NP since the report agreed under NPSG 053</p> <p>Cllr Hitchins reported on the potential changes to the settlement boundary in the future, noting that a housing allocation outside the boundary might be made following publication of the Inspector's report on the draft Local Plan. It was noted that there were currently two live planning application in the system for sites at Mackley lane and Frome Road, which were yet to be determined.</p> <p>Members discussed whether the draft NP should address the potential changes to the settlement boundary. It was noted that the Court of Appeal judgement stated in paragraphs 53 and 55 that the potential change to housing requirements for NSP were not material to the NP:</p> <p><u>Paragraph 53 of the Court of Appeal judgement</u></p> <p><i>The judge said of this ground:</i></p> <p><i>"[125] Although the assumptions made in the [Plan] about the housing requirements of LPP1 have subsequently been found to be partially incorrect, I do not consider that this undermines the [Plan] to such an extent that it retrospectively renders [Mendip's] decision on the [Plan] unlawful. The specific proposals for housing in the [Plan] are unaffected. In the short term, the further required housing allocation will be given effect by LLP2, which will supersede the [Plan] in that respect, as the most recent plan in the development plan. The [Plan] can be updated in the forthcoming Mendip Local Plan Review to align with LLP2, if required. [Lochailort] now has the opportunity to seek planning permission for a 27 dwelling development at Site NSP1 with a realistic prospect of success."</i></p> <p><u>Paragraph 55 of the Court of Appeal judgement</u></p> <p><i>I think that this is what the judge must have meant by her comment that the misinterpretation did not undermine the Plan "to such an extent" that it rendered Mendip's decision on the Plan unlawful. In other words, I think she was saying that the misinterpretation was not material. I agree with her.</i></p> <p>It was agreed that any potential changes to the settlement boundary would therefore be dealt with at the appropriate time.</p> <p>Members also discussed the current planning application on the site of the Roman Catholic Church, noting that this site had not been allocated for development in the Draft Plan. It was confirmed that this site had not been included due to the extensive heritage assessment which would have been required: but the meeting confirmed that the Draft Plan's housing policy encouraged sustainable housing development within the settlement boundary. The Draft Plan contains policies allocating the identified Bell Hill garage site as well as allowing for an exception site. The planning application for the site at the Roman Catholic Church was confirmed as having been supported by the PC and members noted the application to be a proven example of sustainable and supported development in the village.</p>
------------	---

NPS 061	<p>Prepare and agree a report to the PC as to whether the proposed amendments should be supported</p> <p>It was agreed that the Steering Group would support the proposed amendments. A report containing the groups' recommendations would be prepared and circulated after the receipt of the minutes for members' comments. This report would then be sent to the PC in time for its next meeting (14 April).</p>
NPS 062	Date of next meeting - Not required.
NPS 063	AOB - None

There being no further business the meeting was closed at 12.25 pm.