

DENMEAD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Meeting Notes from the Forum Workshop

Date of Meeting Saturday 6 October 2012 in the Ashling Pavilion at 2.00pm.

Present:

Cllr Neil Lander-Brinkley (NLB)	Cllr Kevin Andreoli (KA)
Cllr Felicity Hull (FH)	D/Cllr Patricia Stallard (PS)
Cllr Richard Hallett (RH)	Cllr Ken Scholey (KS)
Peter Ambrose (PA)	Libby Midgley (LM)
David Griffiths (DG)	Philip Hayler (PH)
Deb Appleby – Locality (DA)	Stuart Woodin (SW)
Jane Andreoli (JA)	David Smith (DS)
John Knight (JK)	

Notes taken by Tony Daniells (TD), Clerk to Denmead Parish Council

Next Meeting: Steering Group: Friday 26th October 2012, 2.00pm, The Old School

1. Welcome and Introductions

NLB extended a warm welcome to all and thanked Deb Appleby and Stuart Woodin for attending.

Apologies were received from Cllrs Gibbs and G Phillips and S Lincoln, J Nell, J Budden, J Merrick, P Chisenga, N King-Smith and Jean Buckle.

2. Why are we here

This was a significant meeting as it was the first time that discussions would take place in an open forum to consider the work thus far of the development placement working group. NLB reiterated that a Neighbourhood Plan was about building and there was a need to consider all options. He recounted two recent good news stories:

- The Business Breakfast where local companies had identified the difficulty of finding local people for local jobs. DPC had agreed to advertise vacancies on its website and
- Community engagement with parents of Denmead Junior School children at their parent/teacher sessions on 'recreation'.

3. Report on the work to date of the Placement Working Party

KA, as leader of the working group responsible for this item, referred to one other piece of good news as far as Denmead was concerned. The Minister had decided to allow development at Bartons Farm which should relieve pressure on Denmead. This was included in the draft WCC Core Strategy.

He then went on to give an update on the work of the group and handed out papers in support of this. He referred to

- The brief that was given to the working group
- The criteria used to assess sites and how this was used to grade sites currently in the SHLAA and others identified by the group.

During this exercise, it was evident that two of the sites that had scored highly, were also valuable community assets which should not be considered for development. This led to a list of 22 sites being identified that should be excluded from any further consideration. Some land had still to be assessed. It was also decided that there would be no new development in the Denmead Gap. There would then be a need to ask the residents what they wanted, such as the need for nursing homes or sites for business expansion.

A summary of the work to date was handed out at the meeting. This included

- The assessment criteria
- The list of excluded sites
- Maps of the sites
- The assessment of each site considered so far

4. Questions

The following questions and comments were aired and recorded with any answers shown in italics

- This meeting was part of the process with the need to get views and was being held as part of an iterative process
- Could we redevelop existing sites rather than new sites – *yes, but time spent so far had been in assessing available sites.*
- Any indication from WCC of density expected – *30 dwellings per hectare.*
- Comments on the exclusion list were invited – *brownfield sites should be utilized first but if this resulted in a loss of an amenity, then this should be replaced elsewhere. If replacing existing housing with that of a higher density but with better sustainability, this would be worth exploring and should be referenced in the Plan.*
- Some SHLAA sites had been excluded due to issues with flooding. The SHLAA also considered this issue. Local knowledge had also been factored in.
- The 22 listed exempt sites would have to be justified. There was a need to protect Sites of Importance to Nature Conservation (SINC) and this had not been included so far. Other villages had sacrificed some amenities for housing, but that this had been replaced elsewhere in the Plan. The Plan should be kept flexible. For example, the Old School site if developed, could give rise to other options. There was a need for the 22 excluded sites to be split into two lists – those that could relocate if there was a benefit to the village, and those that should not relocate. Listed buildings should also be included.

5. Assessment Criteria

The following comments were raised when considering the assessment criteria

- If a development had a material and detrimental effect on the village look, this should be included in the criteria
- In answer as to how 1.10 was included, KA responded that if a development had an effect on neighbours, land uses or land owners, then this should be a consideration
- PA suggested including an assessment against 'quality of place'
- SW suggested passing the criteria before specialists in Locality to review the wording such that it would stand up to any challenge
- PPG17 should be incorporated into the criteria, and also add in a reference to WCC documents on distances from amenities.

6. Some basic questions to consider

The agenda had posed some questions to be considered by the workshop. The questions and the comments are summarized below.

- Small developments or 2/3 big ones?
 - Drip feed development as governments change and therefore so do the rules
 - Of the target range of new dwellings, 100 are already in plan to build. Only 50 more needed which can be accomplished by infill
 - Need for exception housing and downsizing. Look at need not just numbers. Consider demographics as current understanding is that there will be 1000 extra people aged over 65 in 20 years
 - Phase development of the plan lifetime. Do not use allocation all in one go.
 - No knowledge at present of what will be the outcome and benefit to the parish of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
 - Need to know what counts against the target numbers, windfall and/or infill
 - Village would prefer small gradual development
- What about space for employers?
 - Support opportunities for small affordable units, but evidence will be needed to justify this.
 - The Parklands concept is good but currently underused
 - Engage with home based entrepreneurs to get an idea of need. The example of units at Waterberry Drive were cited as good examples
 - The workshop also agreed to examine the need for a large industrial site
- What about special areas – i.e. Care Homes, Sheltered homes, Affordable homes
 - The need for these had been considered earlier.

7. Follow on actions
 - a. Continue to engage with businesses and a further business breakfast should be arranged
 - b. Progress other areas of work such as transport and infrastructure. It was recognized that resource was need to further progress these.

8. 'Marmite' survey summary

DA had analysed the survey cards and presented the main findings from the initial analysis.

- The results would help to answer questions and support ongoing work
- There was a summary of responses by age group
- A summary of likes
- A good percentage of respondents wished to see a Neighbourhood Plan for Denmead
- 80 respondents had left contact details and asked to be kept informed of progress.
- A summary of concerns
- Residents valued what was here and the range of likes

A copy of the analysis is available from the office and a copy is attached.

Meeting closed at 4.25pm

Copies to Steering Group and Forum
 Parish and Ward Councillors
 DNP website