

DENMEAD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Meeting Notes from the Forum meeting

Date of Meeting *Thursday 15 March 2012 in the Old School at 7.00pm.*

Present:

Cllr Neil Lander-Brinkley (NLB)	Cllr Kevin Andreoli (KA)
Cllr Felicity Hull (FH)	Cllr Patricia Stallard (PS)
David Griffiths (DG)	Peter Ambrose (PA)
Jane Andreoli (JA)	Nat King-Smith (NKS)
Sylvia Wicker (SW)	Jim Kerr (JK)
Jean Buckle (JB)	Kirk Phillips (KP)

Notes taken by Tony Daniells (TD), Clerk to Denmead Parish Council
Next Meeting: Forum: Friday 13TH April 2012, 7.00pm, The Old School
Steering Group: Friday 23 March 2012, 6.00pm, The Old School

1 Apologies

Apologies were received from Nikki Bowler; Brendan Gibbs; Gren Phillips; Steve Lincoln; Jenny Nell; John Knight; Chris Lyons and Pepe Chisenga.

2. Welcome

NLB welcomed everyone and extended a warm welcome to new members. He summarized activity so far in the project and gave the purpose of this meeting. This being to review the work completed so far on three of the work steps. Each working groups had been asked to draft a vision for their area and to list their findings in bullet form.

It was asked if the overall objectives were the same as the action steps. It was agreed that it was and this had been accepted by the Steering Group and Forum.

Denmead had made progress and had caught up with many of the earlier front runners. Of the websites maintained by those preparing a neighbourhood plan, those of Much Wenlock and Lynton and Lynmouth were found to be the most comprehensive.

3. Areas of Work

a) SHLAA

KA gave an update of progress.

- Criteria had been defined which would be used to assess sites in the SHLAA. This covered location, access and sustainability. This would allow a fair and open assessment process to be used. Both DG and JK had contributed to this work.

In the following discussion, it was observed that the SHLAA was a register of interest by landowners who would like to see land developed. It had no legal standing and was not part of planning policy. Areas of suitable land outside of the SHLAA should also be considered. KA asked that any comments on the document be sent to him and he would incorporate these and republish.

b) Village Design Statement

PA gave an update of progress.

- The VDS was a comprehensive document and he saw no reason to reinvent its content. It had been reworked to follow guidance contained in the DIY Sustainability Appraisal for Neighbourhood Plans. The document would identify those aspects which the DNP would require any future development to recognize and be in sympathy with.

In the discussion, it was observed that the VDS contained much historic information but little forward looking information. It was agreed that there was a need to extract a simple overview from the VDS for planning reference but recognizing that the document would be a statutory planning document and would need as much detail as possible. An example was

given of how the VDS had been misinterpreted to allow development at Hatchmore of 2.5 storey houses.

The document would be developed further with reference to the DIY Sustainability Appraisal document.

c) The Denmead Gap

DG presented an update on his work with regards to the Gap. In addition to the defined Gap, he had also considered green space to the south, west and north of the village. He was disappointed that he had received no feedback despite having distributed it to members of the Forum. DG was affronted that the Planning Committee had considered WCC's Core Strategy during its consultation period but had not informed him that it planned to do so, nor had they included any of the recommendations from his paper. KA replied to this to the effect that the Planning Committee could only comment on the soundness and legality of the method of preparing the Core Strategy. It was not being asked to comment on the content. WCC could not define a new Gap, but the NP could include this, and also redefine the development boundary if it considered both of these to be necessary.

DG considered that the definition on Gaps in the Core Strategy was not sound. He was concerned that the PUSH definition was unsound, and this could become part of planning policy. KA replied that the PUSH definition was for new Gaps.

In the ensuing discussion, the following points were raised

- In the target allocation of new developments, WCC had agreed that the dwellings at Little Frenchies Field would be included in this allocation.
- There was a need to develop a vision before going into specifics
- It was thought that windfall sites developed in the first 10 years of the plan may not count but those in the last 10 years would
- Other parishes in the WCC District were pressing hard to have their target allocations reduced. If this was successful, it could put pressure for development in other areas, including Denmead.
- The Plan should consider all needs and not just housing.
- A map showing the different areas of the village would be useful. KA referred to maps produced for DPC for the Blueprint exercise. The Clerk was asked to determine what authority existed to use existing mapping systems.

4 Other matters raised

NLB asked new members for their thoughts on proceedings.

- JB referred to the drafting of the VDS. This had been a full time job over a number of years. The NP would likely take the same
- SW considered that we should all be working together for a common interest.
- DG reiterated that it was not DPC's role to make decisions without first consulting. NLB apologised for the lack of communication and not informing DG of the Planning Committee's consideration of the WCC Core Strategy. He stated that part of the Working Party's conclusions had been included in the response. The apology was accepted.
- JK advised that consultation with the population of Denmead was difficult and it was something that had to be done early and continuously.
- NLB thought Community Engagement was important and would need professional help. It should not happen until such times as there was something to put to people.
- NKS said there was a need to identify how to consult. FH added that a scattergun approach had worked previously and it had got people talking.
- PA was happy to start of the work area on community engagement. NLB, JK and NKS offered to assist.

4. Summary

NLB summarised the meeting

- SHLAA – principle and criteria defined. Pass comments back to KA. Chris Lyons would be encouraged to help with this work area
- VDS – circulate more widely to NP members to get comments. Printed copies to go to all
- Gap – leave as tabled. DG to consider where to take this
- Community Engagement work area to be started
- Vision from PA only sent to NLB. Will go to all Forum members.

Meeting closed at 9.05pm

Copies to Steering Group and Forum
Parish and Ward Councillors