

**Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) Steering Group**  
**MINUTES**  
**Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2021**

- 246. Attendance:** Cllr Souter (ES), Ivan Royle, (IR), Janet Herring (JH), David Angwin (DA), Wink Hanbury (WH).
- 247. Public Attendance:** The Parish Clerk (Gail Foster-GF) was in attendance along with Richard Eastham from Fera Urbanism, Councillors Whitaker and Cotterell and one member of the public.
- 248. Welcome and introduction:**
- 248.1. ES welcomed everyone to the meeting,
- 249. Apologies for absence:**
- 249.1. Karen Addison, Paul Lee and Ian Courcoux had sent apologies.
- 249.2. To note the Declarations of interest received and any other changes.** Wink Hanbury had sent her declaration of interest. Forms were awaited from Paul Lee and David Angwin.
- 250. Points from the floor:**
- 250.1. None.
- 251. To approve the minutes of the last meeting:**
- 251.1. It was Unanimously agreed that the minutes of the meeting of 22<sup>nd</sup> February be approved. They would be published on the website.
- 252. To review progress made on the Vision Statement:**
- 252.1. A draft had been circulated prior to the meeting. It was agreed by all to approve the wording as a working draft. RE explained that it may be necessary to tweak the document throughout the writing of the plan.. It was suggested that a sentence relating to Heritage and including historic buildings be included. After policies had been written, the Vision Statement would be reviewed again. The current version would be published in as a working draft. **Action: Clerk.**
- 253. To review progress made on Policy WB1: (JH, IC, JD)**
- 253.1. Paul Graves joined the meeting at 19:18pm.
- 253.2. GF had received confirmation from the Environment Agency (EA) that the Brook is classed as a main river and that responsibility for maintenance lies with the EA and the landowner. The weed cutting dates schedule had been circulated which detailed how and when maintenance could take place.
- 253.3.** Discussion ensued regarding what information should be included in the Wallop Brook policy. RE advised that important information from other legislation could be included in the policy to replicate the information that matters and embed into the NDP. It could be presented in a way that felt more personal to the parish. The EA guidelines for Riparian ownership would be reviewed along with other relevant policies. A list for inclusion in the policy would drafted and circulated prior to the next meeting. **Action: JH/JD/IC.**
- 254. To review progress made on Policy VE2 - Views: (ES)**
- 254.1. The original survey data have been reviewed by GF and information added to the PC mapping system. This had been sent to RE to start work on. It was suggested that it might be better to represent long and short views rather than looking in versus looking out views.
- 254.2. RE advised that views that were specifically mentioned in the NDP as linked to policies could be protected but careful wording and thought regarding how to graphically represent the information was crucial. Any development that interrupted or damaged a public view would be resisted.

- 254.3. The list of views would be consolidated into a complete list, which would list reasons for inclusion, and the type of view in terms of long, short, serial or panoramic. Photographs would be added. **Action: GF & ES.**
- 254.4. Examples of graphics previously used to represent views in other NDPs would be distributed. **Action: RE.**
- 255. To decide how the Local Areas of Green Space (LAGS) will be chosen for inclusion in the plan:**
- 255.1. The original list of LAGS that had been presented in the August 2020 consultation had been taken from nominations from the original survey questionnaire. All those nominated had been taken forward and after the consultation two more were added. Scoring had been used to ascertain whether each site met the required criteria for inclusion in the plan. It was agreed that once a site was eligible and could justify being on the list, the scoring became redundant as some sites may be more important than others in terms of community value despite not having a high score. It was also acknowledged that some sites had only been nominated by one or two people.
- 255.2. The Clerk advised that the SG had previously agreed to reduce the number of sites, and to re-score the missing ones. This was disputed by the SG.
- 255.3. RE advised that at this stage it was not necessary to reduce the number of sites and that all nominated could go forward into the plan despite the amount of sites being unusually high. The survey that would accompany the Regulation 14 consultation could be worded in such a way as to seek public opinion on the importance of each site and may at a later date be used to reduce the number if necessary.
- 256. To note that Grant monies need to be returned as not spent this financial year:**
- 256.1. GF advised £7,375 would need to be returned to Locality if no invoices were paid prior to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021. Funds could be applied for again in the new financial year.
- 257. Any other business for consideration at the next meeting:**
- 257.1. No substantial outputs following Feria's checklist as sent to the SG in December (ref: 209\_N\_201208\_Next-Steps-Checklist), had been received by the consultant save for a table extracting elements of the existing VDS and the draft Vision Statement text. Further drafts would be required from the SG in order for the consultant to provide advice on the way forward.
- 257.2. A draft Design Statement would be prepared based on actively supported design features. This would be forwarded to the SG and RE for comment. **Action: GF, WH, JD, KA.**
- 257.3. The Wallops Conservation Area Character Appraisal document had not been completely reviewed by GF as it was 58 pages. IR agreed to assist. **Action: GF, IR.**
- 258. Points from the floor.**
- 258.1. A member of the public attending on behalf of a landowner, asked for clarification that the Green spaces were not going to be reduced by the Steering Group. The landowner had asked when this might happen and had been advised in a letter dated 25 February that the Steering group had not yet decided the method by which the number of green spaces would be reduced.
- 258.2. RE advised that it was not necessary to reduce the number of nominated spaces at this stage and reminded everyone that the entire plan is draft until the Examiner's report is received, and the plan goes to final referendum.
- 258.3. Adrian Walker had advised the Clerk in advance of the meeting that he had been working on an affordable housing community project in the parish for some time and will be submitting a pre-planning application to TVBC shortly. He felt it was very encouraging to read the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan and see that parishioners are looking for affordable houses that can be purchased by local people. This housing solution will aim to be net-zero of energy and with a low carbon footprint. A website and blog will be launched soon to present the ideas and collect feedback.
- 258.4. Cllr Cotterell noted that a lot of work and a great many actions had been completed since the last meeting and felt that the plan would make a big difference to the whole parish.
- 259. To confirm the date of the next meeting:**

259.1. The next meeting would be held on Monday 26<sup>th</sup> April.

**260.** The meeting was closed at 20.30pm.

**Date of next monthly meeting: Monday 26<sup>th</sup> April 2021 at 7.00pm via Zoom.**