

Notes of Mtg with Graham Smith (TVBC) 3 Nov 16.

Att. GS, KP, MW, AL, LC.

Re Conflict of Interests.

Exactly the same rules as apply to the PC. Interests to be declared inc. anything that a third party may feel has influenced direction, allocation etc. Decn has to be made at the start of the mtg and that person should withdraw when the rel. decn is made.

AL has made a decn of interest. He has no aspiration for development. If we get to site selection, then should withdraw as perception that group is objective is important. It will be allocation of sites that is the key issue (if it happens), and Alan should withdraw.

Jason would certainly have to withdraw if we look at site promotion or allocation (and any decisions relating to whether we will do thatKP).

In respect of working on policy development etc, his involvement OK as not on an issue linked to his interests e.g. leisure or heritage OK.

When and if we look at numbers for development or where they should go, it will be time for Jason to withdraw from the SG as there will be a perception of influence, even if not real.

Re Greenspace.

KP explained sitn re Thruxton.

GS. The LP sets out 2 designations in relation to Settlement boundaries....within and outside. Within SB development OK, outside means no development w/o a special reason. Within that outside 'green' area there are various shades of green, inc. land protected for ecological reasons or as local gaps.

Local Gaps look to prevent coalescence b/w settlements...include visual co., no just physical.

Government Guidance does NOT support local gaps. TVBC were very careful (in the LP) in their definition of LGs and reduced the size and number. New Forest DC didn't get their gaps past the inspector in their LP.

For purps of our NDP, we can say that we want to protect the character of spaces BUT we cannot call them local gaps. Local areas of Green space are not defined in the Framework para 77..

Important that we use our evidence base to justify what we put forward but we have to understand that developers and landowners will look to challenge.

The current sitn is that

- a. we have an up to date LP.
- b. Sufficient housing has been identified.
- c. TVBC currently has 7 years of housing supply.
- d. Difficult for developers to make a case at the moment. This posn. Was supported by an inspector this week (Nov. 16).

Re Thruxton Down and West of Village – is countryside and should not be built on save for farm workers accom and possibly things like Fairground sites etc (discussed previous application by showmen etc. TVBC have identified sites for travellers etc.

Re Solar panels – will be a question of how they sit in the landscape.

Any application to develop in the west would be unlikely to succeed b/c of lack of facilities and public transportwould result in dependence on private cars.

Eastern side – cannot stop speculative planning applications. There is a challenge to the LP ongoing.

Discussion re Para 77no definitions of what constitutes an extensive tract of land.