

24

Meeting Title:	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	
Date:	2 nd March 2017	
Venue:	Village Hall, Holwell	
Attendees:	Sally-Anne Holt (Chair Holwell Neighbourhood Plan Working Group) Rodney Antell Steve Atchison Patrick Constable Phil Curtis Colin Evans Dave Hollex Neil Peirson	SAH RA SA PC PhC CE DH NP
	Jo Witherden (Dorset Planning Consultant)	JW
Agenda:	1 Apologies 2 Declaration of Interests 3 Opening Remarks 4 Notes of Previous Meetings 5 Actions 6 Site Assessments 7 AOB 8 Dates of Next Meeting	

Actions

1. **Apologies**

Lord Aldenham (LA), Jo Edmonson (JE), Diana Gibbs (DG), Robert Hole (RH), Roger Kellow (RK), Peter Mcfarlane (PM), Katrina Wall (KW), and Libby Wilton (LW) were unable to attend.

2. **Declaration of Interests**

SAH, CE, RA, and PhC all declared an interest with respect to identifying sites.

3. **Opening Remarks**

SAH started by saying that we are still instructed to carry out the development of the Neighbourhood Plan, adding that there is to be a public meeting of the Parish Council on Tuesday 28th March to discuss this (following our own meeting on 27th February).

Most of our funding has now been used up, and Keith Budgell will be sending in a funding report. Therefore, we need to review our plan and put in a bid for further funds.

JW said that, before we can write a draft plan, we must consider what's to be in it. If we can agree a draft by June it can be reviewed over the summer. Then, following feedback, we can pick it up again in September.

	<u>Actions</u>
SAH said that she'd heard that the timeframe for completion is 5 years from when the area has been agreed – she will check this.	24-1 SAH
4. <u>Notes Of Previous Meetings</u> Notes of meetings 21 and 22 are to be sent out (the meeting on Monday 27 th February will be Meeting 23 – see Appendix A).	24-2 SAH/SA
5. <u>Actions</u> Interviews with estate agents have been taking place but are not yet complete. Village walks are also continuing.	24-3 BD/CE
6. <u>Site Assessments</u> SAH provided two documents for discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Site Assessment Form (see Appendix B)• Site Assessment Matrix (see Appendix C) SAH asked whether the factors on the Site Assessment Matrix reflect what we're trying to achieve. The Motcombe assessment, on which this is based, had more factors, but some were not relevant or applicable for Holwell. The eight Site Assessment Matrix questions were discussed.	
1: This was considered to be a bit too “fluffy”, and the aim of “taking into account changing demographics” was discussed. Some considered the first part to be OK, and omitting the last sentence was suggested. SAH said that she would revise it.	24-4 SAH
2: This question was discussed at length. JW said that the problem is that we would be looking at an empty site. She suggested that one could look at a site and consider whether it <i>could</i> be developed so that it had no adverse effect on its neighbours. SAH said that she was thinking more about the scale of a potential development on a site. But, NP and JW said that it is just the site that we'll be assessing. JW believed that we need to consider a site more in terms of the character of the location (size, neighbours, etc.); therefore, a question that we could ask is whether it would be <i>overdevelopment</i> ? We can state <i>broad</i> preferences about what could go there. In general, the question was approved.	24-4 SAH
3: Everyone was happy that this question had a clear message.	
4: It was felt that this was confusing, as not all of the sites assessed will be for employment purposes. JW pointed out that it is trying to put two points into one score: Employment Opportunities and Environmental Impact. Some of the issues are covered elsewhere – traffic at Question 7 and neighbours at Question 2. But the landscape aspect is not covered anywhere else, though it applies to all development types. SAH also said that the grammar needed improving. It was agreed that this needed further review.	24-5 SAH

	<u>Actions</u>
5: This was considered to be OK.	
6: JW said that this almost covered the landscape aspect. It seemed to provide a link between footpaths and bridleways but was not linked to the environment. SAH said that she would remove it.	24-6 SAH
7: SAH suggested that we delete the wording after “problems”. JW said that, even if the Highways department at WDDC were happy with all sites proposed, we could still compare them with respect to each other. The question was approved.	
8: This question was also approved.	
PhC asked whether the scoring would be made public, and it was agreed that it should be.	
The question of a <u>development boundary</u> was discussed. JW said that we should look at the sites first. If they are scattered, then it would not really make sense to have a development boundary. But, if the sites were located fairly close together it might make sense to have a development boundary. So, we don't <i>need</i> to have a development boundary. SAH pointed out that we have both dispersed sites and others. Different options may present themselves once we have carried out the assessment process.	
The <u>assessment process</u> was discussed. SAH suggested that we aim to have at least three people: one to fill in the form, one to take pictures, and one to edit the map. But the form is to be filled in with the consensus view of the assessment group. JW advised that as many people as possible should attend the site visits. The forms should be brought back and discussed, before the proposed scores are finalised.	24-7 JW
After discussion SAH requested that the final section of the form be removed.	
<u>Dates for performing the assessments</u> were discussed. JW proposed the 14 th , 21 st , and 28 th of March, and thought that two days should be sufficient for 15 sites. We should also identify alternative dates in case the planned ones were cancelled because of poor weather. She added that one didn't normally have the landowners present, though we would need their permission to go on the sites. The 14 th and 21 st looked to be the most promising dates to aim for.	
PC said that he was concerned that we will not know what the landowners have in mind. SAH said that she would try and get more details on this. However, it was suggested that it may be better if we are not influenced by the landowners' plans.	24-8 SAH
7. <u>Any Other Business (AOB)</u>	
SAH will check on population data in the 2001 and 2011 censuses.	24-9 SAH

Actions

8. **Dates of Next Meeting (DONM)**

The next Neighbourhood Plan WG Meeting is scheduled for:

- Thursday 6th April, 2017.

Appendix A - Notes of Meeting 23:



NP Mtg 23 Notes 27
Feb 2017 Issue_1b.p

Appendix B – Site Assessment Form:

SITE ID		
Survey Date:		
GENERAL INFORMATION		
Existing use		
Landform (eg flat / sloping (direction))	Steep / Sloping / Rolling / Flat	
Character of site / immediate area	Intimate / Tight / Open / Exposed / Modest / Grand Uniform / Simple / Harmonious / Diverse / Regular / Formal / Random Calm / Busy / Angular / Curved / Sinuous	
Visibility / prominence from surrounding areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Important views out / views to key landmarks	<input type="checkbox"/>	
SITE FEATURES		
Possible wildlife habitats	<input type="checkbox"/> Animals – <input type="checkbox"/> Habitats –	
Possible historic interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Features – <input type="checkbox"/> Archaeology – <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural associations –	
Natural features worthy of retention	<input type="checkbox"/> Trees <input type="checkbox"/> Water	<input type="checkbox"/> Hedges <input type="checkbox"/> other
Built structures / walls worthy of retention	<input type="checkbox"/>	
POSSIBLE CONSTRAINTS		
Utilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Pylons	<input type="checkbox"/> Drains
Flood risk / ground conditions	<input type="checkbox"/> Stream / river <input type="checkbox"/> Marshy / waterlogged	
Potential pollution / contamination		
Neighbouring land uses	<input type="checkbox"/> Residential / sensitive <input type="checkbox"/> Unneighbourly	
ACCESSIBILITY		
Vehicular access points / connections		
Pedestrian access points / connections		
OVERALL ASSESSMENT		
Useable area	Entire area Part area (describe) None	
Mitigation requirements		
Suitability score	4 – no perceived constraints 3 – minor constraints 2 – significant constraints 1 – totally unsuitable	

Appendix C – Site Assessment Matrix:

SITE ASSESSMENT MATRIX			Explanation of factors considered
Objective	No.	Summary	
	1	Facilitate the development of Holwell	the site (in whole or part) could be developed in a form that offers growth that will meet diverse local housing needs, taking into account changing demographics and social requirements
	2	Ensure development is complementary to neighbouring properties	the site (in whole or part) facilitates <i>housing</i> development to an agreed scale and complementary to neighbouring properties
	3	Reinforcing the developed area within which it is placed	the site is well related to the area of the village in which it is located and would not extend its general spread beyond the existing limit of development or breach significant boundaries and countryside amenities
	4	Support existing businesses and encourage new enterprises	the site facilitates employment opportunities without adversely impacting on the environment in which is proposed to be located
	5	Retaining green spaces and key views	the site does not form an important green space, and its development would not result in the loss of an important view from a public area or highway to the wider countryside
	6	Promoting the use of footpaths, bridleways and community's use of countryside	the site does not negatively impact on the natural, agricultural and built environment including its landscape, built heritage, archaeological sites and wildlife habitats.
	7	Minimising the increase of traffic flow	the traffic that would be generated by the site is not likely to create or exacerbate traffic problems, based on the location and likely access
	8	Preserving the long term future of local services and community assets	the site will not impact adversely on local services, infrastructure, facilities and amenities or may encourage new initiatives that may preserve the long term future of these assets

Scoring explanation

- 2 Highly likely to achieve objective
- 1 Achieves the objective to some degree
- 0 Neutral impact
- 1 Likely to cause some degree of harm / fail to achieve objective
- 2 Likely to cause significant harm / significantly undermine objective
- ? No assessment possible due to level of uncertainty

Declarations of Interest (DoI*)

Where a declaration of interest has been declared in relation to a site, this column should be ticked and the assessment left blank

Additional sustainability checks

These checks are to be undertaken by consultant following SEA screening / scoping work

They are likely to be based on potential impact on known designations or constraints

ASSESSMENT TABLE		Objective score								Additional sustainability checks					
DoI*	Ref	Site name	Facilitate the development of Holwell	Ensure development is complementary to neighbouring properties	Reinforcing the developed area within which it is placed	Support existing businesses and encourage retaining green spaces and key views	Promoting the use of footpaths, bridleways and community's use of countryside	Minimising the increase of traffic flow	Preserving the long term future of local services and community assets	Notes	Biodiversity	Landscape	Cultural Heritage	Soil, water and air	Climatic Factors
1															
2															
3															
4															
5															
6															
7															
8															
9															
10															
11															
12															
13															
14															
15															
16															
17															
18															