

25

<b>Meeting Title:</b>	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	
<b>Date:</b>	6 <sup>th</sup> April 2017	
<b>Venue:</b>	Village Hall, Holwell	
<b>Attendees:</b>	Sally-Anne Holt (Chair Holwell Neighbourhood Plan Working Group) Steve Atchison Phil Curtis Jo Edmonson Colin Evans Dave Hollex Roger Kellow Neil Peirson Libby Wilton	SAH SA PhC JE CE DH RK NP LW
	Diana Gibbs (Holwell Parish Council) Jo Witherden (Dorset Planning Consultant)	DG JW
<b>Agenda:</b>	1 Apologies 2 Declaration of Interests 3 Opening Remarks 4 Notes of Previous Meetings 5 Actions 6 Finalise Site Assessment Matrix 7 Additional Research and Evidence Required 8 Agree Timescales for Sites Review 9 Review Project Timescales 10 AOB 11 Date of Next Meeting	

**Actions**

1. **Apologies**

Lord Aldenham (LA), Rodney Antell (RA), Patrick Constable (PC), Robert Hole (RH), Peter Mcfarlane (PM), and Katrina Wall (KW) were unable to attend.

2. **Declaration of Interests**

Not applicable at this meeting.

3. **Opening Remarks**

There was a good turnout at the Parish council meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> March. The majority view was that the Neighbourhood Plan should go ahead.

Today's focus is on the site assessment matrix and how we then proceed.

**4. Notes Of Previous Meetings**

The notes of meetings 21 and 22 were discussed, and no comments made. Notes for meetings 23 and 24 have just been issued.

**5. Actions**

- 24-1: Ongoing.
- 24-2: Complete.
- 24-3: Interviews with estate agents have been taking place but are not yet complete. Village walks are also continuing.
- 24-4 to 24-6: All questions have been revised.
- 24-7: The final section has been removed.
- 24-8: JW's view is that we just assess the land; housing first, then other options.
- 24-9: Done – the data are available.

**6. Finalise Site Assessment Matrix**

SAH produced an assessment for two sites: one next to “Vale View” and one next to the rectory. Those present divided into two groups and each group assessed both of the sites, using the draft assessment questions shown in Appendix B. Once this was done, and certain questions in the assessment matrix discussed, the results were compared:

It appeared that the groups agreed well for questions 1, 2 and 4. But there appeared to be problems with questions 3, 5 and 6.

JW asked what we thought should be included; Views and Overcrowding / Density seemed to feature strongly. She suggested that we start with housing, as most applications are likely to be for this. LW and PhC pointed out that big sites were very difficult to assess. JW said that it comes back to the needs of the village. PhC said that what we do not know is the views of the planners and their possible development needs.

NP questioned the scoring and suggested that negative scores be avoided. JW said that the system proposed had been found to work in previous assessments.

**Question 1:**

CE said that this covers scale and density.

**Question 2:**

This question seemed to work well.

**Question 3:**

This was found to be problematic, particularly how one should consider “most forms of development”. JW said that the aim was to identify the best and worst sites, but that this question was probably not right.

The question asks whether development is in the right place; there are

**Actions**

also two issues: the type of development and the location of the development. CE asked whether we should assess whether the site could support development. JW said that we should think housing first. SAH asked what we should do about the rest of the question – concerning location and environment. She said that she would reword and simplify this question.

DG asked whether we need consider all types of housing. JW said that we should consider those types that we would like to see in the village; it will depend on what goes in the Neighbourhood Plan - we can specify this as part of our policy.

**Question 4:**

The question of views was discussed – views featured strongly in the questionnaire results. PhC pointed out that Question 4 referred to views from public areas. JW said that there was no right to a view in planning terms; we can consider privacy however. This could be a decider, between two possible sites, say. But it should not be an overriding question, as this would lead to very dispersed settlements. JE said that the problem of being overlooked generated highly emotional responses.

25-1  
SAH

**Question 5:**

JE believed that this question depends on numbers. JW said that, if the maximum number of houses for the site was 10 say, then how would we score Question 5. The +1 score was based on an assumption of only one house; if ten, then a -2 score might also have been given. JW said that the question boils down to “can you access the site safely?”. SAH said that there is an assumption of “normal” traffic, so a blind bend, a crossing or parking say could affect this. So, assume a certain level of traffic and ask whether the development of the site would either create a problem, or make an existing problem worse. She said that she would reword this question (JW suggested adding an explicit reference to pedestrian traffic).

25-2  
SAH

**Question 6:**

LW asked what is meant by “new initiatives”. SAH said that it asked how it might impinge on community assets. PhC asked whether we should separate domestic development from business and commercial development (LW said that the last version of the questions did do this).

**Summary:**

SAH summed up the results of the discussion so far. We need new wording for questions 3, 5 and 6. LW suggested changing the order of the questions, putting Question 3 first. The need to cover views was discussed. JW suggested changing Question 4, or adding a seventh question. SAH said that she would add a new question, addressing backfill development.

25-3  
SAH

**7. Additional Research and Evidence Required**

Several areas would benefit from further research, including:

**Actions**

**Employment**

We have not yet had a response from several businesses, such as Hosies and the Nursery School. But there is not a desparate need for this at this stage.

**Transport**

Transport has been discussed with the WDDC. PhC asked about possible sources of funding for traffic calming.

**Housing Style**

NP and CE have done some work on housing style. SAH said that if there is any information of local interest, then let her know.

**8. Agree Timescales for Sites Review**

SAH said that we need to have carried out our assessments in time for the next meeting, therefore, by the week before the meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> May (therefore 26/4). She will provide information on the sites via Dropbox.

**9. Review Project Timescales**

JW said that we want to have our consultation completed in July (and publish the site score results). Therefore, there would be two more Working Group meetings before this.

We will need evidence to support our policy. This will need work. (SAH has had some responses from Estate Agents).

SAH said that we need to look at decision points and identify decisions JW said that we will need to collate all of our evidence and draft the plan. But consultation is the next major step. By the next meeting we can discuss the structure and content of the Neighbourhood Plan , and aim to review an outline structure in June.

**10. Any Other Business (AOB)**

CE asked who would be drafting the Neighbourhood Plan. SAH said that an initial draft would probably be produced by her, with help from JW.

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

The next Neighbourhood Plan WG Meeting is scheduled for:

- Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May, 2017.

**Appendix A - Notes of Meeting 24:**



NP Mtg 24 Notes 02  
Mar 2017 Issue\_1.pdf

## **Appendix B – Draft Site Assessment Questions:**

SITE ASSESSMENT MATRIX - HOLWELL PARISH			
Objective	No.	Summary - we aim to	Explanation of factors considered
1	Ensure development is complementary to neighbouring properties		The site is suitable for development of a scale and density that is complementary to neighbouring properties (both character and amenity)
2	Ensure development reinforces the settlement 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 Holwell's general spread beyond the existing limit of development or breach significant boundaries and intrude into the countryside
3	Ensure development is appropriate to the area within which it is placed		The site could facilitate most forms of development without adversely impacting on the environment in which it is proposed to be located. Factors to consider include tranquility, trees and hedgerows, historic buildings, flood risk etc
4	Retain green spaces and key views		The site is not 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
5	Minimise any increase of traffic flow		An increase in traffic accessing the site is not likely to create or exacerbate traffic problems, based on the location and likely access
6	Preserve the long term future of community assets (Church, village hall and nursery school)		The site will not impact adversely on local facilities and may encourage new initiatives that may preserve the long term future of these assets
<b>Scoring explanation</b>			
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			
<b>Declarations of Interest (DoI*)</b> Where a declaration of interest has been declared in relation to a site, this column should be ticked and the assessment left blank			
<b>Additional sustainability checks</b> 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			