	33	
Meeting Title:	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	
Date:	2nd November 2017	
Venue:	Village Hall, Holwell	
Attendees:	Sally-Anne Holt (Chair Holwell Neighbourhood Plan Working Group)	SAH
	Steve Atchison	SA
	Patrick Constable	PC
	Jo Edmonson	JE
	Colin Evans	CE
	Dave Hollex	DH
	Libby Wilton	LW
	Diana Gibbs (Holwell Parish Council)	DG
	Jo Witherden (Dorset Planning Consultant)	JW

Agenda:
1. Apologies for absence
2. Opening remarks
3. Acceptance of notes from Meetings 30 and 32
4. Actions arising from previous meetings
5. Declarations of Interest
6. Site Options Consultation feedback
7. Character and Heritage Assessment discussion
8. Outline of Draft Policies and Intentions
9. Date of next meeting
10. AOB

Actions

1. **Apologies**

   Lord Aldenham (LA), Rodney Antell (RA), Phil Curtis (PC), Bruce Duncan (BD), Roger Kellow (RK), Peter Mcfarlane (PM), and Neil Peirson (NP) were unable to attend.

2. **Opening Remarks**

   SAH explained that the complaint that had been made concerning the site analysis procedure had been addressed formally by the Parish Council and dealt with.

   There has been an additional complaint from elsewhere concerning the effectiveness of communications about the Neighbourhood Plan. This is being addressed.

3. **Notes Of Previous Meetings**

   Notes for Meeting 30 were not produced but SAH has now produced some at the request of NP and these have been sent to him for review.

   SAH
   33-1

Actions

The Notes for Meeting 32 were reviewed and accepted.

4. **Actions Arising from Previous Meetings**

Meeting 29
Action 29-1: Ongoing.

Meeting 31
Action 31-1: Complete.
Action 31-2: No longer relevant.
Action 31-3: Complete – decided against generating guidelines.
Action 31-4: Reviewed and considered impractical.
Action 31-5: Complete.
Action 31-6: Complete.
Action 31-7: Ongoing.
Action 31-8: Not appropriate.

Meeting 32
Action 32-1: Complete; SAH has spoken to agent.
Action 32-2: Complete; SAH spoke to John Baker at Buckland Newton. They'd done similar things to us, and had no new suggestions.
Action 32-3: Complete. Flyers distributed.
Action 32-4: Complete; SAH spoke to Locality.
Action 32-5: Ongoing; draft Neighbourhood Plan in preparation.
Action 32-6: Meeting was cancelled, pending Parish Council meeting.
Action 32-7: Complete; noticeboards put up.

5. **Declarations of Interest**

Declarations of interest made by CE and SAH.

6. **Site Options Consultation feedback**

6a. Introduction

SA and JW explained what progress has been made with analysing the feedback data. JW said that she was happy with the statistics, and that we need to think about the details. JW's analysis of results was discussed, including the merits or otherwise of values used to calculate the weighted average[1].

It was agreed that the site data were sufficiently comprehensive to justify using them as the basis of assessing site suitability, focussing initially on the Green and Amber sites.

---

[1]   A **weighted mean** (or weighted average) is like a simple average except that, instead of assuming that all of the values being averaged are equally important (and so have equal weight), some of the values are more important (so have more weight) than others.

Actions

Two key results have been derived from the feedback data:
- A Ranking of the sites in terms of their perceived suitability.
- A Value for the acceptable number of houses to be built over the next 15 years.

JW went through her figures and calculations. JE said that the randomised site list, with anonymous names for the sites, was a very good idea, and avoided introducing bias.

SAH pointed out that twice as many agree with the proposed Magna site for affordable housing than disagreed.

6b.   The Number of Houses

A value for the acceptable number of market value houses to be built over the next 15 years was obtained, using the results for Question 4 on Housing Growth. (See Appendix A for more details)

This gave values of 3.1 and 3.8, depending upon the weightings used; two types of weightings were applied. One set was based on taking the maximum value from the ranges in the question (so, for the range of 4 to 6 houses, a value of 6 would be used); the other set was based on taking a mid-point (so, for the range of 4 to 6 houses, a value of 5 would be used). The mid-point method gave the lower result, 3.1, and the maximum value method gave the higher value, 3.8.

These results suggest that 3 or 4 market value houses should be built, over 15 years.

JE asked if Rural Exceptions still apply - SAH answered that they do. JE then said that we should make it clear that, therefore, the weighted average number of houses would be in addition to the Rural Exception housing.

DG said that we need to decide whether it was to be 3 or 4 houses. JW believed that, when the results are presented to the community, the mid-point would probably be the more reasonable approach. But we could still have a 4th site as a reserve; so we could have 3 with 1 reserve, in case not all of those approved materialize. She added that we still need to take heed of peoples' views.

SA said that, whatever numbers were used, it should be clearly explained how the figures had been arrived at, probably giving any equations and using a worked example.

CE added that there would be those who wanted more. He believed that a lot of site owners would be unhappy that the result is for only 3 or 4 houses, given the amount of work and number of meetings that have been involved at arriving at that result.

Actions

6c.   Ranking of Sites

Three ways have been used to assess the ranking of the sites, using the results to Question 1 in the feedback questionnaire, on Green, Amber and Red sites:

- A Mean has been calculated, using +2, +1, 0, -1, and -2 for the scores rated as from 5 to 1, to obtain a result. (See Appendix B for more details)
- A Median has been calculated, based on all scores.
- A Median has been calculated, based on combining the results rated as 5 and 4 and those rated as 1 and 2.

It was agreed that the Mean is probably the most reliable method. PC said that the Mean looked to be the strongest method for assessing the acceptable number of houses to be built. CE was of the same view.

DG agreed that the Mean was the best approach, but that any anomalies from using the Medians should be explained.

6d.   Discussion of Way Ahead

SAH said that the Clerk to the Parish Council has still to check that respondees are on the Electoral Roll. But, once this is complete we can finalize the calculations.

DG said that a lot of people, and especially site owners, would be interested in the results; and that there would be interest in proposals for the village hall. CE asked at what stage the data would be made public, and whether the first viewing of the figures would be in the village hall, or on the website, or somewhere else.

SAH explained that we will need to inform the site owners first, and emphasized that it's an iterative process. DG asked what the other Neighbourhood Plan villages had done. JW said that some villages had used posters to advertise their results; but we need the information all together.

SAH said that we could combine the results with the policies; the Neighbourhood Plan is not only about houses. We could use various means to present the results, including a newsletter, the benefice magazine, the website, and meetings. DG was concerned that those who cannot come to a meeting might have a problem.

CE suggested delivering a newsletter then JE suggested a newsletter, then a meeting to explain the results - so perhaps headline results followed by a meeting. JW suggested adding the draft plan.

SAH asked what date we might aim for - a December meeting was suggested.

JW said that we will need to consider what we do after giving feedback to the community.

7.   **Character and Heritage Assessment discussion**

SAH explained that, now that the Holwell Heritage and Character Assessment report has been revised, we cannot change it. PC asked whether we had to accept it. SAH said no, we don't. We can use the report as evidence but can also decide if it is too broad or narrow though it should point to areas that may need a policy.

SAH asked whether CE and DH would look into flood risk for the Neighbourhood Plan; they said that they would.

CE/DH
33-2

She also said that we need a Local List of things that are valued, other than listed monuments etc. So, could someone look into it. JW explained that there tends to be one if a conservation assessment has been carried out.

NP/PhC
33-3

JE pointed out that it doesn't actually make the items listed in the sense that listed building consent would be required for changes to be made. but we may have an influence on a planning decision.

SAH said that views are popular with some people, and green spaces. She asked if PC could look into it green spaces further; he said that he could. She added that, if anyone has any more feedback, let her know.

PC
33-4

8.   **Outline of Draft Policies and Intentions**

The proposal for draft policies was reviewed. These cover:

- Housing, addressing housing needs together with scale/design; we would use evidence from the questionnaire and the analysis of the results. There are 3 policies:
    - H1 covers numbers and location.
    - H2 covers affordable housing.
    - HD1 covers housing design.

- Employment and Business, to support business and commercial enterprises. There are 2 policies:
    - EB1 covers change of use of existing buildings and new buildings.
    - EB2 covers home working.

- Community Facilities, aimed at retaining and enhancing facilities. There are 2 policies:
    - C1 covers community facilities. Currently there are very few - SAH is to talk to the Rector and to that Rodney and Celia Antell to obtain more information.
    - C2 covers green spaces. PC pointed out that really we only have wide verges at present.

- Environment, aimed at protecting and enhancing the environment, including natural, agricultural and built aspects of the landscape. There are 3 policies:
    - E1covers the wider environment and rural character.

Actions

- – E2 covers building and features of local historic interest.
- – E3 focusses on hedges, trees and planting schemes.

- Renewable Energy is addressed under the Local Plan's policy COM11, but we could add to this if appropriate. Thus, there are no Renewable Energy policies.

- Transport is addressed under the Local Plan's policy COM7; we cannot control traffic speed or volume, but we can address safety and infrastructure concerns that may be relevant. There are no Transport policies.

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

Date agreed as Tuesday 28th November, at SAH's house.

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

SAH has been asked to redo the disclosures of interest from each of us. Paper copies of the forms were provided, and SAH will send soft versions.

SAH
33-5

Appendix A

How we used your anwers to Question 4
to decide how many houses you think should be built in Holwell over the next 15 years

- Question 4 allowed one of four options to be chosen; the options were:

  Option 1 = Only conversions or rural exception sites.
  Option 2 = As 1 but with up to 3 custom build houses.
  Option 3 = As 2 but with up to 6 custom build houses.
  Option 4 = As 3 but with up to 10 custom build houses.

- We used a weighted mean[2] calculation to help us - this is a mean calculation where some values contribute more than others.

- The weighted mean was calculated twice, each time with a different set of values for a, b, c, and d; this way we made a calculation looking at the highest votes received as well as the mid number of votes received for each option.

- Details of the calculations

  A weighted mean, or weighted average, was obtained using the following equation for the results for Question 1:

$$\text{Weighted Mean } = \frac{[(\text{Option 1 Score}).(a) + (\text{Option 2 Score}).(b) + (\text{Option 3 Score}).(c) + (\text{Option 4 Score}).(d)}{[(\text{Option 1 Score}) + (\text{Option 2 Score}) + (\text{Option 3 Score}) + (\text{Option 4 Score})} \quad (1)$$

  Where: "a" is the weighting for Option 1.
  "b" is the weighting for Option 2
  "c" is the weighting for Option 3.
  "d" is the weighting for Option 4.

- <u>One set</u> was based on taking <u>the maximum value</u> from the Option ranges:
  so a = 0, b = 3, c = 6 and d = 10.

  If, in this worked example with dummy numbers (shown in red), the results were:

  Option 1 (Only conversions or rural exception sites) =   20
  Option 2 (As 1 but with up to 3 custom build houses) =   10
  Option 3 (As 2 but with up to 6 custom build houses) =   5
  Option 4 (As 3 but with up to 10 custom build houses) =   2

  Then, using Equation (1), this gives:

$$\text{Weighted Mean } = \frac{(20).(0) + (10).(3) + (5).(6) + (2).(10)}{(20) + (10) + (5) + (2)} = \frac{30 + 30 + 20}{37} = \frac{80}{37} = 2.2$$

---

[2] A **weighted mean** (or weighted average) is like a simple average except that, instead of assuming that all of the values being averaged are equally important (and so have equal weight), some of the values are more important (so have more weight) than others.

- The <u>other set</u> was based on taking a <u>mid-point value</u> from the Option ranges:
  so a = 0, b = (1+3)/2 = 2, c = (4+6)/2 = 5 and d = (7+10)/2 = 8.5.

  Using Equation (2), with the same dummy numbers, this gives:

$$\text{Weighted Mean} = \frac{(20).(0) + (10).(2) + (5).(5) + (2).(8.5)}{(20) + (10) + (5) + (2)} = \frac{20 + 25 + 17}{37} = \frac{62}{37} = 1.7$$

- Thus, the mid-point method gives a lower result.

- The actual scores gave 3.1 using the mid-point method and 3.8 using the maximum method.

Appendix B

How we used your answers to Questions 1
to calculate your top selection of sites

- A weighted mean[3], or weighted average, was obtained using the following equation:

$$\text{Weighted Mean} = \frac{[(\text{No.of 5s}).(+2) + (\text{No.of 4s}).(+1) + (\text{No.of 3s}).(0) + (\text{No.of 2s}).(-1) + (\text{No.of 1s}).(-2)]}{[(\text{No.of 5s}) + (\text{No.of 4s}) + (\text{No.of 3s}) + (\text{No.of 2s}) + (\text{No.of 1s})]} \quad (2)$$

Where: The weighting for the number of 5s = +2
The weighting for the number of 4s = +1
The weighting for the number of 3s = 0
The weighting for the number of 2s = -1
The weighting for the number of 1s = -2

So, in the following worked example with dummy numbers (shown in red), if we had the scores shown below from Question 1 results:

Question	Highly Suitable / Acceptable 5	Suitable / Acceptable 4	Neutral 3	Unsuitable / Unacceptable 2	Highly Unsuitable / Unacceptable 1
Weighting	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
Score	10	20	10	6	2

Equation (2) would give:

$$\text{Weighted Mean} = \frac{[(10).(+2) + (20).(+1) + (10).(0) + (6).(-1) + (2).(-2)]}{[(10) + (20) + (10) + (6) + (2)]} = \frac{[(20) + (20) + (0) - (6) - (4)]}{48}$$

$$= \frac{40 - 10}{48} = \frac{30}{48} = 0.63$$

- And so, with the dummy scores in this example, the Weighted Mean would be 0.63.

---

[3] A **weighted mean** (or weighted average) is like a simple average except that, instead of assuming that all of the values being averaged are equally important (and so have equal weight), some of the values are more important (so have more weight) than others.