

South Leverton 7th NP Steering Group Meeting

Thursday 4th October '18

Agenda

- 1 Apologies for absence
- 2 Members Present
- 3 Impact of the revised Neighbourhood Plan Policy Framework
- 4 Call for Sites
- 5 Grant Application
- 6 The Next Phase of Activity
- 6 AOB
- 7 DONM

Discussion

1 Apologies

Lisa Hughes had emailed to say that she had not been able to attend this or previous meetings because of her later arrival home from work. She had enquired if future meetings could commence at 7.30pm instead of 7pm. The general opinion of the Steering Group members regrettably considered that 7.30pm would be too late and decided to continue to meet at 7pm, with an invitation for Lisa to join the meeting at 7.30pm. Dave Hampton and Jamie Spittlehouse had also submitted their apologies.

2 Members Present

Catherine Hoyle, Gerry Wareham, Andy Marsh, Gordon Muir, Terry Lickorish, Andrea Scott James, Hannah Kerley, John Landreth, BDC representatives: - Luke Brown, Will Wilson. A member of the public Roy Clegg was also present.

Nine residents were present at this meeting.

3 Impact of the revised NPPF

Will and Luke explained that the government had issued this latest version of the NPPF, the purpose of which was to determine that strategic policy making authorities should establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area, and within which strategic policies should also set out a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas to reflect the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development. BDC now have to interpret this NPPF and prepare for each neighbourhood area a particular required housing figure. Their intention would be to determine this requirement in conjunction with each Steering Group, recognising there would be 2 housing figures for each area, namely a required minimum number of new houses to be built, along with a maximum target figure. Luke and Will advised this maximum figure would remain at 20% of the dwellings at the time of the NP preparation. In the case of South Leverton, the target figure would remain at 40 or so, and given that the SL NP included for this figure then there would be no effective impact. Members commented that the number of new houses planned in their NP and ultimately built would depend on a number of factors, e.g. the number and area of available sites, and after

approval of the NP the interest of developers in building on the designated sites in accordance with the number and type of houses specified by the village residents. At this early stage members considered that they would proceed as intended although concern was expressed with regard to the possibility of the NP identifying the number of planned houses being less than the required figure specified by BDC and hereafter further housing developments being imposed against the wishes of residents.

Roy Clegg as a member of the public expressed his concern that BDC had repeatedly failed to meet housing targets, and he questioned BDC priorities when developers wanted to specify the type of houses to be built compared with the approved NP. He also suggested that once a NP had been authorised the associated parish council should be the body to determine planning applications. Members were not supportive of this suggestion.

4 Call for Sites

Catherine itemised, on a confidential basis, the expression of interest she had received to date. She did not think it appropriate to attempt any discussion with regard to suitability until expert opinions were available, and all expressions of interest had been received. It was encouraging that a number of land owners had already come forward.

5 Grant Application

Andrew confirmed that the first application for expenses had now been submitted for authorisation. Further applications would be required for consultants, and technical advice.

6 The Next Phase of Activity

No technical survey of housing developments could be commenced until appropriate consultants were available, which could not proceed until the associated grant applications had been submitted and approved.

Action: Andrew Marsh

Luke and Will advised that whilst awaiting completion of the call for sites and appointment of consultants it would be beneficial for members to reflect on and consider development of the other wishes expressed by the residents.

Resident wishes as recorded at the 4th July meeting are repeated below for convenience of members consideration.

Residents SWOT Analysis – Strengths - The village has a good community spirit and is a friendly place to live with a pub, garage, village hall, and a historic church. **Weaknesses** - Lack of vision and initiatives, no facilities for children to play, poor maintenance of roads and footpaths, poor public transport links, inadequate NHS and state school services. **Opportunities** – Revitalise the village, improve the age mix from an aged population with new housing and infrastructure to encourage younger families to live in SL, improved local transport links, development of local cycle routes and walking trails taking in wild life pastures and historic village buildings. **Threats** - There is a danger that community life as such will continue to diminish and become dormant due to an ageing demographic, coupled with a present lack of initiatives to revitalise the village population, and along with residents’ reluctance to use village existing facilities,

Residents Comments with regard to Housing Developments

- Downsizing properties to be included
- New starter homes to be included

- Developments to preserve and enhance existing character and rural feel
- Mixture of building styles to enhance individuality of appearance
- Developments be both infill and on the village outskirts
- Developments to enable residents to operate business from home
- Improved infrastructure to accommodate increased population
- Consideration of acceptable impact on access to and from housing developments
- BDC to grant planning permission in accordance with NP
- Possible village infill sites to be surveyed for suitability in consultation with land owners

Residents Comments with regard to other possible NP Developments

- Introduce traffic calming chicanes
- Develop a safe play area for children
- Vigorous pursuit of NCC for resurfacing of roads and pavements
- Creation of job opportunities following local power station closures
- Development of pleasant open spaces to encourage new residents into the village
- Development of additional resident activities with existing village facilities
- Development of environmental protection measures
- Development of a community arts and crafts facility

Increase the number of benches around the village

- Arrange more village community events
- Prepare an accurate map of the village streets, housing, historic and listed buildings

The SG were as a whole in agreement with the majority of the proposals put forward by the residents, particularly for housing developments where there was a need for older residents to have the opportunity to downsize from their present detached houses into bungalows, and to provide affordable housing to encourage the introduction of younger families into the village. A number of the residents' aspirations were directly associated with the village PC rather than the SG and ultimately the responsibility of NCC e.g traffic calming and maintenance of road surfaces.

7 AOB

There was no other business.

8 DONM

Thursday 8th Nov'18 at 7pm.

(note: the landlord of the Plough confirmed he would be able to accommodate future Steering Group meetings without charge subject to reasonable notice. What do members think? Please advise in order to make the appropriate booking.

Gerry Wareham