

CLAVERDON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN GROUP

Minutes of Neighbourhood Plan Group Meeting 14th June 2018

Present :: Councillors David Middleton & Hazel Spiers , Mr. N. Pearce & Mr. R Lees

Apologies.

Apologies were received from Anne Marshall: Dan. O'Donnell: John Cronin: Lorna Perkins: Andrew Williams: Tony Rodger: Councillors Simon Lawton: Nick Dargan: County Councillor John Horner

1. Chairman of the Meeting

- 1.1. David Middleton offered to be Chairman of the Meeting and this was supported by Hazel Spiers

2. Minutes of the last meeting

- 2.1. No minutes of the previous meeting were offered for approval
- 2.2. Thanks to Robert Lees for attending to ensure a smooth hand over to Margo Key

3. Recommendations from Neil Pearce

- 3.1. After reviewing the document of comments made by Stratford District Council (SDC), Neil made recommendations as to the tasks to be undertaken as follows

4. Enhancing the NP for evidence

- 4.1. The NP needs to be enhanced by referencing the facts back to the evidence that has been gathered – ie from the questionnaires & responses received during the process of compiling the NP. The Group need to do this in conjunction with actions required under actions below & at points 9 & 10

5. Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB)

- 5.1. SDC has a different BUAB to that shown in the NP. Neil advised that SDC will object unless the BUAB is exactly as they determine. Neil recommends that the Claverdon NP designate the boundary simply as a "Development Boundary" showing where development can happen, and not as a BUAB. Neil will argue for our case as he has done so for other neighborhoods. Action for Neil - to do the more justification for our BUAB boundary to remain as shown, but under the designation of a Development Boundary.

6. The relationship between the NP & The Village Design Statement. (VDS)

- 6.1. The VDS is not part of the NP, but the principles of the VDS are shown at Appendix 1 – pages 31&32.
- 6.2. The NP, once in place carries more weight than the VDS, and the VDS may be disregarded entirely after the NP is in place. How much weight do you want to give to the VDS in the NP – ie attached in electronic form to the NP for full reading because you want it to have ongoing weight, or extract what is required from the VDS for the NP, and reference it as an evidence source and be aware that the importance of the VDS will decline.
- 6.3. David recommended 2 people undertake a project to work through the VDS and the NP and ensure that the NP captures everything it should from the VDS with supporting reasons, and then recommend to the Group the next best steps for the VDS and how it is used going forward & as supporting evidence in the NP.

7. SDC comments document requires removal of LGS's from the NP

- 7.1. SDC require the Local Green Spaces designated under CLAV 1,6,7,8, &9 to be removed. Residents have submitted responses objecting to CLAV 6&8 and have requested removal.
- 7.2. **CLAV 1** – Yarningale Common. Despite the many qualities of the site, SDC require its removal as LGS because of its size (almost as large as the residential area of the parish) and that it is not located at the heart of the residential community. Both of these criteria are lawful reasons to deny the location as a LGS.
- 7.3. Concern over losing 5 sites as LGS. – As the sites are designated Greenbelt in any event, they do not require the protection of LGS status. It will not enhance the sites in any way and therefore Neil recommends following SDC requirement and taking them out as resistance would be futile. This also satisfies the 2 requests of residents for other reasons. Action point – NP Group to meet and document their decision on the LGS
- 7.4. The other sites designated as LGS, are to stay are CLAV 2,3 ,4,5 & 10.
- 7.5. The meeting expressed thanks to Lorna Perkins for all her hard work on the LGS sites.
- 7.6. That the areas proposed for LGS will still have significant protection as they are within the Green Belt.

8. Email from John Cronin following his discussion with Snitterfield Councillor Kimberley.

- 8.1. Neil does not see that there is anything to consider and the definition of “Limited Infill” is defined in CS10 and in case law.
- 8.2. In terms of CS10 and the NPPF, Neil will deal with the SDC comments recorded under “4.0 Housing “page 7, para 4.3 and will review that point in conjunction with “limited infill”.

9. Resident & Society/Organization Responses.

- 9.1. Claverdon Station – The meeting noted that Steve Burman had attended the Parish Council Meeting and advised that the Railway Franchise had made contact and that as the landowners they were not against the possibility of the idea of a carpark. The responses from residents included objections to a car park at the station. Neil reminded the group that the insertion was under the Appendix 2 – Community Aspirations.
- 9.2. It was agreed that Neil would change the wording in the NP document from – “The Parish Council will seek to obtain planning permission to build a car park adjacent to Claverdon Station....” to reflect the support of the Parish Council for a car park under certain circumstances and to reflect that this is an aspiration.
- 9.3. The NP Group need to check the accuracy of the responses and decide from the feed back what amendments will be made to the NP. The document circulated by John Cronin to the Group headed “Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan – Comments received from Pre-submission Consultation” has a box after each submission “*Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response*.” It is recommended that each member of the Group read and determine what changes they would like to see before attending the next meeting. Action – NP Group

10. Working Document – The’ recommendations -

- 10.1. At the next Meeting the Group are to compile a list of changes from the *Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan – Comments received from Pre-submission Consultation* and apply them to the NP document. The changes must be done under the “track changes” mode within the Word Document
- 10.2. The SDC Comments document already has highlighted the minor amendments and the Steering Group response of “Amendment acceptable”. These are to be applied to the NP in the same way as 10.1.
- 10.3. All changes must be considered along with the evidence gathered and referenced back to that evidence wherever possible
- 10.4. The Group should review the remainder of the comments made by SDC and show

on that document the changes that they agree and those they disagree with. The document should be submitted to Neil for review before any amendments are made to the NP, along with the partially amended NP.

- 10.5. Neil will then do a technical reword of the document and provide recommendations against the remainder of the rejected comments from SDC.
- 10.6. Neil advised that changes to the document was a 2-person task.

11. Next Steps in the Process after the above is completed -

- 11.1. Once there is a clean version of the NP ratified by the Group, it will be submitted to the Parish Council for approval.
- 11.2. This document will then form the *Submission Document* to go to SDC.
- 11.3. The Group must produce a *Consultation Statement*. Neil recommends the Group google this and produce their own statement from the template provided. Action for NP Group.
- 11.4. Neil will do the technical parts and produce the *Basic Condition Statement* showing how all the conditions of producing the NP have been met.

- 12. **Dates for next Meeting** – to be circulated shortly – but all agreed that another meeting must be held soon and preferably before the end of June to allot tasks and projects. The meeting concluded at 8pm.