

# **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING GROUP HELD AT THE PARISH ROOM, BUCKLAND NEWTON ON TUESDAY 18 NOVEMBER 2014**

**Present:** John Baker, Nick Baker, Jacqui Cuff (Chair), Chris Osmond, Cathy Shippey (Minutes), Steve White and Jane Willis.

**Apologies:** Rodney Cuff, Chris Hildred, Trevor Marpole, John Nell, Maree Pollard, Tom Shippey, Andrew Stone and Lin Townsend.

## **Declaration of Interests:**

John Baker and Nick Baker declared an interest in Plots 9 and 10.

Neither John Baker nor Jacqui Cuff voted on any of the plots due to their involvement in discussions with landowners.

**Minutes of the Last Meeting** were approved.

**The Purpose** of this Meeting is to resolve the issue of Phasing, to clarify issues regarding Plot 2, and to outline Planning Conditions both generally and specifically.

## **Phasing:**

NB produced a map which showed the proposed new housing plots in red, and the present layout of the village in grey. The proposed plots were seen as manageable over the 15-year period, and their impact relatively minor. JB stated that if the three individual houses and the two outlying plots were excluded, then the remaining seven plots are all within Buckland Newton village. JC said that regulations, restrictions, and the personal circumstances of both landowners and the community involved must be taken into account. And we must plan for smaller housing for the elderly and infirm.

JC said that the Group has come to a good position for the Draft Plan to proceed, and there will be a further public consultation ensuring that every household can have a say. It will be last opportunity for people in the community to comment prior to the final plan being submitted for evaluation by WDDC and the Independent Examiner. The referendum (with a minimum 51% majority of voters) will be the deciding factor in the plan being adopted as a statutory planning document.

JB stated that it is up to the community to decide what will be built and when.

JC said that of the two versions of the provisional site summary, the phasing in version 2.2 was best, except that Plots 5 and 6 had been allotted to Phase 3, when perhaps this affordable housing could be built sooner rather than later.

CS said that if Plot 1 were to be developed first, due to the apparent need for a property adapted for disability, why would Plot 2 need to be placed in Phase 1 per Version 3.2. JC indicated that in version 2.2, Plot 2 is in Phase 3. NB asked if CS should declare an interest, but she declined. JB said that the owner of Derriman Cottage had said that she didn't mind being opposite the existing property. CS still thought the land elevation is set too high for any building because of the question of 'overlooking'.

SW queried the need for three phases rather than two, because of difficulty in choosing between the 2 versions. JB replied that as certain plots will have a mixture of affordable and open market houses and it was a case of trying to get a balance of numbers of each type being built in each phase and ensuring that there was no risk a lack of incentive for landowners to deliver on the affordable element, once the open market houses had been built.

JC commented that there are 10 households currently registered on the WDDC list and suspect more people will join the Housing List once they know that affordable housing is proposed here. Currently the Neighbourhood Plan has the possibility of delivering 22 affordable houses in the next 15 years.

SW stated that Damian Brothers had requested that monitoring of buildings and construction taking place to ensure that the affordable housing ratio would meet the requirement of 55% of the running total of properties being built. JB stated that the final plan would do its best to accommodate.

JB said that Planning Permission is valid for three years at a time.

NB then suggested phasing according to the plots belonging to the three landowners offering plots, eg. calling plots 5 and 6 one site; plots 2 and 3 one site; Plot 1 one site; and Plot 7 a fourth site, a condition being that on any one site, building of open market housing doesn't exceed affordable. There was insufficient support for this idea.

JC reminded the Group that Plot 5 is likely to be sold to a social housing provider/landlord anyway, which builds affordable houses only. She also stated that any plot in the area could be identified as an 'exception site' at any time, ie. a plot where affordable houses could be built. The Neighbourhood Plan allows for the community to have considerable say in numbers of properties etc being built on the sites identified.

JW thought that a natural progression would be 'ribbon development', which may slow traffic on the B3143. Some feedback received was opposed to such development, but not a significant number.

JC then stated that landowners would not necessarily be building all houses at once on a certain plot, but rather over the 15-year period, and NB gave Plot 6 as an example.

JW asked if the community could be asked to rank the order of building.

JC asked if there should be phasing at all; JB replied that the main concern is to build more affordable housing; JC stated that would occur organically as all landowners have expressed a genuine commitment to affordable housing and historically development has not occurred all in one go. A long discussion occurred where the various options were discussed including an alternative phasing suggested by CS.

A vote was taken, with 2 votes for phasing and 5 votes for building organically. It was therefore agreed that building will be done organically and this will go forward into the Draft Plan for further comment.

JC said that building of affordable houses will be maintained, and that the landowner(s) of plots only containing affordable housing *want* that type of housing, and no other.

CS asked if all of one landowner's plots would be developed consecutively, and JC said 'No, it is unlikely due to the costs, planning permission timescales and landowners own circumstances'.

CO asked if the 15-year period of building could be extended. JB replied that a new Neighbourhood Plan would be necessary to determine any other development outside of the defined Development Boundary. JC said that it could be that nationally we possibly could have more housing 'forced upon us' anyway, alternatively there could be a radical change of policy in the opposite direction. However, all parties have agreed to abide by the new local and neighbourhood plans, regardless of who is in power.

JB said that when a Planning Application is lodged, there will be consultation, advertising, formal notice of building plus correspondence to adjacent neighbours.

SW asked that if the plan is to build organically, how would that ensure that affordable housing will be built. JC replied that this is already stipulated in the Local and Draft Neighbourhood Plan. NB said that we can add a planning stipulation that no open market house will be occupied until affordable houses are allocated on a mixed development.

JC stated that Jo Witherden will be informed of the decision to build organically.

JC will investigate whether or not a semi-detached property could comprise one affordable home and one open market home, rather than two of one type.

## **Planning Policies**

JB distributed a comprehensive list of planning policies to be included in the Draft Plan. There would be separate policies for each plot on the items and points listed therein. SW requested a clause regarding light pollution be added to the Draft.

JB will liaise with Jo Witherden on all points listed in his draft planning policies document. She will be asked also to clarify issues such as parking allocation and spacing, garages, and green spaces, this last item not necessarily reflecting what is in the Local Plan. JC suggested insertion of a special clause to protect the Parish Field as a minimum stipulation.

## **Date of Next Meeting**

To be advised.

The meeting closed at 9.50pm.

CS 19/11/14