

MINUTES
BERRICK SALOME PARISH COUNCIL
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP
5th March 2019

A meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group was held at the Berrick & Roke Village Hall on Tuesday 5th March 2019 at 7.30 pm.

Present:

Ian Glyn (IG) (Chairman – Parish Council)
Ray Perfect (RP)
Sarah Russell (SR)
Brian Tracey (BT)
Sue Lyons (SL)

1. Apologies for Absence

Douglas Taylor (DT)
Chris Cussens (CC)
Sarah Vaccari (SV)
Chris Kilduff (CK)
Conrad Shields (CS)
Derek Shaw (DS)

2. Declaration of Interests

SL declared a beneficial interest in a paddock in respect of which a planning application (P13/S2758/FUL) for a new dwelling had been submitted to SODC in 2013 but subsequently withdrawn prior to determination.

3. Minutes of Previous Meeting

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 12th February 2019, were approved and signed by the Chairman.

4. Matters arising from the Minutes

All Matters Arising have been dealt with and are reflected in the drafts of all the documents that are to be approved (amended as appropriate as a result of tonight's meeting) by Parish Councillors on 14/3. DT's comments re settlement boundaries were noted and would be dealt with later in the meeting.

RP stated that he thought that the Allotments should be included as a Green Space. This to be covered later in the meeting.

Re 5.3, NH has received written confirmation from SODC that the indicative Housing Requirement from Berrick Salome is zero. --Note -- the same correspondence from SODC stated that Berrick Salome had been incorrectly classified as "other village" in the draft of the Local Plan and that it would be reclassified as " smaller village" in future drafts.

5. Settlement Boundary and Green Space Designation in Roke

DT had proposed that the fisheries be taken out of the Green Space designation but that the two other plots in Roke (including the plot which is currently the subject of enforcement action) be included.

The meeting was content with the designation of the plot by the HSH on the basis proposed.

A discussion followed re the plot along the footpath to the allotments and the inclusion in that designation of the plot adjoining the road. IG reported on the concerns/ views expressed to his fellow Councillor Ellie Cross about this issue and reported Neil Homer's written advice on the subject (see Appendix below these minutes).

The meeting felt unanimously that the inclusion of the plot by the road risked the Inspector questioning the integrity of other allocations (and particularly that of the remainder of that plot).

The concerns of local residents were understood, and it was suggested that a meeting be convened urgently to discuss the matter and better explain the issues. IG to arrange.

In the meanwhile, the meeting decided to exclude the plot by the road from the designation, relying on it being outside the settlement boundary to protect against inappropriate development -- following NH's advice on the matter.

Furthermore, it was felt that the worth and integrity of the Designation of Green Space to the plot remaining would be enhanced if RP's thoughts re the Allotments were adopted as, by doing so, an important and well used corridor between Roke and Berrick Salome would be preserved. It was felt that to do so would deliver on the wishes of parishioners (as expressed in the '17 questionnaire) that footpaths / connecting walkways should be preserved and enhanced

So, decision taken that the plot remaining and the Allotments be designated, separately, as a Green Space.

6. Settlement Boundaries in Berrick Salome

DT asked that the meeting consider two issues concerning the Berrick Salome settlement boundary: -

6.1) Doesn't the way the boundary is currently drawn leave too many opportunities for development?

The meeting considered that:

- This matter had been debated at length in recent months
- Rules for the definition of the settlement boundaries had been agreed and were included in the drafting of the Plan documentation
- These rules had been applied correctly
- The boundaries proposed had been approved by a vote amongst the team members with all except DT agreeing them.
- The exercise of defining settlement boundaries should not be driven by a desire to stop or restrict development where appropriate. Rather it is designed to clearly create and define the four settlements in the Parish -- in pursuit of the direction given to the NP team by the '17 questionnaire
- The definition of the settlement boundaries should properly reflect the individual character of the Settlements.
- If development opportunities emerged as a result of the exercise to define the settlements - then " so be it" - again in pursuit of the direction given by the '17 questionnaire and also by the SODC Local Plan in the context of windfall / infill development.

So, the meeting concluded that the answer to DT's question was " No"-- noting DT's view to the contrary.

6.2) Exclude the paddock to the rear of 'Crickhollow' because it does not conform to the criteria for inclusion, is contrary to NH's advice and choosing to retain it within the boundary opens the Steering Group to accusations of 'cronyism'.

The meeting considered that

- This matter had been debated and decided upon many times over the past months
- SL had correctly distanced herself from any decisions on this matter given her declared conflict
- The proposed boundary followed strong natural features - in this case a water course and reflected the triangular (Y shaped) nature of the settlement
- To exclude it by creating an artificial zig zag in to Weller Close would create a precedent for zig zagging that should then be applied elsewhere in the Parish to specifically exclude land which might otherwise be appropriate for development.
- The plot in question would still be subject to other policies in the context of its development potential - and most particularly its ability to demonstrate that it was infill versus backfill
- The fact that NH had promoted an alternative treatment was a factor to consider but, as NH had himself said, "The Plan belongs to the Parish not to him" and there is evidence, elsewhere in the drawing of the settlement boundaries, where the team have taken a different approach to that initially proposed by NH (ie outlying buildings)

So, the meeting concluded unanimously that the inclusion of the paddock in question was appropriate given all the circumstances --noting DT's view to the contrary.

7. Review/ Sense Check of the Documentation by Craig Tribe

The team were grateful to Craig for his review and the points he has raised will be incorporated in to future drafts.

8. Next Steps

The meeting concluded that the Plan documentation (as amended by the decisions taken at this meeting should be passed to Councillors for scrutiny and (if they see fit) for approval and onward transmission to SODC.

DT's suggestion that the Plan was not ready for Approval was noted but, in the absence of specific notification of where it was deficient and where improvements could be made, the meeting decided to proceed as above.

In coming to that conclusion, the meeting was conscious of the hard work that the team had put in to date, the momentum and the process so created and the danger of further delay in the context of third-party activity as witnessed of late in Roke.

9. Date of Next Meeting

No further meeting was fixed but it was noted that the team would have to reconvene if Councillors were not happy to approve the Plan to be put before them and, in any event, to marshal support for the Plan prior to the Referendum on it.

All members of the team were also asked to attend (if possible) the forthcoming PC meeting (March 14th) at which the Plan was to be considered.

Appendix

From: NEIL HOMER <neil@oneillhomer.co.uk>

Date: 5 March 2019 at 12:33:42 GMT

To: Ian Glyn <chairman@berrickandroke.org.uk>, Brian Tracey <Brian.Tracey@leslie-jones.co.uk>, Sue Lyons <sue@lyonsmarketing.com>

Subject: FW: Green space. Roke.

All - to be clear, my view is that the original LGS proposal would be unlikely to be supported by an examiner, but the recent changes made to the plot closest to the Roke Road will make the argument even harder to win. To restate, securing an LGS designation of the land would only have been desirable, not essential. Drawing it outside the boundary is essential. Regards, Neil

On 05/03/2019, 10:49, "NEIL HOMER" <neil@oneillhomer.co.uk> wrote:

Ian,

The LGS proposal - I've advised that in our experience, examiners are more persuaded by the 'less is more' approach, which is seen as credible provided the evidence is there to back it up. As you say, I have my doubts about all of this land meeting the LGS tests but I understand your position.

I also agree that the plot is not included in the boundary as the land does not form part of the existing observed built up area of Roke. Given the consequence of a planning application being outside the defined boundary, that would be the stronger policy defence. However, your NP will not carry its full weight until made, so you'll have to hope that SODC refuses an application, anticipating that if appealed the NP will have been made by the time the appeal is heard and the appeal will be dismissed.

Given its importance, you should also seek the advice of SODC, rather than rely on mine alone, as these things will be their call in the end.

Regards,

Neil

oneill homer