

**MINUTES
BERRICK SALOME PARISH COUNCIL
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP
15TH JANUARY 2019**

A Meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group ('the Group') was held in the Berrick Salome Village Hall on Tuesday 15TH January 2019 at 7:30 pm.

Present:

Brian Tracey (BT) (Chair)
Ian Glyn (IG) (Chairman - Parish Council)
Chris Cussens (CC) (Parish Clerk)
Conrad Shields (CS)
Ray Perfect (RP)
Sarah Russell (SR)
Derek Shaw (DS)
Douglas Taylor (DT)
Chris Kilduff (CK)
Sue Lyons (SL)
Sarah Vaccari (SV)
Neil Homer (NH) (Oneil-Homer, planning consultants)

1. Apologies for Absence

All present.

2. Declarations 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of which a planning application (P13/S2758/FUL) for a new dwelling had been submitted to SODC in 2013 but subsequently withdrawn prior to determination.

IG declared a beneficial interest in an agricultural field in Berrick Salome located to the rear of the 'Old Post Office' and opposite St Helens Church. **IG** confirmed that neither he nor the co-owner would raise any objection to the field being designated as a 'Green Space'.

3. Minutes of Previous Meeting

The Minutes of the previous meeting, held on 13TH November 2018, were unanimously approved.

4. Matters arising from the Minutes

None.

5. To receive planning consultant's observations on the responses to s.14 consultation

NH tabled a brief summary (copy annexed hereto) of his observations on the responses received to date from statutory consultees. The meeting noted that the policies in Section 5, were the most significant part of the

plan and of these, BER1 was key. He went on to recommend modifications to the various plan policies as set out below:

5.1 BER1

NH recommended reviewing the proposed Settlement Boundaries against the criteria that had been used to define them. However, a majority of Members expressed little appetite for making alterations to the boundaries as presently proposed.

5.2 BER2 - 6

NH advised that these policies currently lacked supporting evidence and should:

- make liberal reference to the 'SODC Design Guide';
- try to use non-prescriptive expressions such as 'have regard to';
- be consistent with the Character Appraisal (which itself will need to be amended to inform the design approach in terms of window styles, roofs, etc.).

Action: BT, NH

5.3 BER8

NH recommended either deleting or re-writing this policy because it conflicts with SODC Local Plan policy. The meeting decided to **delete** policy BER8.

5.4 BER9

NH recommended including any notable views looking *into* the parish viewed from public vantage points inside the parish boundary. Proof must be provided, in the usual way, that any chosen view is indeed notable and as such merits inclusion in the plan.

Action: SR, SV, RP (photos) , BT (mapping).

5.5 BER10

NH reminded the meeting that justification must be provided for designating a tract of land as a 'Green Space' in accordance with the criteria set out in NPPF 2018 para 100 which states that the land must meet three criteria:

- a) is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
- b) is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and
- c) is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

It was decided that the tracts of land proposed for designation as 'Green Space' be reviewed against the NPPF criteria and be either retained or deleted accordingly.

Action: DT (Roke & Roke Marsh), **IG** (Berrick Salome/Prior)

5.6 BER13

NH advised re-drafting this policy to remove emotive issues and to provide adequate supporting evidence.

Action: NH, IG (obtain supporting evidence from PC's 'Traffic Group', etc.)

5.7 BER15

Change so as the policy refers to water only rather than to infrastructure in general. **Action: NH**

6. To consider responses to informal consultation on draft pre-submission plan

IG tabled a document, 'Consultation Statement draft 6b - Int', copies of which had previously been circulated to Members.

IG made notes for his own use in relation to this item and as such are not reproduced here. In particular, **IG** requested **NH** to comment upon consultee observations 14/12a to 14/12e (Respondent: Liam Tiller) and 03/1a to 03/1c (Respondent: Andrew Partis) . **Action: NH, CC, IG**

Regarding 14/12b and 03/1c **IG** suggested that the Rokemarsh settlement boundary could be adjusted. **DT** asked **NH** whether Rokemarsh in its entirety could simply be treated as being in 'open country' thereby dispensing with the need to designate a settlement boundary at all (reason - SODC's 'Settlement Assessment Background Paper 2018' lists Rokemarsh as not included in the Settlement Hierarchy because it is "not considered a suitable location for development"). **NH** advised that: "the use of boundaries does not affect the status of the villages in the hierarchy, it just brings clarity to their form."

10/01 (Respondent: John Bird) **CK** reported that a poll of the local community living in the immediate area found 16 in favour of designating the land as 'Green Space' and 1 against. **BT** commented that the Roke settlement boundary could be adjusted to include the land in question. The meeting decided to retain the 'Green Space' designation provided it could be shown to meet NPPF criteria (see item 5.5, above) **Action: DT**

7. To discuss a plan of action for the development of the submission plan and supporting documentation

It was agreed that, for the time being, **SL** will carry on 'managing the writing/revising process' for the plan documentation that she has been doing up until now.

- 7.1 Plan, Sections 1 and 5. **NH** undertook to produce new versions of Sections 1 and 5 and forward both, in editable form, to **SL**. **Action: NH**
- 7.2 Plan Section 2. Review (and amend if thought necessary) history details in light of consultation comments received on subject. **Action: DS**
- 7.3 Plan Section 3 relevant parts need revision to reflect policies in the final s.19 version of the emerging local plan 2034. **Action: DT**
- 7.4 Evidence Base Report. Amend the Character Appraisal in connection with item 5.2 above.
- 7.5 Consultation Statement. Compile a schedule of consultees' observations (from both the informal and the formal s.14 consultations) and propose responses thereto. **Action: CC, IG and NH.**
- 7.6 Basic Conditions Statement. **NH** agreed to draft the statement and then forward it to **SL**. **Action: NH.**
- 7.7 Review of draft plan by SODC. It was suggested that it might be prudent to afford SODC an opportunity to comment on a late draft version of the plan documentation. However, some Members expressed concern that SODC might not respond quickly thereby delaying completion of the documents. **Action:** Decision deferred until next meeting.
- 7.8 Document Quality Assurance. The meeting agreed that the final drafts of the documentation should be proof read by suitable person(s) outside the Group. Craig Tribe (the PC Treasurer) was nominated as one possible proof reader subject to his availability - **IG** confirmed he would ask him. **Action: IG**
- 7.9 Timescales. **IG** suggested that the Group should aim to be in a position to submit the final draft of the plan documentation to the PC in time for scrutiny at the next PC meeting on 14 March.

8. AOB

- 8.1 During a preamble at the start of the meeting **NH** mentioned that following submission of the plan to SODC and prior to examination SODC will organise a six week public consultation (any consultation responses received by SODC will be forwarded directly to the Examiner). **DT** asked if there were any circumstances under which SODC could decline to take the plan forward to examination. **NH** advised that: "SODC can only reject an NP if the examiner

recommends that too - it cannot prevent an examination provided the submitted paperwork is in order".

8.2 **NH** suggested that once the plan is ready for submission to SODC it would be worth the PC giving consideration to circulating an informative note or newsletter to parishioners summarising the key points of the plan and advising them that they will have a further opportunity to comment upon it *via* the public consultation organised by SODC.

8.3 **NH** remarked that he thought it unlikely there would any need for him to attend future Group meetings.

9. Next meeting

The date for the next meeting is Tuesday, 12TH February 2019 at 7:30pm, to be held in the rear meeting room of the Berrick Salome Village Hall.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9:50 pm.

Signed Chairman

Date

ANNEX to agenda Item 5 - consultant's observations on the responses to s.14 consultation

BERRICK SALOME PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

REGULATION 14 PRE-SUBMISSION PLAN REVIEW (JANUARY 2019)

KEY POINTS RAISED

- BER1 - SODC ok with boundaries but note comment on agricultural buildings (Recommend – review boundary versus criteria)
- BER2 – delete ‘contemporary architecture’ and simplify (Recommend – modify along lines suggested and fill evidence gaps on items not yet in the character appraisal)
- BER3 – BER6 – more evidence in appraisal to justify details and needs clearer explanation and citation of character appraisal and some rewording – disagree that policies are not policies - not sure SODC has understood the process and intent (Recommend – modify along lines suggested and fill evidence gaps on items not yet in the character appraisal – follow up explanation to SODC on process and intent)
- BE7 – SODC and Ridge not understood policy or appear to know about NPPF 2018 §71 (Recommend – follow up explanation to SODC)
- BE8 – not consistent with SODC LP policy so delete or major rewrite (Recommend – unless very keen to keep and modify then delete and rely on new LP policies)
- BE9 – improve views evidence (Recommend – modify along lines suggested and fill evidence gaps)
- BE10 – improve LGSs evidence (Recommend – modify along lines suggested and fill evidence gaps)
- BE13 – not policy but infrastructure and missing empirical evidence – if not evidence then delete and cover in Section 6 as potential S106/CIL projects (Recommend – either provide traffic etc evidence and leave as policy or move to Section 6)

GENERAL

- Add some AONB references and consider value of views into village (AONB)
- Reference listed buildings in plan doc and heritage in the Vision (HE)
- Update policy context section to reference final SODC LP Reg 19 version
- General tidying of policy wording and references

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Agree SG response to key points raised
- If key points of disagreement then arrange meeting with SODC to resolve
- Complete evidence improvements as suggested
- Complete consultation schedule of responses and append to Consultation Statement