

Wellington Heath Neighbourhood Development Plan 2018 Review

Minutes of Virtual Working Group Meeting 21st May 2020

Participating: David Williams (DW), Peter Constantine (PC), Colin Davis (CD), Frank Rozelaar (FR), Tony Cooke (TC), Richard Hurley (RH).

Agenda Item	Minutes	By Whom
1	<p>The virtual meeting via Zoom started at 7.30pm with DW as host who welcomed everyone.</p> <p>DW explained the Parish Council had agreed that the NDP should be reviewed during 2020/21 in view of the possibility that it could be contested at some point after two years since it was adopted (October 2018).</p> <p>As specified in paras. 73-75 of the 2019 NPPF, HC is required to have a five year housing land supply and a minimum target of 95% delivery. (HC current delivery is around 74%). This puts pressure on HC to find and ensure development of additional sites in the review of their Core Strategy. It is important to ensure the NDP maintains 100% strength rather than deteriorate after two years. Para.14 of the 2019 NPPF is relevant in this respect.</p> <p>The objective is to “tune” the NDP to make it more robust and up to date, addressing any shortfall in housing if appropriate, updating housing statistics and including any relevant amendments suggested by HC.</p> <p>It was expected a “light touch” approach would be used rather than a significant redrafting of the Plan which would require resubmission at Reg 16 to HC with the possibility of another referendum if the Examiner so decided.</p>	
2	PC was confirmed as Chairman with RH taking the minutes	
3	The method of communicating was discussed and it was agreed for participants to raise hands to indicate the desire to speak.	
4	Apologies: None Declarations of interest: None	
5	<p>PC asked for each participant to express their own thoughts and after general discussion it was agreed to proceed with the review using the “light touch” approach described by DW.</p> <p>Worthy of note in the discussion was:</p> <p>5.1. HC were intending to review their Core Strategy during 2020/21 and the NDP review would have to reflect any changes to the Core Strategy.</p> <p>5.2. It was not expected changes to the Core Strategy would impose an obligation on small parishes like Wellington Heath to inflate their housing targets.</p> <p>5.3. Funding was available via HC if a fundamental redesign of the Plan was expected with resubmission at Reg 14 or 16 and referendum.</p> <p>5.4. The term “Local distinctiveness” was not included in the new NPPF.</p> <p>5.5. Developers had not contacted the PC direct to clarify aspects of the NDP. Any questions were dealt with by HC as and when planning applications were proposed or made.</p> <p>5.6. The extent to which developers were influenced by the affects of the Coronavirus was discussed. It was felt there was sufficient pent-up demand for housing that a resurgence of the property market was likely soon.</p> <p>DW had agreed to inform Karla Johnson (HC) when we had agreed the scope of the review.</p>	DW

6	<p>HC's Development Management Team had made a few comments/suggestions regarding the current NDP. In particular Policy WH6, HC and AONB Highway Design Guides, the 2019 NPPF and WH11. It was agreed these areas would be looked at initially and also an update of policies generally including Policy WH18 (mobile phone and broadband services).</p> <p>With regard to highway design and any conflict between HC and the AONB documents it was suggested a hierarchy of such documents could be included but a review and action plan was suggested.</p> <p>Revisions incorporating the new NPPF would initially involve a "word search" to identify where reference had been made.</p> <p>It was accepted a minimum time requirement (12 months) for marketing the community asset in Policy WH11 was required.</p>	
7	<p>The tables produced by PC and HC for housing completions and deliverability of Allocated Sites were discussed.</p> <p>The planning consent at Squires Mount was no longer relevant as the plot had been divided into gardens.</p> <p>Three of the Allocated Sites had been sold to developers and it was expected the sites would be developed very soon. The "Sumner site" application was "on hold" for additional information. The Sumner family would need contacting again.</p> <p>It was expected the overall target of 28/29 additional houses would be exceeded by a small margin well within the Plan period.</p>	
8	<p>It was agreed:</p> <p>CD and RH would meet to discuss a review of the Highway Guides having regard to more recent documents (including Manual for Streets 2).</p> <p>FR would look at the effect of the new NPPF on the NDP.</p> <p>PC and DW would contact the Sumner family regarding Allocated Site 23.</p> <p>TC would look again at all policies to see if any needed updating (such as WH18).</p> <p>With regard to the comments made by HC's development Manager on policy WH6, DW would seek to clarify exactly what was required.</p>	<p>CD/RH</p> <p>FR</p> <p>PC/DW</p> <p>TC</p> <p>DW</p>
9	<p>Communication with parishioners was discussed. It was agreed that until we had progressed further with proposals for the review it was not necessary to inform parishioners. At some stage an article in the newsletter might be appropriate.</p> <p>In view of the fact that the new draft Core Strategy would not be available until well into 2021 any communication was premature.</p>	
10	FR had volunteered to be editor of the NDP review.	FR
11	<p>No date for the next meeting was agreed. In view of the current social distancing measures and the work allocated to each member it was agreed to hold the next meeting in approximately six weeks' time. In the meantime communication would be by email.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 9.14pm.</p>	

Documents distributed for the meeting:

1. Agenda.
2. HCC Guidance Notes Ref an NDP Review.
3. HCC NDP Dept. feedback.
4. Emails from Karla Johnson.

5. PMC's and HC's Charts ref houses built/anticipated in present planning period.
6. NPPF 2019