

**The Winterbournes Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG)  
Minutes of the 35th meeting held on 26 June 2017**

**Attendance:** Andrew Argyle (AA) Chair, Gaenor Nokes (GN), Barry Lake (BL), Chris Campbell-Jones (CCJ), Charlie Bruce-White (CB-W), Peter Biggins (PB), Dan Steadman (DS) and Richard Folkes (RF). In addition, Anna McBride (AM), Link Officer.

**Apologies received from:** Maureen Atkinson (MA)

**Part 1**

1. AA welcomed Anna McBride, Wiltshire Council NP Link Officer, to the first part of the meeting with the aim of hearing her views on the validity of the NPSG's activities to date. Consequently, a number of issues were discussed:

a. The housing allocation for the Winterbournes would appear to be in the region of 23/24 but AM explained that there was no definitive figure because the total number allocated of 108 (ref: Housing Land Supply Statement) was to be shared across the whole of the Amesbury Community Area (ie 108/5). However, she was broadly content with our thinking and confirmed the validity of the housing allocation requirement up to 2026.

b. AM had seen the NPSG's 3\4 site allocations which would provide for 23/24 new houses and she confirmed that the assessment work carried out CB-W was good. In proposing the 4 sites, it will be essential to provide strong evidence as to why the other sites are considered to be unacceptable, especially as the Village Questionnaire exercise had placed one site ahead of the others but the NPSG had assessed it as unsustainable. All sites must have been assessed fairly, equally and with transparency. In her view, the NPSG has been using the correct criteria in assessing the various sites and she warned that we must continue to be consistent in how we apply them. It would be easier for parishioners to understand our recommendations if the headline results of the assessments, with the criteria applied, could be written in tabular format. The finer details could be read in the supporting reports, if necessary.

c. AM advised that environmental assessments should be completed fully before deciding on preferred sites. It would be feasible to provide villagers with the assessments, hold a public meeting to discuss the pros and cons of each site and then make a decision on the preferred sites through a further questionnaire. However, in essence, the core (13 houses) of the Winterbournes' housing allocation is recommended to be sited at S90 and this can be presented at the public meeting on 7 Oct 17 for acceptance or not. AM advised that the NPSG will have to demonstrate why the whole of the SHLAA site at S90 is not being considered to accommodate more than 13 new homes. Reasons include the pig farm exclusion zone designation and that houses would be built at the lowest elevation.

d. AM advised that where the Environment Agency had rejected sites (eg the pig farm exclusion zone), it was for the NPSG to challenge the decision if the NP had an opposing view.

e. AM was asked if there were any definitive reasons why Wiltshire Council would reject a proposed site. She advised that an example would be a County Wildlife Site, such as the land adjacent to Marsh Motors, Winterbourne Gunner (N3). Other examples are, whether a site can be accessed, whether parts of a site are subject to flooding, and whether a site is considered to be too far from the village centre (drawing on demographics/social mobility aspects). In cases where a hamlet lay away from the main village, for instance, the council would not expect to see very much new build there for reasons of sustainability. The rationale for building houses near the centre of a village is based on easy access to amenities, school, public transport, footpaths etc.

f. AM advised that one of the advantages of allocating a larger site such as S90 was the possibility of including affordable housing.

g. AM confirmed that if the village had an adopted NP, the community would receive directly 25% of the Community Infrastructure Levy, based on a square metre formula, and only 15% without one. The Council would wish to see what community projects would be likely to be funded from the 25% windfall which is paid by the developer.

h. On the SEA issue, AM confirmed that a response from David Stuart of Historic England remained outstanding. She had forwarded the 3/4 proposed sites to Historic England, the Environment Agency and Natural England. The last two have responded with no concerns.

i. AM advised that when submitting our draft NP to the Wiltshire Council planning authority, the NPSG will need to furnish a Consultation Statement (with a summary of responses received), a Basic Conditions Statement (evidence of conformity with national and strategic policies & EU obligations and contribution to the achievement of sustainable development), SEA (if required), and a plan of the NP area. The draft NP will be examined by Wiltshire Council after it has been presented to the community. The various stages were mentioned:- the Village Meeting on 7 Oct, circulation of the first draft of the NP, a simple questionnaire with a date for the return of comments, a final draft for formal assessment by the Council, including its own six week consultation, assessment by the examiner and finally the referendum. All information is in the public domain, including the criteria against which the examiner makes his assessment. AM would email AA detailing the road map to a referendum.

j. A question arose as to whether the information contained in the flow-chart produced by Wiltshire Council for NPs was up to date, as the pathway had previously appeared to be quite clear (as at I, above) but now there would appear to be a number of additional hoops to jump through. AW explained that these hoops pertained to public consultation (eg six weeks for the community to comment on the draft NP).

k. AM confirmed that the allocation of 108 took account of all new homes built to date and those applications for which planning permission had been given. 30% of an estate of over 10 new houses must be affordable homes. AM emphasised that the figure of 108 is not set in stone and so if the community wanted more houses, this might be achievable. On the other hand, to seek a reduction from say 24 to 15 new houses, would place the Winterbournes in a risky position with Wiltshire Council.

l. AM will consult with her Spatial Information Team to discover how the NPSG can obtain up to date Ordnance Survey maps.

m. As to common pitfalls, AM advised that we must make sure that everybody is consulted. AM will forward a list of statutory consultees.

n. AM suggested that the NPSG should read the Housing Sites Allocation Plan which includes some site assessments, including the Winterbournes, which might be of background interest. She will forward an email to CB-W with the link.

## **Part 2**

2. **Minutes of the last meeting.** The minutes of the last meeting (34th) held on 24<sup>th</sup> May 2017 were accepted and approved.

3. **Matters arising and review of Part 1.** The NPSG voiced its appreciation of the clarity with which AM had answered its questions. The key to a successful outcome would be ensuring full consultation with the community and producing a simple, easily digestible NP. It will be essential to evidence and detail the reasoning behind the NPSG's allocation of sites which, incidentally, had not been criticised in any way by AW. The criteria applied to the site assessments must be the same for all of the sites (eg an assessment of ground elevation, or access etc). A matrix would be most beneficial as the information can be read at a glance. Affordability of new houses was seen as an objective by the community in the Village Questionnaire, and so the NPSG will need to explain the rule ( ie 30% over 10) as it is unlikely that the NP will meet the expectation with an allocation of only 23/24 new houses. (NB: Down from 32 when the larger villages allocation was 128, now 108).

4. **NP Update.** Mervyn Pannett, currently in France, had been continuing to work on the chapter on Open Spaces and hoped to have a draft ready in July, 17. CB-W was working on the Housing chapter and GN was preparing a paper on the school parking issue, following her meeting with the head, for circulation to NPSG members. CJ had met with the owners of the Village Post Office and Store who expanded on their comments in the Village Questionnaire (NB: A note of the meeting has been filed in Dropbox) and a further meeting to learn more about a possible grant from the Post Office is planned. RF confirmed that the draft list of NP Projects had been discussed at the Parish Council meeting, including cycle paths, car parking, community orchard and amenity areas. The Parish Council would be looking for land based projects only.

## **5. Planning Applications.**

a. Black Horse Lane (16/1098/FUL). No change. Awaiting decision.

b. Briar Cottage (17/00770/OT). A decision by Wiltshire Council is due to be made by 27<sup>th</sup> June.

c. Rose Farm (17/02/198/OUT). Highways England had undertaken an average speed test in June on behalf of the developer to assist with the planning application. In addition, DS mentioned that he had put forward a planning application for a house and annex for his disabled son which, as a two storey house had been refused. A new application

for a single storey house behind the village allotments (Down Barn Road) is in course of preparation and DS will share this with the NPSG at a suitable time.

6. **AOB.** None

Next Meetings:

Monday, 31st July 2017

Monday, 11th September 2017

Saturday, 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017 (Village Meeting)

Monday, 24<sup>th</sup> October 2017