

Tarset and Greystead NDP Steering Group Minutes for meeting held on 23rd September 2014 at 10 am

1. Introduction and apologies

Present: Preston Hoggan (Chair), Megan Nixon, Anne Monroe, John Holland, Jenny Ludman (NNPA) and Mary Lou Downie and Kevin Tipple (NCC).

Apologies from David Watkins and Darrell Jackson.

Rex Cooper has resigned from the Group. Grateful thanks were expressed for the huge amount of work he has contributed, well in excess of that expected from his role as Secretary.

2. Minutes and Matters arising from meetings of 9th September 2014

Amendments to Draft Minutes of meeting 2nd September:

Amendments to previous minutes will be made by Megan rather than Anne.

Action: Megan

Following these amendments the minutes were agreed as a true record.

Matters arising:

Jenny and David English met Tony Gates: funding of Jenny's time as NNPA planning support is available 2 days per month until December. It was agreed to proceed on this basis, with Jenny's agreement, and revisit the issue if work pressures necessitate in future.

Map making support will be available from the Park Authority's GIS officer. It will be prudent to check that he is aware of the commitment made.

Action: Jenny to contact the GIS Officer.

Tony Gates suggested the policies should be reviewed by the Park's Development Control Officers and that NCC should review them on behalf of NNPA, to assess any strategic implications. Although both NCC Core Strategy and that of NNPA are currently being revised, it is most likely that T & G's Plan will be completed first. Input from NNPA's Landscape Architect was also offered. It was decided that policies should be firmed up before any reviews might be undertaken.

Preston has sent Spence and Dower the Donkleywood boundary map and will send them the revised Greenhaugh boundary map.

Action: Preston.

Re 4.5: Jenny reported that Chris has identified a Planning Inspector who may be willing to review the Plan on a voluntary basis. This can be pursued when a draft is available, probably at the end of November.

Re 4.3: The pre-submission draft Plan Version 1-a shows how 'non-planning' community issues can be included in the Plan. See item 4.1 below.

Re 4.5: Query re backing up Rex's records can be answered when Daryl returns

4. Discussion of Jenny Ludman's pre-submission draft Version 1-a.

4.1 The draft shows a 'skeleton' structure and some illustrative written comment.

4.2 The current skeleton structure may need to be modified after further thought about the relationship of the General Development, Lanehead and Greenhaugh Development Policies.

4.3 Jenny's next task is to review the evidence base, including community responses and Spence and Dower's work, to ensure the Plan accurately reflects them. She therefore needs the updated version of Spence & Dowers' work urgently.

Action: Preston to contact Spence & Dower to expedite delivery of the update.

4.4 'Fishing' to be removed from the employment categories on page 9.

4.5 Since preserving the tranquillity of the area is an important consideration in assessing tourism development applications, the type/use of the development is important and needs to be included on page 14 in the 'Tourism' paragraph. The same point needs to be made in the section on 'Design and Location of Development'.

4.6 It was agreed that the Plan should include a glossary.

4.7 Several documents will need to accompany the Plan at the scrutiny stage. They include:

i) A Community Engagement Statement.

Action: Megan

ii) A Sustainability Appraisal. Each policy's contribution to sustainability will be assessed as positive, negative or neutral using the list identified on page 11 of the draft Plan. The aggregate sustainability can then be assessed. This process is not included in Jenny's current agreed work. The Allendale Plan exemplifies the technique, although its content is not ideal. Sustainability is constantly being reviewed in drafting the policies, but the appraisal can be conducted at a later stage.

iii) In addition to the summary in Chapter 2, a Condition Statement will assess conformity of the Plan policies with the NPPF, NCC and NNPA core strategies. Since T & G's Plan will predate finalisation of new versions of these, it will be reviewed against the current versions.

4.8 Jenny requested help with writing the 'history' on p 24.

Action: Anne undertook this task.

4.9 There are thirteen properties in the NCC part of the Plan area. The current draft Chapter 1, page 8, suggests the area is unpopulated and should be amended to reflect this.

Action: Jenny.

4.10 Jenny asked for feedback in the next meeting on Chapter 3, page 13 re 'Issues identified by people in the local community', to suggest any improvements and ensure it is comprehensive, including non-planning actions.

Action: All.

5. Heritage Assets Policy.

A first draft was considered, with queries highlighted for discussion.

5.1 English Heritage's wording can be used

5.2 The draft policy requires developers to show no heritage asset is adversely affected by their proposed development, taking into account an eleven point list of criteria. It was suggested that the list is removed from the policy wording but it should retain a requirement to submit a heritage statement with applications which affect heritage assets or their settings.

There needs to be a trigger for such a requirement, so that developers know when a statement is required. It was agreed that the trigger should be inclusion in the TAG list, amended to cover only the Plan area. A copy of the TAG list can be appended to the Plan. It is being revised at present and creation of a Local Heritage List is planned. Therefore the policy will also refer to inclusion in these as triggers in future.

Action: Anne and Preston to rework the policy in light of this discussion.

6. General Development Principles.

6.1 Working Draft 4 of the policy was considered. It was developed from the basis of the community's expressed wishes and the evidence base of work by Spence and Dower, as well as considering NNPA policies and those of other National Parks. It was noted that Jenny's draft Plan structure allows for two policies covering this material: General Development Principles and Design Policy.

Action: All members of the Group were asked to consider the draft policy and check for comprehensive coverage of issues and accuracy.

6.2 The draft expands the requirement for high quality and sustainable design by providing a bullet point list condensing the design work by Spence & Dower. Nonetheless, this policy is too long compared to the others. It was agreed that this could be redressed by including only the high level principles in the policy, for instance the requirement for appropriate materials, whilst using the bullet point list in the draft as the basis for an appendix to the Plan. Jenny's draft Plan structure includes such an appendix.

Action: Megan and Anne to redraft the policy based on this discussion.

6.3 The meaning of Spence & Dower's statement that roof forms should be simple was not wholly clear.

Action: Preston to seek clarification from them.

6.4 The planners present advised that planning permission is not needed to construct fences around existing properties unless they are in excess of 2 metres high or 1 metre where the boundary adjoins a highway. However, boundary treatment can be controlled in giving permission for new development.

7. Any Other business.

7.1 On his return next week Darrell will be asked to write to Rex, thanking him for his sterling work as Secretary.

7.2 Appointment of a new Secretary and associated practical arrangements were also deferred until Darrell's return.

7.3 Kevin will email to the Group the consultees list. The utilities list is more extensive than initially thought.

8. Date of next meeting

The next meeting will be on Tuesday 7th October, Tarsset Village Hall, 10 a.m.