

Minutes: Tasset and Greystead Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting Tuesday 5th May 2015.

1. Introduction and apologies

Present: Preston Hoggan (Chair), John Holland, Mary Lou Downie, Jenny Ludman (Independent Consultant), David English (NCC), Kevin Tipple (NCC), and Clive Coyne (NNPA).

Apologies were received from Megan Nixon, David Watkins and Darrell Jackson.

2. Minutes of the last meeting on 28th April 2015.

Re Item 7: 'Also the LPAs will produce a strategic policy...' should read 'Also the LPAs will produce a list of strategic policies...'. Other than this, the Minutes were agreed as a true record.

3. Matters arising

There were no matters arising.

4. Update on consultation

Preston tabled an updated summary of numbers of responses: 61 from residents plus one email from a resident but not using the proforma and not responding to individual policies. Several of the Statutory Consultees have responded; NCC response is expected shortly.

Preston tabled a transcript of all comments from residents, organised by policy, with the exception of a few late arrivals to be added, which were positive and therefore not in need of addressing under Item 6 below. It was agreed to add the comments from the resident's email to the Lanehead policy comments, since they refer to Lanehead. A hand written list of comments received will also be added to the relevant policies. (Action: Preston)

It was agreed to use the format tabled to record a response to each comment and, if appropriate, to note any resulting alterations to the Pre-submission Consultation Draft Plan.

Comments about the final question, asking about approval or otherwise of the Plan as a whole, have yet to be transcribed but were mostly positive. (Action: Preston)

5. Updating Draft Plan to take account of comments received

Jenny's input was originally planned to conclude by 15th May, which is now unattainable. Many of the responses to residents' comments will be technical, for instance references to NPPF content. At present there appears to be little change needed to policy - based on Item 6 below. Jenny will not be able to write the Basic Conditions Statement until the Plan is finalised. In the meantime she will work on responses to the resident consultation.

The NCC consultation response will arrive shortly, including comments from the Archaeologist and on NPPF compatibility, and will need to be addressed. (Action: David English)

The Group will therefore work on the changes needed at next week's meeting, for which there will be no need for NCC or NNPA to be present.

6. Review by Policy of resident comments

The comments were considered, policy by policy. In many cases they do not warrant any response other than to note they have been considered and no action is needed, or reference to NPPF as explanation. Some comments indicate the link between a Policy and its Policy Explanation needs clarification or strengthening. Several issues were identified for further consideration and possible alterations to or clarification of the current draft Plan. They include:

TG2 & TG8: distinction between designated and non-designated assets

TG3: Glass roofs and conservatories. Clive will forward the Lighting Guidance, to be considered in responding to this point. (Action: Clive)

TG3: solar panels on roofs

TG3: no intention to preclude good quality contemporary design: add a paragraph to the Policy Explanation.

(Action: Jenny)

TG7: removal of permitted development rights from redundant building conversions.

TG7: the distinction between new build and conversion, issue of NPPF constraint on development in 'open countryside'

TG8: absence of a local list of heritage assets.

TG9: evidence for sight lines between bastles. More information to be sought on this. (Action: John)

TG3 & TG11: hedges acceptable as well as stone walls

TG16: it was agreed to include Sidwood as a Community Asset. Preston has been working on a map of the recreational area for PC purposes which could be included as the necessary definition of the area. It needs to refer to physical features for clarity.

7. Review of other stakeholder observations

The response from NNPA, dated 1st May 2015, was considered point by point:

Page 4: The Community hoped to add detail to the current and former NNPA plans and strengthen their ability to implement their policy more effectively in line with the Community's views, as expressed in consultations.

Page 8: National Cycle Route name will be added to the Plan.

Page 9: This can be clarified in the Plan.

Pages 10-11: The community consultation reveals mixed views on forestry: positive as a source of jobs but potentially negative as regards visual impact on the landscape. Transport of felled timber from some locations within the Plan area is currently causing concern to affected residents.

Page 11: this was not explored in the consultation.

Page 12: The community welcomes undergrounding of power lines where feasible.

Page 13: there are differing views, the bulk of opinion probably considers current afforestation to be sufficient.

Page 13, Objective 6: Agreed to add 'sensitively' after 'accommodated'

Page 21: tree protection needs to be considered. Additional criteria would be needed to protect hedges.

Page 25: it is not necessary to specify roof colours for agricultural buildings since the NNPA Planners specify acceptable colours.

Page 26: Goat willow to be added

Page 44: Agreed to add text on this point to section on Gateway Views.

Page 29: The phrase has been considered at length in previous discussion. Caution was counselled in view of feedback on other neighbourhood Plans. The wording will be reviewed.

Page 32: the wording will be changed in view of an update on the status of the outstanding planning applications in Greenhaugh.

Page 45: covered above

Page 46: covered above

Page 49: The profile of forest edge planting has changed already so this is not considered necessary.

Page 50: covered above

Page 52: covered above

Pages 54-55: TG2 addresses the first part of this comment.

Page 58: Agreed to remove g)

Page 60: NCC usually specifies removal after 12 months of infrastructure not being used. There is an ongoing debate whether foundations should be removed as well as the base and tower of wind turbines. The current Policy Explanation and wording 'no longer required' need to be reviewed and tailored to the type of structure.

Responses from other Stakeholders will be considered at future meetings.

8. AOB

The NCC screening opinion is expected soon.

(Action: David English)

9. The next Meeting

It will be on Tuesday 12th May at 10.00 a.m. in the Village Hall.