

22

<b>Meeting Title:</b>	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	
<b>Date:</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> February 2017	
<b>Venue:</b>	Village Hall, Holwell	
<b>Attendees:</b>	Sally-Anne Holt (Chair Holwell Neighbourhood Plan Working Group)	SAH
	Rodney Antell	RA
	Steve Atchison	SA
	Patrick Constable	PC
	Phil Curtis	PhC
	Colin Evans	CE
	Neil Peirson	NP
	Diana Gibbs (Holwell Parish Council)	DG
	Jo Witherden (Dorset Planning Consultant)	JW

<b>Agenda:</b>	1	Apologies
	2	Opening Remarks
	3	Notes of Previous Meetings
	4	Actions
	5	Dates of Next Meetings
	6	Questionnaire
	7	Site Assessments
	8	AOB

## Actions

### 1. Apologies

Lord Aldenham (LA), Bruce Duncan (BD), Jo Edmondson (JE), Robert Hole (RH), Dave Hollex (DH), Roger Kellow (RK), Peter Macfarlane (PM), Katrina Wall (KW), and Libby Wilton (LW) were unable to attend.

### 2. Opening Remarks

SAH thanked everyone for their input, following their review of the Questionnaire results.

SAH said that we have now received £700 from VSOS (Village SOS), as a grant; this covers expenses such as Jo Witherden's support, communications, printing, etc. We have also had £5,000 from DCLG (Department for Communities and Local Government) to go towards Jo Witherden's time, travel costs, printing (for example the cost of printing the Questionnaire was about £250), etc. Keith Budgell, as Parish Clerk, is managing this. We will need to apply for further funding, to support the Neighbourhood Plan.

SAH also recently attended the Neighbourhood Planning Conference in Bath, on Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> January 2017. It involved various lectures and workshops, and SAH found it very useful.

**Actions**

3. & 4. **Notes from Previous Meetings and Actions**

The draft notes from Meeting 21 were reviewed. Minor changes were identified, including the addition of an action for SAH in Section 4 and the addition of an explanation of the diagrams at Appendix B. Other actions were reviewed.

5. **Dates of Next Meetings (DONMs)**

Meetings are scheduled, and the Village Hall booked for:

- Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 2017.
- Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> April, 2017.
- Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May, 2017.

(The Village Hall will be in use as a polling station for Local Government election on Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> May 2017).

6. **Questionnaire**

Feedback from the Questionnaire analysis was discussed. DG asked how we compare with other villages JW said that Holwell is one of the smallest, and that others of a similar size are at an earlier stage with their Neighbourhood Plans. But in general the results are similar to those for other villages, regarding environment, quality of life, housing, etc. So, there are no surprises.

The meeting then reviewed the comments provided by members of the Neighbourhood Plan WG. These included those of NP, CE, DH, LW, PhC, PC, and RK.

7. **Site Assessments**

JW had brought some examples of the process used by the Motcombe Neighbourhood Plan group. This was discussed and it was agreed that something similar would be very useful for assessing the relative merit of different sites. JW said that we would need to create our own scoring scheme with respect to our identified objectives

SAH said that we could try and use the Questionnaire results for creating the scoring. DG asked where our Mission Statement came from. SAH explained that she had drafted the original which was then revised and accepted following discussion within the WG (see notes for Meeting 7, 25<sup>th</sup> January 2016). She added that these could be rewritten if we felt that was necessary.

NP said that we could put together a set of design principles and then consider the sites with respect to our objectives. So, for example, we could identify sites with respect to their suitability for a certain type of development.

JW said that design principles were unlikely to rule out the potential for a site unless there was a particularly significant constraint. Landowners may also be willing to change their initial designs if this would mean their sites would be more favourably considered. On this basis it was

**Actions**

better to look at the merits of the site, rather than focusing on the designs that landowners may have put forward. CE said that we cannot specify whether a building should be made of stone or slate, say. JW explained that the Local Plan policies on design are about reinforcing local character. So we could identify a preferred style that fits in with the existing character of Holwell, which would allow a mix of housing styles; this preference would be different in a village like Milton Abbas. If we say nothing, then it will be down to the planning authority.

SAH said that we would need to make a judgement on how narrow the requirements could be. This would involve going through an assessment process and then putting the results out for review. CE asked how the consultation on sites is to take place; would it be in the Village Hall. SAH thought that the Village Hall would be a good place, and that it would attract people. We could have all sites, including those that have been ruled out, for people to see. Probably in April. SAH said that she would circulate the proposed site assessment form. JW will e-mail the scoring sheet from the Motcombe Neighbourhood Plan, for us to think about

22/1  
SAH

DG asked if there was a permanent closing date. SAH said that we will need to accept late entries. JW said that there are always late ones, and that we need to be pragmatic, especially if they are good sites. If they aren't any good, they may only require a cursory review. But once we are very close to submission, it would be feasible to say that it is too late, simply for practical reasons.

In response to a question about whether other sites could still be permitted once the Neighbourhood Plan was adopted, JW explained that decisions should follow what is in the Plan, although there can be material considerations that mean they are over-ruled if there are very good reasons. SAH asked about Rural Exception Sites. JW said that landowners would need to demonstrate a need, and preferred sites to address such need could be covered in the Neighbourhood Plan. NP asked what would happen if there are a lot of proposed sites that are good. How do we decide which should go forward and which should not. JW said that the Neighbourhood Plan will either allow specific sites or identify an area within a development boundary. Those landowners not selected, or not within the boundary, could still put in a planning application but the Neighbourhood Plan policies would be a main consideration in deciding such planning applications.”

JW said that the number of responses that we received would depend on advertising levels of interest, but it would be good to have a reasonable choice of sites as there should then be some good ones to select. PhC said that the scoring totals should identify the best sites. JW said that some issues would be fundamental and would rule out sites, such as the risk of flooding. It was agreed that the derivation of the scores should be made public.

**Actions**

8. **Any Other Business (AOB)**

- |  |               |
|--|---------------|
| NP now has access to the mapping software. If anyone else would like to learn about it, let SAH know.  | 22/2          |
| Interviews with estate agent are in progress. CE has taken charge of two of these.   | CE/BD         |
| We have still to complete our village walks; these include Holwell Manor, Westrow, and outlying areas. CE will help us to get organized, probably at weekends, weather permitting. | 22/3<br>DH/CE |
| SAH asked if people in the group could provide support in certain areas, such as putting up notices and other practical tasks; she said that she would produce a list.             | 22/4<br>ALL   |

**Appendix A - Notes of Meeting 21:**



NP Mtg 21 Notes 12  
Jan 2017 Issue\_1b.pdf