

Great Bedwyn Neighbourhood Development Plan Working Group

Record of Meeting 10

Friday 24th November 2017, 6.30 pm at Old Chapel, Browns Lane

Present:

Martin Bailey (MB), Nick Gibbins (NG), Charles Howell (CH) (PC link), Sue Mason (SM), Chitra Bharucha (CB), Paul Evanson (PE), Andrew Hutchison (AH), Anna Ditchburn (AD), Nick Wilkinson (Chair), Helen Sheehan (HS) (Secretary)

From WC:

Vicky Burvill (VB)

From Place:

Cleo Newcombe-Jones (CN-J), Georgina Perry (GP)

Away:

Emma Glenister, Jenny Bowley, Claire Tarbox, Ali Burch

Minutes - GBNDP Meeting 10

Item 1 – Opening Remarks

- NW thanked CH for use of Old Chapel for the meeting, and welcomed GP, CN-J and VB to the meeting. For the purposes of tight timing for the meeting (constrained by various factors including train times) NW proposed that some items on the agenda that can be covered separately at a later date and the focus on for this meeting would be to obtain updates and clarification on the NDP from WC and Place Studio.

Item 3 – Update on meeting with Crown Estate agents (17/11/17)

- NW and CH met with Alice Rawdon-Mogg and Julian Harbottle from Savills, the Crown Estate agents, who confirmed the Estate owns the paddock opposite Castle Road (and the Church field, not under building consideration by them at present). There was an acknowledgment for the need for affordable housing and the Crown Estate might have some latitude to help small communities however they still need to gain maximum profitability for Crown Estate. They can offer help via completion of all technical work, road access and landscaping, and some increase in proportion of affordable housing above 40% smaller houses, and Section 106 designation – waiting for technical report by Christmas.
- CN-J advised that the NDP group should ask for a scope of the technical work underway by Savills (e.g. does it include landscape, ecology, heritage, highways, drainage assessment etc).

Action: NW

Item 7 - WC and Place comments on further work needed to complete the draft NDP

- VB's has made some notes from her first impression of the NDP (VB please send to HS)

Action: VB

- The NDP has to have a strong story linking the vision to objectives, and then policies and projects. VB felt that there is a lot of context that could be paired down (much of the detail can form part of the evidence base). Guidance from Place Studio would be provided on this as the NDP draft is developed.

Action: VB/CN-J/GP

- VB mentioned that the development strategy paragraph needs more clarification. It appears just two sites left. Brook Street also needs detail in terms of boundaries. VB keen to refine the development strategy paragraph in the NDP and follow with an evidence base table of sites rejected and why (this would form evidence base to the NDP itself).
- David Stuart from Historic England will want to see a lot of detail on impact on Heritage Asset, this will need to form part of the evidence base. The GBNDP should have more detail on heritage aspects of development. VB is investigating this further and will advise what the NDP needs to provide for the plan.
- Appendix 3 of the NDP has addressed this area – wait for VB to advise after her meeting this week. It is far better to do all the historical detail and potential impact up front. It is one of the most difficult tests for a NDP to pass.

Action: VB

- AH said that heritage surrounding Tottenham House and the Aylesbury family, going back 500 years, is significant and it is crucial that any impact on it be carefully considered – is it possible to mitigate satisfactorily?
- NW mentioned extensive Tottenham Park heritage investigation, but planning application not due until December. It was noted by VB/CN-J that a decision on Tottenham Park was due before the NDP could be given any weight.
- Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England – three statutory bodies that will need to consider the NDP. VB mentioned that if the NDP doesn't have enough detail in areas of interest to these bodies (in the evidence base) then a SEA will be required. If, however, enough detail is provided the SEA might well not be required.

- VB hopeful however that an SEA will not be needed and CN-J said it would be helpful for Savills to provide the scope of their work on Tottenham House. NW will ask Savills for headings.

Action: NW

- VB keen to refine the development strategy paragraph in the NDP and follow with a table of sites rejected and why.
- Dead SHELAA sites – Bolland Close, Fortlands and Stokke Common– why are they still in the SHELAA assessment, when they are built on? VB thinks they are there until the site owner asks WC to remove them (which does not tend to happen). The Vicarage site can be referred to in the NDP as a potential Brownfield site within the Settlement.
- Assets of Community Value – VB suggested they are included in the NDP as well as being considered for the register held by Wiltshire Council (under Localism Act) – and provided a guidance print-out “Ownership of Assets Tool Kit” to CN-J.
- Registering Community assets are all about gaining time; a six month window for the community to buy the asset (on the open market) is evoked if the asset is to be sold.

Action: CNJ/GP/NW

- CN-J said the NDP should include a policy on local green space designations and community assets.

Action: CNJ/GP/NW

- A policy on views/vistas and Green Infrastructure (ie linear features like the water meadows and the canal/river corridor can also be included.

Action: CNJ/GP/NW

- Community assets are all about time; a six month window for the community to buy the asset.
- Renewable energy – there are many examples in NDPs, although the potential for locally specific policies is limited. NG said onshore wind farms are impossible to get accepted, due to national policy position (CN-J confirmed this was the case). PE thought that hydro-electric power could be considered on a small scale. It is very difficult to dictate whether developers must place solar panels on new buildings but there are a few examples of this eg Brighton/Bath/London. No NDP has been successful in doing this to date.
- CN-J said it’s possible to get utility information free of charge from utility companies (about grid constraints for large scale solar - which can be a showstopper in some rural areas). The Centre for Sustainable Energy also provides advice and policy examples for NDP which can be looked at to see if worth adapting for the GBNDP.

Action: CN-J/GP/NW

- NW pointed out that Wiltshire policy/advice on tourism is very vague – he contacted Visit Wiltshire who confirmed that no money is available for the NDP to promote Great Bedwyn’s many attractions, just to fund Visit Wiltshire. VB indicated that in terms of WC planning there are policies pro tourist accommodation, therefore it is likely that these issues are already well covered in Wiltshire's Core Strategy/Local Plan.

Action: CN-J/GP/NW

- The Local Plan review is out for consultation now – until 19/12/17. Look on-line at Pewsey being divided in 3 and a plan period of 2026 is now 2036. NW to comment in WC consultation on inadequate CIL and affordability criteria.

Action: NW

- CLT – there is funding to set up a CLT but no money to buy land. WC have £650k to help in this area and VB confirmed this money is specifically for CLTs. VB will find out more and report back.
- VB said the important thing is to allocate sites in the plan – it could go down the CLT route but that doesn't have to happen right away.

Action: VB

- To achieve affordable housing the HNS says the community would have to build 28 or more houses in total (40% rule) to achieve HNS target. Therefore Great Bedwyn will have to find an additional site; possibly the school field (although outside the NDP area). Without more sites the NDP cannot meet the HNS target. VB said the school field cannot be designated by the NDP except as a future aspiration; but the PCC could put in an application now, as parish boundaries are not totally relevant to planning applications. Refer to this in the community survey part of the NDP. SM said one parish she worked in had facilities in a different parish which didn't work well and putting policies in place was impossible.
- VB pointed out the importance of aligning the NDP to existing core strategy for now until the Site Allocations DPD becomes policy. It's still in draft form and will not be submitted until spring 2018.
- NW reported that Claire Perry, during her visit to Bedwyn, promised to support affordable housing. Patrick Pease and Nick Holgate are trying to get a CLT together with advice from Trevor Cherrit. This is very early but things are moving forward.
- Car parking review will be published in 2018 now. AD said that if a car park is located opposite Back Lane the land must permeable and this should be stated in the NDP.
- NW and HS will produce a new NDP programme with updated timescales.

Action: NW/HS

- NW confirmed Place Studio has been paid in full now with no more funding in the pipeline. CN-J agreed and mentioned there is further funding that can be accessed, for NDP including site allocations, although it is unlikely that this will be needed.
- As a WG, Place Studio suggested more thought is needed on NDP tactics – if the Browns Lane site is not offering what the community wants, it may be prudent to hold on until the next round of WC Area Housing targets, especially if Crown Estate deal inadequate with local demands/aspirations.
- There is a "Weekly List" detailing all the planning applications in the area. AH publishes these in the Parish News.
- Kennet Conservation Association listed a load of unlisted buildings that should be of merit. Refer to Article 4 – see what has been done and possibly append to NDP.

- This is the link VB sent for the WC planning map:

<http://wiltscouncil.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=74a353612a934bd48fee1f2bc564cdd8>.

- A pro forma is required for the two housing sites and two employment sites (Jeff Bishop has provided a template) to spell out the methodology. Place Studio can assist with the next stage site assessment working with the WG

Action: NW/HS/CN-J/GP

- Site assessments should show why area beyond Brook Street 30mph signs has been considered fairly and disregarded (flood plain and access). VB will talk to the conservation officer and the NDPWG will get the detail of the site assessment done.

Action: VB, NW, NDPWG

- If the NDP doesn't need an SEA then a whole section is required on why it's carrying out a site assessment/pressure of population/what's changing in Bedwyn etc. CN-J considers that it is likely than an SEA will be needed.
- Evidence of consultation will have to be submitted as a separate NDP document at Reg 16 stage – outlining details of open days, organisations and businesses consulted.
- Place Studio to work out suggested next steps for the NDP, including evidence gathering and policy drafting.

Action: CN-J/GP

See appendix below for VB additional comments during and since the meeting

Questions for Vicky Burvill in Preparation for GBNDPWG Meeting 24 November 2017

Affordable housing at Royal British Legion – there were no affordable units proposed and none were required by policy. – Ministerial Statement.

Priority Questions

Question	Response
1. What are your first impressions of the draft NDP (dated 1 October 2017)? 2. How and at what stages would you like to provide comments on the draft? We'd welcome any specific comments at this point.	We would like to comment on the site assessment more fully before SEA. Please let us have the full assessment and we will contribute any additional information that we hold, including any comments from colleagues such as Conservation Officers. Then any updates can be made to the site assessment, and relevant information included

Question	Response
	<p>in the plan. This will help the SEA screening to proceed more smoothly.</p> <p>We can also informal feedback on the current draft of the plan (Oct 2017 draft). In terms of getting it ready for the SEA screening I have made a few comments at the meeting (Dec 2017) to aid clarity in the housing section. However, we can also give some feedback on the evidence base and any key points.</p> <p>Following SEA / HRA screening, the next time we will comment on the plan will be at Reg 14 stage.</p>
<p>3. How can the recent Great Bedwyn Housing Needs Survey be used in the NDP/planning decisions?</p>	<p>As per e-mail, sent 24.11.2017</p>
<p>4. Please can you provide us an update on the SEA/HRA Screening Opinion that WC is undertaking for the NDP?</p>	<p>WC don't do SEA assessment. But we can share information / data for the assessment if we have it.</p>
<p>5. Should a SEA be required, what further information do you anticipate WC will require to complete the assessment, and from whom?</p>	<p>Great Bedwyn SEA is on hold while we dealt with the process our end and with HE. Also – there is a need to tweak the wording of the housing development section slightly to make housing site selection clear.</p> <p>UPDATE: - as above. Please submit your site selection assessment and methodology for our comment. We will be able to get detailed comments from in-house experts, which will in turn speed up the SEA process.</p>
<p>6. The indicative list of Local Green Spaces is provided in Appendix 1. We appreciate you will need to see the assessment of these sites, showing how they meet the national policy criteria, but do you have any initial comments on the shortlist?</p>	<p>In response to the paragraph on Green Spaces on page 14, and Map 5 I can see that the shaded green areas would appear to be local in nature, in that they are related to the settlement. However, the field next to the school cannot be designated in the plan as it is not in the neighbourhood plan area.</p> <p>The evidence base will be useful and will need to show their significance and value to the community.</p>

Question	Response
<p>7. Any potential problems with current brownfield sites within Settlement? (Vicarage opposite Church in Church Street (is this now a SHLAA site?); open land around 24, Farm Lane); SE corner of Church St/Brook St junction). No need at this stage to agree specifically, we will show you on map, and in the NDP we will only be including a criteria based policy about infill, as none of these are currently available.</p>	<p>Yes Vicarage is now a SHLAA. For the other SHLAA sites – high level assessment indicates no problem, but more detailed assessment would look at impacts on conservation area, listed buildings, ecology, landscape etc.</p> <p>Infill policy would be useful, however be mindful that Core Policy 1 and 2 stipulate ‘infill’ at small villages only. The policy would need to talk about development being supported within the settlement boundary. Presumably this is what you mean by infill any way?</p> <p>The NDP should include a design policy giving guidance on the palette of materials that are appropriate , and other considerations based on the conservation area statement and other evidence if needed – as many of these sites will have heritage impact.</p>
<p>8. Do you have any advice about policies to support renewable energy proposals? (there are no large scale wind proposals, but potential solar panel sites maybe).</p>	<p>A good thing to consult on. If you want renewable projects to come forward it might be worth considering allocating a site and make it a community-owned project.</p>
<p>9. Can we reserve two sites just outside the Settlement boundary for potential non-tarmac car parks (Brook Street field next to Wharf, and paddock behind old telephone exchange off Back Lane next to allotments; and/or include a supporting policy? Will show you on map.</p>	<p>Put them on a map, with some discussion of constraints, and we can comment on them, as per site selection process.</p>

Question	Response
10. Were any of buildings proposed for Article 4 (2) Direction in the Kennet GB Conservation Area CA&M Proposal of March 2007, ever so designated?	Answered in e-mail (24.1.2017)

More general policy queries

Question	Response
<p>A. What is the latest progress on the Site Allocations DPD?</p> <p>B. When is it anticipated that the revised GB settlement boundary be approved by WC?</p>	<p>Submission is timetabled for spring 2018 (May Cabinet and Full Council). Currently we are analysing comments, preparing responses. GB settlement boundary will be approved when the plan is adopted. But it will have more weight in planning decisions as the process moves on.</p> <p>The NP can also include the same settlement boundary revision that is proposed in the draft DPD – just make it clear in the document that it is being reviewed and open for consultation.</p>
<p>C. What information has WC received from DCLG in recent weeks about additional funding and changes in planning regulations, in order to action the Government's recently announced intention of boosting house-building. I suspect none, but we need to know.</p>	<p>Wiltshire Council are getting some funding and it is likely that part of this will be to fund additional support for groups such as yourselves, and part to distribute as grant funding to parishes. More information will be available when we can confirm.</p> <p>We are hoping to start a NP update in parish newsletters.</p>
<p>D. How will the Local Plan Review 2016-36 Consultation Paper, the Joint Spatial Framework Issues Paper, and the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, affect the Great Bedwyn NDP?</p>	<p>Business as usual. – The NDP only has to align with adopted policy. You could consider changing the plan period to 2036, but make sure evidence base matches. Alternatively, review the NP in 5 years time, when there will be different adopted policy and can change the time scale and anything else then.</p>

Question	Response
<p>Could you advise on any other new planning matters that the NDP group should be aware of?</p>	<p>The main update is to the grant funding programme, see below. Also some of the changes made by the Neighbourhood Planning Act have been incorporated into the NP Regulations and come into force at the end of January.</p>
<p>E. What is the latest progress on the Site Allocations DPD. Is revised GB settlement now approved by WC?</p>	<p>Answered above.</p>

Supplementaries (if time)

F. Choice of Community Assets? (see next page for list of potential sites). – **just put a list in the NP.**

Is it still you we need to consult rather than a separate WC department?

G. Is Tourism section worth expanding as one of few options for increasing local employment? There seems to be a disconnect between VisitWiltshire at high level and what is available on the ground.

H. Any thoughts on potential impact of Tottenham Park planning application (due for submission in December), as a result of owner's pre-planning discussion?

Updates to neighbourhood planning processes, coming into force on 31 January

Further regulations laid on 13 December:

- update notification of planning applications requirements to neighbourhood planning qualifying bodies.
- introduce flexibility into the process for modifying neighbourhood plans that are in force to keep them up-to-date, so the process is proportionate to the changes being proposed.
- facilitate the modification of a neighbourhood area and provide for what is to happen to a neighbourhood development plan or order that is already in force in that area. These regulations come into force on 31 January 2018.

Relevant Planning Practice Guidance will be updated where appropriate in due course.

Neighbourhood Planning Support Programme

Further details regarding the new 2018-22 Neighbourhood Planning Support programme are due to be announced shortly. This programme aims to continue delivering support to communities who are (or are interested in) creating a neighbourhood plan or order, including members of public, community organisations and town and parish councils. The support shall also be available to those replacing and / or modifying an existing neighbourhood plan. It is anticipated that groups will be able to apply for grants for the next financial year (i.e. issued after 1 April 2018) from February 2018, and be able to apply for related Technical Support packages from April 2018. Further updates can be found [here](#)

Potential Community Assets and/or Local Green Spaces

St Katherine's Primary School Playground and Field.

GB Primary School Playground and linked field (latter officially in Little Bedwyn).

GB Memorial Playing Field (including Tennis and Croquet Clubs and playground).

Village Square and Grass verge to High Street.

Allotments.

Three Tuns Public House.

Former Cross Keys Coaching Inn in High Street.

The Store.

Post Office/Bakery Shop.

Surgery.

GB Cricket Club ground and pavilion.

GB Village Hall and surrounding field.

Shawgrove playground.

Church Field.

Watermeadows and footpaths along River Dun and Canal.

The Wharf and its grassed and parking area.

Potential grassed car parks next to wharf and south of allotments.

Crofton Pumping Station complex and car park.

Manor Road grassed area.

Forest Hill trees.

Presumably designated public footpaths, bridleways, etc need no further protection in these categories?

The Plan can have an objective to retain footpaths, bridleways as far possible. A developer can apply to have them removed or re-routed. Equally the neighbourhood plan can look at improving linkages if necessary and a policy can be worded to support proposals that retain existing paths / linkages / access to the countryside / pedestrian and cycle permability, or include the improvements where there is a need.