



ONWARDPLAN
MINUTES OF THE STEERING GROUP MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY 21ST AUGUST 2015
AT 7.30 PM AT THE PARISH ROOM

PRESENT:

Philip James, Pam Verdon, Jeremy Fellows, Helen Fleming, Stephen Blandford, Richard Cooper, Alison Tizard, David Stewart, Gill Warsop, Guy Holmes-Henderson, David Ellis,

APOLOGIES:

James Harvey, Belinda Hallam, Jim Head

1. Minutes, declarations of interest

The Minutes from 5th August were approved and Pam will put them on Dropbox. There were no new declarations of interest regarding sites that have not already been recorded.

2. Update from OPC

Philip had received a summary of comments from OPC Councillors about the Draft Plan. He had forwarded this to some members of the Steering Group. Stephen is preparing a written answer to many of the comments. This will be presented to an informal meeting with OPC on Monday, 24 August.

David S said that he thought it may also necessary to have an EGM of OPC before 7 September in order that the public could attend and everything would be in the public domain.

It is then expected that OPC will sign off the Pre-submission Plan on 7 September.

Jeremy reported that Newlyn Farm have applied for planning permission for 5 retail units at Lodge Farm. David reported that the land swap which is due to happen with regard to land at Hatchwood and a canal basin is proving more complex than expected and is likely to take a further couple of months.

3. Chair

Philip explained that he was resigning due to an imminent house move out of the area. Stephen, with the backing of the Steering Group, has provisionally agreed that he may take up the position of Chairman of the SG. He has yet to confirm Jon Hale. Stephen explained that he has accepted the position with reservations as he may not enough time available and he hopes that the Steering Group will assist him.

4. Draft Plan

The SG has been sent the latest version of the Draft Plan with further amendments by RCOH. The following was discussed further:

Policy 2 – Housing sites: It was agreed that within the site parameters for Land at Hook Road the land buffer should be 10 metres and not 8 metres.

Policy 3 – Local Gap: After much discussion and a vote, it was agreed that the 2 gaps in the Plan should remain with insufficient evidence to include any others.

Policy 5 – General design principles: Again after much discussion it was decided that the detailed information about each area should be removed from the Plan with any important points included in the general principles at the start of the policy. Gill agreed to do this by Friday lunchtime.

Policies 6, 7 and 8 – Conservation areas: It was agreed that the views maps should be included at this point.

Policy 9 – High Street: This policy should remain as it is and more explanation needs given to OPC with regard to what is and is not possible within a Neighbourhood Plan with regard to change of use of retail buildings.

Deer Park:

It was noted that the OPC had previously objected to a "resist development" policy being included in the NP and resolved that a policy about the DP should not be included. This had been regarded as unsatisfactory and to try to find a way around the impasse the Steering Group had been investigating whether the OPC might agree to the inclusion of a policy for the DP which reaffirmed its status as a designated heritage asset, by virtue of being in the Odiham Conservation Area. Draft wording had been included in the draft NP sent to the OPC for consideration but comments from OPC members had indicated that this was still a concern for them. In the meantime the advice (attached) received from RCOH offered three options which cast doubt on the wisdom of the course the Steering Group had been pursuing and so further revised wording had been prepared which has now been circulated to the Steering Group prior to its being forwarded to the OPC.

A number of members of the Steering Group expressed their very strong reservations about adopting a "no policy" as a matter of principle. They did not think this reflected the views expressed in the previous community consultations and were concerned this would lead to the Steering Group being criticised by the community and blamed for something which was not of their doing. They are also concerned that this might lead to the community expressing its displeasure about this matter by voting against the NP notwithstanding the wider consequences. Many of the Steering Group wished the OPC to revisit their decision to exclude a policy for the Deer Park.

However, it was recognised as important to progress the NP and to achieve pre submission as quickly as possible. Given the current stance of the OPC on the DP issue and their dominant position so far as deciding what was to be included in the NP, the Steering Group were not in a position to insist.

After further discussion it was resolved to offer up the revised "no policy" wording to the OPC for their consideration together with the latest advice on the DP issue from RCOH but to record formally in the minutes that the majority of the Steering Group still believed strongly that a "resist policy" of some sort would better reflect the views of the community. Such a policy would also be preferable, particularly at the pre - submission stage, because it could then still be altered or removed in the light of pre submission reaction, whereas if no policy was included it would not be possible to include a policy dealing with the DP later

if the community strongly opposed a "no policy" approach.

Philip will inform Jon Hale.

5. Update for pre-sub

Richard presented two possible photo collages for the front cover of the Plan. It was agreed that the one with the most photos should be used.

Pam asked about the list of consultees who need to be informed of the Pre-sub Plan. All bordering parish councils and Hart's neighbouring District Councils need to be informed. The other names on the list will be included where thought necessary. Pam will liaise with Sarah, Clerk to OPC, to let her have the lists for email and paper letters.

Next meeting: Tuesday, 1st September

APPENDIX

Advice received from RCOH with reference to Deer park:

'There are 3 choices: say nothing, say a lot or say something. If you can't say a lot (i.e. is there a case for enabling a development, if so then what balance to strike, if not then making that clear), then it's best to say nothing and leave it to HDC, the NPPF, the HE advice on enabling development and a planning application. A new para in the preamble to the section can explain the absence of a policy (e.g. no consensus) but remind the reader of Policy 1 (i.e. outside the settlement boundary) and the national guidance etc.

If you want to be seen to be saying something then it must at least relate to matters that can help determine a planning application. My last amendment corrected this, as the previous draft was not a proper policy. But, you'll do so knowing that the policy carries little meaning and is therefore only a gesture so it's not conspicuous by its absence.

As with all policies, you can delete them after Pre Sub and head to Sub but not add them if they relate to new land, otherwise you're obliged to do another Reg 14 consultation.'