

MUCH MARCLE PARISH COUNCIL

Report of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Party Public Meetings held in the Memorial Hall on Sunday 22nd March 2015 and Monday 23rd March 2015

Present:

	Public	Working Party Members
Sunday 22 nd March	24	9
Monday 23 rd March	56	10

The attached Power Point Presentation was used to illustrate the three listed talks.

Welcome and Introduction:

Chairman T Weston 6 mins.

Summary of Conclusions from the Public Questionnaire:

B Morgan 15 – 20 mins.

Review of Land Allocations:

J Marsden 25 – 30 mins.

The maps of these locations and other printed material were provided courtesy of Weston's Cider.

The Land Allocations were further illustrated by photographs of the sites.

The Question and Answer Sessions following the introductory talks were chaired by B Morgan.

Issues Raised:

Sunday 22nd March:

1. The land allocations referred to housing issues only and not industrial land.
2. Farming land and employment land had not been considered.
3. The working party was complimented on the well organised presentation, the speaker was a little disappointed by the relatively small number of attendees and emphasised the importance of the Neighbourhood Plan. The speaker's experience of the situation in Malmesbury where a developer had built 800 houses despite local opposition as the Neighbourhood Plan was not in place.
4. The requirement for the parish to have 7 developments was confirmed as a minimum number.
5. In response to a question about affordable housing the size of a single development required to include affordable housing was given as 10.
A rural exception clause could potentially allow affordable housing otherwise.
6. With reference to the potential development of the SLIP and surrounding land the meeting was reminded that community response had indicated that the retention of a pub as a community asset was preferred. However the failure of businesses at that site could lead to a planning application that included a change of use having a very strong case.
7. Houses yet to be built were included in the count of developments for the period to 2031.

8. The adequacy of the sewage works was raised and this was linked to the way in which grey water was required to be handled in developments greater than 10.
9. The issue of three storey housing as a popular modern development was introduced. It was indicated that style of housing in traditional forms as indicated from the questionnaire could be influenced by including guidance for development in the Neighbourhood Plan. Other aspirational content could also be included.
10. A suggestion box at the shop was a suggested means for the community to communicate with the Neighbourhood Plan Working Party .

Issues Raised:

Monday 23rd March

The meeting was recorded aurally and the mp3 files are available.

1. A resident of Rushall expressed concern that information about the meeting and the questionnaire had not been fully circulated to the community. B Morgan replied that the questionnaire had been distributed to all residents on the open electoral role and others who were known. Some residents were unintentionally omitted from the questionnaire. The present meeting had been publicised by posters around the village, in the Mercury magazine and by flyers delivered by the local postman. Unfortunately the enquirer did not take the Mercury and had directed that the postman should not deliver junk mail.
2. An enquiry concerning the positioning of the Herefordshire Core Strategy in relation to the Much Marcle Neighbourhood Plan provided K Johnson of the Herefordshire Planning Department the opportunity to explain that the Core Strategy was in the process of being reviewed. The analysis of that review was expected to be completed in June. The confirmation that Much Marcle would be required to complete 7 domestic developments for the period to 2031 was not given and that number may change. It was pointed out that the Core Strategy would be adopted when the working party was drafting its policies. Individual sites and settlement area considerations would require further examination.
3. A Much Marcle resident commented that the meeting concentrated on housing whereas the questionnaire had included other issues and how were these to be addressed. The Core Strategy would be the dominating factor in how these issues were handled. The Village Design Statement had not been particularly effective in its operation. The Neighbourhood Plan would be able to set out guidance and aspirations. B Durkin (County Councillor) indicated that the Neighbourhood Plan was enshrined in law and had greater powers than past legislation. The case against unnecessary development would be much stronger.
4. A suggestion that houses be designed to fit into plots of land e.g. Border Oak housing reminded the meeting of the unpopularity of the Monks Walk housing. A design brief for a development was possible but generally policies need to set down within Neighbourhood Plan.
5. The question as to whether housing already within the planning process would be included in the number of required developments was answered in the affirmative.
6. It was proposed that the traffic issue at the village centre could be resolved by moving the school towards the Ross road and including other facilities such as tennis courts, cricket pitches and swimming pools. Cost issues appear not to have been considered. The Chair of the school Governing Body suggested that a healthy school population was essential for the viability of the village.

7. Gardens as brownfield sites was questioned. Reference to the plot of land opposite to the Rushall Club being a brownfield site was put into doubt as no structure or building had ever been at that location. It was suggested that this would have to be tested by a planning application.
8. The definition of affordable housing was some % of the local market valuation. 10 properties on one site was quoted as the requirement for affordable housing to be built. K Johnson was unable to provide advice as to exception sites and would investigate the matter further.
Affordable housing could be built on individual plots but the land owner would be unlikely to receive full market value.
Part of the equity of affordable houses was owned by a Social Housing Group so that it remained as affordable housing in perpetuity.
9. A request for clarification as to one site covering the required building or spread throughout the community was answered by indicating that the questionnaire results indicated that residents' preference was for spreading the developments. However the one site that could potentially accommodate the required housing was MM15B land opposite to Glebe Orchard. This site has constraints that would need to be addressed – the stream, boggy ground, current use and a traditional orchard.

B Morgan invited those attending to join the Working Party which meets at 7.30 pm on the third Wednesday of the month at the Memorial Hall.

Received Written Suggestions:

1. Traffic congestion would be reduced by building a footpath from the cross-roads to an entrance at the rear of the school. Parents could drop off children at the cross-roads so that the problems close to the school would be relieved.
2. The barn at Swan Cottage was proposed as a potential development site.

J. Gibbon

Secretary NPWP

28th March 2015