

## Housing and Planning Sub- Group

Meeting 6 March 2018

Present:

Liz Pegrum (EP) Tony Ferrari (TF) John Bellis (JB) John Crisp (JC) Bill Davidson (BD) Mike Blee(MB)

### Notes and action points

1. Considered Brian Wilson's answers to our initial questions. See attached email. Wide ranging discussions on the subjects and Brian Wilson's (BW) responses, together with a review of the survey results which enabled the conclusions, actions and approach set out at 2 below to be agreed. General agreement that we must follow the survey and not try to persuade people to change their opinions . JC commented that the survey was badly drafted in places and had led the responses - different questions would have come to a different answer. All agreed that many of the answers to the survey were contradictory and it would be difficult to work around these but we must try to come to reasonable conclusions. BD was concerned that the minority views were not being considered, and no consideration of smaller groups, or non-participants in the survey was to be included in the plan. There would be a further consultation in due course which might enable these views to be brought out. Further consultation might help to iron out the inconsistencies in the survey response.
2. Outline approach:
  - Housing Numbers: 1-20 seemed to be suggested by the survey, some discussion as to whether it should be weighted in any way and how these numbers could follow through into the plan, but BW had said that we cannot cap the numbers but can define density, this seemed to be difficult to achieve. Agreed weighting not appropriate. EP to contact Brian Wilson to ask how this might be tackled in Sutton Poyntz, and how this might be realistically related back to the survey results. **(Action EP)**
  - Housing need: it was felt that the survey had not identified housing need because most people own their own homes and therefore there was no need for affordable housing. If more houses were to be built they would be open market houses and not restricted to the village so although there was a desire, identified by the housing need survey for smaller two bedroomed houses and bungalows it was felt this was not fully supported by the HNS and BW had intimated the same in his advice email. It might be possible to look again at the housing need in Preston as a whole and take a fraction of that as an allocation to Sutton Poyntz, but the feeling was this would not give any meaningful or useful figures. Similar calculations on the basis of a fractional approach had been attempted earlier on in the process and had only given extremely small numbers certainly less than the 0 to 20 indicated by the survey. Await answers to BW's questions to the housing numbers/density, but in general felt that the main reaction to the HNS survey was to look at the design and size of any future builds.
  - Identification of housing sites; it was agreed that identifying housing sites within the village could cause controversy and opposition to the plan and therefore it was agreed that no such sites should be identified. Discussion as to what the types of sites might be - agreed that the plan had been in favour of building in gardens and just about in favour preferably as a secondary option of knocking down and building higher density properties on the site. Discussion as to whether the site next to the pond might be suitable for development – JC thought Miss Saunders garden and house plus adjacent property would be suitable for a knockdown and redevelopment of small cottage style houses next to the pond - general agreement that this might be a good

idea but could cause controversy and the plan being rejected at referendum, so no mention in the neighbourhood plan. Similarly BW's suggestion of development behind the Waterworks was thought to be inappropriate, but again not be mentioned in the plan because of controversy.

- Development Boundary; the survey had clearly shown that there was no desire to change the development boundary and it was agreed that this should be reflected in the policies.
- Attitude to affordable; although EP was in favour of affordable housing in the village on a moral basis, the feeling around the table was that it was not appropriate for the village. MB said it would not be sustainable and therefore no need to consider affordable housing.
- How do we deal with consultation with landowners? Agreed this was now difficult, because the development boundary would not be changing and therefore, in reality there was nothing to discuss with developers. We had missed the opportunity to see whether they would be prepared to offer something to the village in exchange for development. Consultation to be dealt with by the main committee, this subgroup to consider the results in due course.
- Style and design : difficulty with style and design is that the survey is contradictory, seems to be a majority in favour of reflecting the design of nearby properties while at the same time wanting the design to reflect the style in the village core, careful wording needed to encompass both. Style should include size of properties, number of parking spaces, electrical charging points, and the need for smaller houses within the village. Agreed that too many stipulations could put off developers as it would make knockdown and rebuild projects unaffordable.

3. Proposed policy template: agreed that JC and JB would put together a first draft of the template for first three of the agreed policies (bullet point only, not prose) to be circulated by end of play Sunday 11 March. Rest of the group would then send comments back to EP by Friday 16 March who would amalgamate into a format for circulation prior to the steering group meeting on 20 March.

The four policies were agreed as;

- numbers/density/size of new build
  - development boundary
  - style and design to include car parking and electric chargers
  - key views
4. Key Views - at meeting was agreed to leave drafting of this policy until after the assessment visit on 21/3. EP is going to drive round the consultants to get them to the more difficult viewpoints. (MB emailed EP after the meeting to suggest a policy should be ready for the steering group meeting on 20 March.)