

Attendance

Samantha Banks **SB**, Karla Johnson. Herefordshire Council.

Members of Cradley Parish Council & NDP Group: Tanya Lloyd Jones **TLJ**, Geoff Fielding GF, Anne Scarsbrook

Member of Cradley Parish Council, NDP Group and HoV: AlanEldridge **AE**.

Members of NDP Group: Seonaid Barber Jeff White

David Crofts DC – Independent Planning consultant

Opening

SB-Identify risks in the process opening after from HC NDP group parish council.

NDP Officer role to ensue your plan meets the basic conditions, identify risks involved. Role is not to govern/look at constitution.

Role of the NDP for where we are at the NDP, progress next, risk involved.

Overview

TLJ-	<p>Started in 2013 first ndp meeting. Published Parish Plan in 2010. Spoke with Gemma for guidance .NDP process use detail consultation subsequent events themes identified. Purpose of meeting is to draw issues of concern in the NDP process.</p> <p>In 2014 a questionnaire had been drafted up. Storrige district a 2nd questionnaire out.</p> <p>Advertised in the PC newsletter, every household distributed.</p> <p>2 planning for real events. 1 in storridge, 1 in Cradley in 2014.</p>
AE-	<p>Heart of the village project started in 2014. Initially a working party of the the Parish Council.</p>
TLJ-	<p>Cradley Parish Council employed David Crofts Planning consultant to draft up plan.</p> <p>Used parish plan as base information.</p> <p>Looked at Colwall NDP, they did a landscape capacity assessment, produced</p>

	<p>landscape assessment.</p> <p>In 2015 identify landscape and ranked sites within Cradley and Storridge.</p> <p>Options have been considered. Various housing proposals came into discussion. Issues discussed the east part of the village, housing and a shop ad sites considered.</p> <p>Pixiefeld large housing development was granted planning permission for upto 60 houses.</p> <p>103 is the minimum housing target figure for Cradley parish 2011-31.</p> <p>It wasn't appropriate to select large sites as a large housing area that nearly meet housing target.</p> <p>PC decided to go with smaller housing plots and windfall figures. Us landscape character assessment that C.Tinkler completed as a basis for development. Questionnaire drafted options considered.</p> <p>After much discourse and disagreement- Cradley Parish Council managed to sort out questionnaire.</p> <p>Questionnaire results identified key issues.</p> <p>Desire for second shop –survey showed 50% support.</p> <p>Strategic gap has been discussed, defined criteria-this had been identified in the 1992 Malvern Hills Local Plan development area.</p> <p>Settlement boundary.</p> <p>Cradley Parish Council collected a wide ranging selection of evidence.</p> <p>Parish Plan/ design statement, large amount of evidence collected over time.</p>
SB-	<p>NDP for whole for parish area polices for ndp area.</p> <p>Plan outlines where the settlement areas are.</p> <p>Core Strategy and NDP policy sit side by side but the NDP must conform to the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Anything on the 4.14 and 4.15 identified settlements will expect main development within the identified settlement boundaries. Anything outside that will be classified as open countryside.</p>
TLJ-	<p>David Crofts had spoken to Kevin Singleton (Planning Policy Manager) regarding policy and settlement boundary issues relevant to the NDP.</p> <p>Anything in or adjacent to the settlement development, presumption is in favour for development.</p>

SB-	<p>Cradley is listed under the RA2 policy as a village where proportionate housing growth will be appropriate. Storridge not on the RA2 list and is classified as open countryside .</p> <p>Need robust major evidence to support NDP policies. Need major evidence if NDP disagree with policy stated in the core strategy. Generally NDP polices judged against core strategy.</p> <p>Policies are assessed against Basic conditions and the plan against meeting these.</p> <p>RA3 policy-open countryside policy everything in the parish area which is not identified in the settlement boundary is classed as open countryside.</p>
TLJ-	<p>CNDPSG hosted planning for real events, questionnaires.</p>
SB-	<p>Current status of NDPs</p> <p>1 passed under examination awaiting referendum.</p> <p>6 awaiting examination.</p> <p>20 reg 14/16 have gone through</p> <p>Reg 14 consultation is first official consultation.</p> <p>This process you will consult with statutory consultees and officially notify Herefordshire Council. Internal consultees include Development Management, Policy Team, Housing, Environmental Health, transport, education, parks etc.</p> <p>Risk period is at reg 14-16.</p> <p>Reg 14 should take into consideration comments.</p> <p>Take on board comments .Show the best option. Take the middle ground/ balancing conflicting views.</p> <p>Less risk if you take on deal with issues/ objections at an earlier stage.</p> <p>Reg 14 stage critical to pick up problems.</p> <p>Post reg 14 requires consultation statement and basic conditions statement.</p> <p>No regs state what you have to do.</p> <p>NDP erg 14/16- Notify, enable access on web and in paper form.</p> <p>At reg14/16 stages will be published on the Herefordshire Council website.</p> <p>It should also be published on your Parish council website/ NDP website. Put paper copies of the plan in public places for easy access.</p> <p>Consultation-horses for courses whatever is suitable for your parish.</p>

	<p>Questionnaire accessible to every household.</p> <p>Consultation posters/ events invite public to.</p> <p>Emails/ questionnaire</p> <p>Whole raft of ways to approach consultation.</p> <p>No set way of approaching consultation.</p> <p>Different iterations. Variety of methods off approaching questionnaires .</p> <p>Difficulty in analysing results/ can prove lengthy/ different methods to approach this.</p> <p>Wording of questions. Effective wording/ when it comes to questions.</p> <p>Questionnaires could raise contentious issues, such as housing land, specific things.</p> <p>Sort out issues through further consultation/ reaching middle ground.</p> <p>Policy or proposal stated within your plan.</p> <p>If consultation hasn't been done properly. People have oppportuning to comment on the plan.</p> <p>Referendum vote is just yes or no similar to local elections.</p> <p>Referendum has or be 50% plus 1 in order to pass and be adopted.</p> <p>Voted determined on how the parish feels about the plan.</p> <p>Plan through to vote. Ensure plans are right before going to examination and regulatory stages. It is best to debate out contentious issues before going to referendum.</p> <p>Worst case scenario is to have a failed referendum from lack of public support.</p> <p>If the plan fails all the hard work and evidence base goes with it.</p> <p>Core Strategy does not allocate settlement boundaries to ra1 and ra2 policy.</p> <p>Consultation statement states how you have shown public engagement.</p> <p>Gis lists addresses of all the address points in the parish for a small fee.</p>
AE-	<p>AE queried use of Statistics from heart of Village questionnaire for NDP. Named responses.</p> <p>There was a discussion about consultation coming together hov group with ndp group.</p> <p>HOV consultation had named responses. Wanted to ask a set of non-leading questions. Provide 1 set of results.Consultation interviewers sat while people have</p>

	<p>filled it in .</p> <p>Consider options that have evolved from our consultation</p>
GF	<p>Stated that he had read with regard to the approach to be adopted for consultation that questionnaires should not involve lobbying or direct engagement.</p>
SB	<p>SB confirmed that this was correct and that also anonymous comments were acceptable.</p>
TLJ-	<p>Points of action. Get rid of any outstanding issues and send through draft plan.</p> <p>David Crofts appointed Planning Consultant-Produced 1st draft, 30th October deadline Nov 16th. Response from Parish Council. Nov 24th prior to parish council meeting.</p> <p>No proposal for housing stated within the plan, criteria based policies. Detailed policies. No proposals, weight of evidence in favour of a strategic gap in between two parts of the village.</p> <p>Pixiefield has outline planning for upto 60 and with other committed developments have approximately 90 houses houses and minimum housing target is 103. Therefore windfall is expected to meet the minimum.</p>
SB-	<p>Given the committed developments in place in CPC and the shortfall of approximately 13 houses, HCC would not expect to see specific sites identified for housing and it is sufficient to rely on windfalls to make up the shortfall.</p> <p>The NDP must give evidence with a historical windfall figure to give an idea of what windfall numbers are achievable.</p> <p>A small allocation/ infill could be suggested as well to ensure deliverability the housing figures.</p> <p>Proportionate growth for the whole area.</p> <p>NDP Cannot be anti-development and have no cap or maximums.</p> <p>Must illuminate ill feelings and issues before reaching reg 14. This may cause problems at referendum/ later stages of the NDP process.</p> <p>Karla will comment on NDP draft/ evidence base once you send it through and send it back after Christmas. After Christmas review comments.</p> <p>We will check if your plan meets the basic conditions, check against Core Strategy compliance and gives advice how to improve your plan.</p>
SB-	<p>Do consultation in January. Receive NDP comments in January. January fine tune the plan. Mid feb, have final draft of the plan. February Karla to do HRA and SEA Stage B and C assessments.</p>

<p>Aim for March to reach reg 14 consultation. (6 weeks) Ensure you get as many responses as possible at this stage.</p> <p>June/ July 2016 Reg 16 (6 weeks). This stage need to submit consultation statement and basic conditions statement.</p> <p>Examination August/September 2016.</p> <p>Referendum paid and organised by Herefordshire Council.</p> <p>If plan fails referendum, you will have to wait 2 years for resubmission unless the plan has dramatically changed.</p>
--

From: Tanya Lloyd Jones <tanyalj65@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Jan 4, 2016 at 10:43 AM

Subject: Fwd: Amended meeting notes for CSNDP Group meeting with HCC December 2nd 2015

To: ken nason <innmentor@aol.com>, Anne Scarsbrook <anneant262@googlemail.com>, Alan Eldridge <alan@alaneldridge.co.uk>, ann carver <mail@derekandann.co.uk>, Geoff Fielding <geoffreyfielding@btinternet.com>, Jeff White <whitehawthorns.cradley@care4free.net>, seonaid Dawn barber <seonaidawnbarber@gmail.com>, David Crofts <david@estcourtplanning.co.uk>

Cc: Mary Barnett <marym.abarnett@btinternet.com>, Chris Lowder <clchaircpc@aol.com>

Dear all

Please see below - Karla has responded by return. I also attach the agreed meeting minutes.

Ken - please upload onto the PC/NDP page.

Many thanks

Tanya

NDP Group

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Johnson, Karla <Karla.Johnson@herefordshire.gov.uk>

Date: Mon, Jan 4, 2016 at 8:39 AM

Subject: RE: Amended meeting notes for CSNDP Group meeting with HCC December 2nd 2015

To: Tanya Lloyd Jones <tanyalj65@gmail.com>

Hi Tanya,

Just to confirm the amended version of the minutes are fine.

Best regards

Karla Johnson

Planning Officer | Neighbourhood Planning | Herefordshire Council

PO Box 230 | Blueschool House | Blueschool Street | Hereford | HR1 2ZB

T: 01432 261788 E: Karla.Johnson@herefordshire.gov.uk, neighbourhoodplanning@herefordshire.gov.uk (for Neighbourhood Planning enquiries)

Any opinion expressed in this email or any attached files are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Herefordshire Council. This email and any attached files are confidential and intended solely for the use of the addressee. This communication may contain material protected by law from being passed on. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this email in error, you are advised that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please contact the sender immediately and destroy all copies of it.

From: Tanya Lloyd Jones [mailto:tanyalj65@gmail.com]

Sent: 03 January 2016 17:22

To: Johnson, Karla; Banks, Samantha

Cc: Mary Barnett; ken nason; Chris Lowder; David Crofts; Anne Scarsbrook; ann carver; Jeff White; Geoff Fielding; seonaid Dawn barber

Subject: Amended meeting notes for CSNDP Group meeting with HCC December 2nd 2015

Dear Samantha and Karla

Please find attached the amended meeting notes for the meeting of 2nd December 2015 - amendments are in red as tracked changes. These have been updated and agreed with all the NDP members present as well as David Crofts, the independent planning consultant. The changes relate in the main to the list of attendees and points of accuracy regarding statements made at the meeting, such as the reference to Pixiefield, which given this will be a public document should be correct before it is published.

Please can you confirm that you are happy with the amended version so that we can upload it onto the NDP section of the Parish Council website.

Wishing you a Happy New Year!

Kind regards

Tanya

Parish Councillor and NDP Group

"Any opinion expressed in this e-mail or any attached files are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Herefordshire Council, Herefordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (HCCG), Wye Valley NHS Trust or 2gether NHS Foundation Trust. You should be aware that Herefordshire Council, Herefordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (HCCG), Wye Valley NHS Trust & 2gether NHS Foundation Trust monitors its email service. This e-mail and any attached files are confidential and intended solely for the use of the addressee. This communication may contain material protected by law from being passed on. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this e-mail in error, you are advised that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please contact the sender immediately and destroy all copies of it."