## Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group 10th February 2020 Chidham and Hambrook Village Hall 7pm

**Present:** Keith Dimon, Jane Towers, Andy Collins, Richard Weavis, Martin McBride (Chair), Jacky Sheppard. Stephen Johnson, Andrew Sargent, Karl Seddon, Andrew Kerry-Beddell, Peter Bolton, Rachel Perri.

Apologies: Roger Gowlett, Philip MacDougall, Marie Gilby.

**Honorary Secretary**: Lisa Wilcock

## Meeting commenced at 1900hrs

Meeting Commenced at 1500ms				
041/20	Apologies			
	Apologies received from Roger Gowlett, Philip MacDougall, Marie Gilby.			
	Noted that Peter Bolton and Rachel Perri had joined the group.			
042/20	Declarations of interest			
	None.			
043/20	Minutes 27 <sup>th</sup> January 2020			
	Approved.			
044/20	Matters Arising			
	Noted that the meeting notes have not been circulated.			
	a) The Parish Council has agreed to vire up to £5,000 for the NPSG if it is			
	needed. The Locality grants will not be applied for again until April as if a			
	grant was as awarded now, it would have to be spent by end March so this			
	has been put on hold until the new financial year.			
	c) MMcB tried to contact Jon Herbert but he has had no response with			
	regard to a project plan and timescales. Since the meeting JH has contacted			
	Bambi about the project plan and timescales.			
045/20	Developer and Landowner Questionnaire Part I.			
	a) The final version of questionnaire was distributed to the group in			
	advance of the meeting noted that the document has been approved by the			
	Parish Council at their last meeting. The group was asked to approve the			
	document for its distribution. Noted that this was the first or three phases of			
	communication. Phase 1 a generic questionnaire, Phase 2 a more detailed			
	questionnaire possibly bespoke to each suitable site, Phase 3 a face to face			
	meeting with developers and landowners, where applicable. Noted that 2			
	very minor changes to the questionnaire were made by the Chairman. It			
	was agreed that the current document will have a covering letter with it to			
	explain the reasoning behind the questionnaire and will be distributed to all			
	landowners/developers via email. A vote was taken to proceed with the			
	questionnaire the majority carrying the vote to proceed. It was agreed that			
	the questionnaire will be sent out this week with a deadline moved to 13th			
	March. Action: SJ to write a draft covering letter and pass it to the group for	SJ/LW		
	comment and BJ. Action MMcB to send updated version of the	BJ/MMcB		
	questionnaire to BJ. Action BJ to distribute to via email and then by post			
	where no email is available. Action LW to put together the list of contacts			
	with emails.			
	b) Noted that the group want pressure to be placed on CDC to confirm the			
	Parishes allocation or at the very least a timescale as to when this			
	information will be released. Noted that District Councillors have asked the			
	same. Noted that a response from Valerie Dobbs regarding the restrictions			

on developing sites within the AONB had been received and distributed to the group.  O46/20 Developer Site Update a) Noted that an outline application had been received on one site. If planning were approved allocation of houses will be deducted from the total allocation of houses in the NP. Another site was discussed as it now appears to have more practical access points. Action PMcD to provide feedback on the site access at the next meeting. b) Noted that the housing needs survey for all developers in on the website for them to access if they wish to. b) Entry Level exception sites was discussed as the number of houses cannot exceed 5% of the 'adjacent settlement'. The group asked for clarification on this so they fully understand the implications. Action JT to contact CDC to ask for clarification.  O47/20 Site Classification a) The Chair proposed an addition to the site allocation colours. The extra colour could be Orange. Noted that the Troy document shows that some Amber sites are not suitable for development however once the Design Code, SEA and questionnaires are received the group may choose to change the recommendation and consider the site for development. The group considered an extra colour of Orange to award the sites affected. The group discussed each of the Amber sites that are currently considered unsuitable by the Troy document. The Chair proposed to add Orange as a new colour to help during the site allocation process post Design Code, SEA and developer questionnaire feedback. The group agreed to leave the colour designation as it is (i.e. Red, Amber and Green) as adding another colour just for the group's purposes could become confusing.  O48/20 AECOM and SEA Assessment a) Noted that the AECOM Design Code and SEA meetings had been completed in between the meetings but both their reports are likely to take up to 3 months. Noted that AECOM have asked to see the NPSG 15 year Vision. The Vision needs to be finalised and the group discussed how best to complete this quickly. Noted that the NP is l			
O46/20 Developer Site Update a) Noted that an outline application had been received on one site. If planning were approved allocation of houses will be deducted from the total allocation of houses in the NP. Another site was discussed as it now appears to have more practical access points. Action PMcD to provide feedback on the site access at the next meeting. b) Noted that the housing needs survey for all developers in on the website for them to access if they wish to. b) Entry Level exception sites was discussed as the number of houses cannot exceed 5% of the 'adjacent settlement'. The group asked for clarification on this so they fully understand the implications. Action JT to contact CDC to ask for clarification.  047/20 Site Classification a) The Chair proposed an addition to the site allocation colours. The extra colour could be Orange. Noted that the Troy document shows that some Amber sites are not suitable for development however once the Design Code, SEA and questionnaires are received the group may choose to change the recommendation and consider the site for development. The group considered an extra colour of Orange to award the sites affected. The group discussed each of the Amber sites that are currently considered unsuitable by the Troy document. The Chair proposed to add Orange as a new colour to help during the site allocation process post Design Code, SEA and developer questionnaire feedback. The group agreed to leave the colour designation as it is (i.e. Red, Amber and Green) as adding another colour just for the group's purposes could become confusing.  048/20 AECOM and SEA Assessment a) Noted that the AECOM Design Code and SEA meetings had been completed in between the meetings but both their reports are likely to take up to 3 months. Noted that the NP is likely to be reviewed again in 5 years with another housing allocation and now is the time to 'ring fence' certain areas within the Parish to protect them from future development but allow the areas to be designated for other community us			
a) Noted that an outline application had been received on one site. If planning were approved allocation of houses will be deducted from the total allocation of houses in the NP. Another site was discussed as it now appears to have more practical access points. Action PMcD to provide feedback on the site access at the next meeting. b) Noted that the housing needs survey for all developers in on the website for them to access if they wish to. b) Entry Level exception sites was discussed as the number of houses cannot exceed 5% of the 'adjacent settlement'. The group asked for clarification on this so they fully understand the implications. Action JT to contact CDC to ask for clarification.  047/20 Site Classification a) The Chair proposed an addition to the site allocation colours. The extra colour could be Orange. Noted that the Troy document shows that some Amber sites are not suitable for development however once the Design Code, SEA and questionnaires are received the group may choose to change the recommendation and consider the site for development. The group considered an extra colour of Orange to award the sites affected. The group discussed each of the Amber sites that are currently considered unsuitable by the Troy document. The Chair proposed to add Orange as a new colour to help during the site allocation process post Design Code, SEA and developer questionnaire feedback. The group agreed to leave the colour designation as it is (i.e. Red, Amber and Green) as adding another colour just for the group's purposes could become confusing.  048/20 AECOM and SEA Assessment a) Noted that the AECOM Design Code and SEA meetings had been completed in between the meetings but both their reports are likely to take up to 3 months. Noted that AECOM have asked to see the NPSG 15 year Vision. The Vision needs to be finalised and the group discussed how best to complete this quickly. Noted that the NP is likely to be reviewed again in 5 years with another housing allocation and now is the time to 'ring fence' certain	046/20	· ·	
a) The Chair proposed an addition to the site allocation colours. The extra colour could be Orange. Noted that the Troy document shows that some Amber sites are not suitable for development however once the Design Code, SEA and questionnaires are received the group may choose to change the recommendation and consider the site for development. The group considered an extra colour of Orange to award the sites affected. The group discussed each of the Amber sites that are currently considered unsuitable by the Troy document. The Chair proposed to add Orange as a new colour to help during the site allocation process post Design Code, SEA and developer questionnaire feedback. The group agreed to leave the colour designation as it is (i.e. Red, Amber and Green) as adding another colour just for the group's purposes could become confusing.  AECOM and SEA Assessment  a) Noted that the AECOM Design Code and SEA meetings had been completed in between the meetings but both their reports are likely to take up to 3 months. Noted that AECOM have asked to see the NPSG 15 year Vision. The Vision needs to be finalised and the group discussed how best to complete this quickly. Noted that the NP is likely to be reviewed again in 5 years with another housing allocation and now is the time to 'ring fence' certain areas within the Parish to protect them from future development but allow the areas to be designated for other community uses in the future. Noted that the Vision should include ideas like a pathway and cycle route along Broad Road and will then feed onto the proposed CHEMROUTE. Noted that KD has the feedback from the Open Day but there is a need to conduct another Residents Survey. It was agreed to form a sub group so they can formulate a new residents' survey. Action JT, KD, JS to put together the survey in time for the next meeting.  b) Noted that one member referred the group to the Locality website to find further information. The link was sent out via email in advance of the meeting.  c) The group notes that there ar	040/20	<ul> <li>a) Noted that an outline application had been received on one site. If planning were approved allocation of houses will be deducted from the total allocation of houses in the NP. Another site was discussed as it now appears to have more practical access points. Action PMcD to provide feedback on the site access at the next meeting.</li> <li>b) Noted that the housing needs survey for all developers in on the website for them to access if they wish to.</li> <li>b) Entry Level exception sites was discussed as the number of houses cannot exceed 5% of the 'adjacent settlement'. The group asked for clarification on this so they fully understand the implications. Action JT to contact CDC to</li> </ul>	
a) The Chair proposed an addition to the site allocation colours. The extra colour could be Orange. Noted that the Troy document shows that some Amber sites are not suitable for development however once the Design Code, SEA and questionnaires are received the group may choose to change the recommendation and consider the site for development. The group considered an extra colour of Orange to award the sites affected. The group discussed each of the Amber sites that are currently considered unsuitable by the Troy document. The Chair proposed to add Orange as a new colour to help during the site allocation process post Design Code, SEA and developer questionnaire feedback. The group agreed to leave the colour designation as it is (i.e. Red, Amber and Green) as adding another colour just for the group's purposes could become confusing.  1048/20  104	047/20		31
a) Noted that the AECOM Design Code and SEA meetings had been completed in between the meetings but both their reports are likely to take up to 3 months. Noted that AECOM have asked to see the NPSG 15 year Vision. The Vision needs to be finalised and the group discussed how best to complete this quickly. Noted that the NP is likely to be reviewed again in 5 years with another housing allocation and now is the time to 'ring fence' certain areas within the Parish to protect them from future development but allow the areas to be designated for other community uses in the future. Noted that the Vision should include ideas like a pathway and cycle route along Broad Road and will then feed onto the proposed CHEMROUTE. Noted that KD has the feedback from the Open Day but there is a need to conduct another Residents Survey. It was agreed to form a sub group so they can formulate a new residents' survey. Action JT, KD, JS to put together the survey in time for the next meeting.  b) Noted that one member referred the group to the Locality website to find further information. The link was sent out via email in advance of the meeting.  c) The group notes that there are 2 wildlife maps showing slightly different Wildlife Corridors. It was agreed that the group should contact Sarah Hughes to ask for an up-to-date Wildlife Map. Action BJ to contact Sarah	047/20	a) The Chair proposed an addition to the site allocation colours. The extra colour could be Orange. Noted that the Troy document shows that some Amber sites are not suitable for development however once the Design Code, SEA and questionnaires are received the group may choose to change the recommendation and consider the site for development. The group considered an extra colour of Orange to award the sites affected. The group discussed each of the Amber sites that are currently considered unsuitable by the Troy document. The Chair proposed to add Orange as a new colour to help during the site allocation process post Design Code, SEA and developer questionnaire feedback. The group agreed to leave the colour designation as it is (i.e. Red, Amber and Green) as adding another	
completed in between the meetings but both their reports are likely to take up to 3 months. Noted that AECOM have asked to see the NPSG 15 year Vision. The Vision needs to be finalised and the group discussed how best to complete this quickly. Noted that the NP is likely to be reviewed again in 5 years with another housing allocation and now is the time to 'ring fence' certain areas within the Parish to protect them from future development but allow the areas to be designated for other community uses in the future. Noted that the Vision should include ideas like a pathway and cycle route along Broad Road and will then feed onto the proposed CHEMROUTE. Noted that KD has the feedback from the Open Day but there is a need to conduct another Residents Survey. It was agreed to form a sub group so they can formulate a new residents' survey. Action JT, KD, JS to put together the survey in time for the next meeting.  b) Noted that one member referred the group to the Locality website to find further information. The link was sent out via email in advance of the meeting. c) The group notes that there are 2 wildlife maps showing slightly different Wildlife Corridors. It was agreed that the group should contact Sarah Hughes to ask for an up-to-date Wildlife Map. Action BJ to contact Sarah	048/20	AECOM and SEA Assessment	
Hughes on behalf of the group. d) Noted that the Design Code is on hold until the next meeting as they		completed in between the meetings but both their reports are likely to take up to 3 months. Noted that AECOM have asked to see the NPSG 15 year Vision. The Vision needs to be finalised and the group discussed how best to complete this quickly. Noted that the NP is likely to be reviewed again in 5 years with another housing allocation and now is the time to 'ring fence' certain areas within the Parish to protect them from future development but allow the areas to be designated for other community uses in the future. Noted that the Vision should include ideas like a pathway and cycle route along Broad Road and will then feed onto the proposed CHEMROUTE. Noted that KD has the feedback from the Open Day but there is a need to conduct another Residents Survey. It was agreed to form a sub group so they can formulate a new residents' survey. Action JT, KD, JS to put together the survey in time for the next meeting.  b) Noted that one member referred the group to the Locality website to find further information. The link was sent out via email in advance of the meeting. c) The group notes that there are 2 wildlife maps showing slightly different Wildlife Corridors. It was agreed that the group should contact Sarah Hughes to ask for an up-to-date Wildlife Map. Action BJ to contact Sarah Hughes on behalf of the group.	

	meet in 2 weeks just to agree a Vision that can then be written up and sent	
	to AECOM once approved.	
049/20	Matters for next agenda	
	a) Timetable from Jon Herbert	
	b) Request to create subgroups to concentrate on Housing and Transport	
	Environment as per email from PMcD.	
	c) Next meeting 24 <sup>th</sup> February just to complete the Vision.	
	d) Residents Survey to be ready for agreement and then to be passed to	
	Parish Council for approval before it is released.	
	e) Policies – sub groups to review feedback. Noted that Client Earth had	
	written to CDC regarding Climate Change. Within that letter there are 19	
	references that the group can use to help with their own policies.	
	f) Feedback from PMcD on site access re Minute 046/20 (a).	
050/20	AOB	
	a) The group asked to see a copy of the terms of reference the Parish	
	Council use during their Planning Meetings. Action LW to source a copy of	
	this document from BJ.	LW
	Date of next meeting	
	24 <sup>th</sup> February Vision meeting (no minutes)	
	2 <sup>nd</sup> March next full meeting	

Meeting ended at 2103hrs