

HALLATON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Held in the Snooker Room, Stenning Hall on 17 January 2019 at 7.30pm

Attending: Gary Kirk, Linda Jones, Chris Kilby, Melisa Brucciani, John Norton, Ali Rutherford, Della Stones, John Morison

Apologies: Rosie Warne

1. Linda Jones welcomed all those attending the meeting.

2. Conflicts of interest declared:

Linda Jones - Valentine Goodman Charity

Ali Rutherford - Family connection to owners of Cow Close site

John Norton - Museum

Chris Kilby - Goodman and Fenwick Trust

3. Comments and questions from the Public were heard, summarised as follows:

Tricia Palfreyman - In 2015 the village put forward 2 SHLAA sites on North End and one at Cow Close. If the whole of the Cow Close site were developed the result would be excessive for the village.

Gary Kirk responded: The whole site is within the limits to development but not all of the site would be developed. There will be a meeting next week with the Agent to clarify where the building line will be drawn. The limits to development will be revised accordingly.

Tricia Palfreyman - As a landowner in the village I was sent a questionnaire asking if I would be willing to submit land for 3 or more houses, but the Neighbourhood Plan refers to sites of 5 or more. Why has this changed?

Gary Kirk: The cut off for a site to be referred to as 'windfall' is 'fewer than 5 houses'. Harborough DC's own site assessment process (SHLAA or Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) excludes all sites with a capacity of fewer than five.

Tricia Palfreyman - Medbourne have been allowed to include sites of just two houses.

Linda Jones: Our site allocation has been assessed according to identified housing need. Small developments cannot meet this need, as Medbourne demonstrates.

Mike Wilby - Why is land being identified for development when Hallaton does not meet the criteria for a requirement to provide housing. It has a Church, school and pubs but no public transport links. If affordable housing is to be built then these residents would not be able to afford cars so will need a bus service.

Gary Kirk: The issue of how many houses Hallaton has to take is set at a minimum of 30 by Harborough District Council. We cannot challenge this. They also require sites of 11 or above to have a percentage of affordable homes.

Linda Jones: We have looked at transport as part of the Community Facilities section of the Neighbourhood Plan.

James Palfreyman - The last housing needs survey suggested that actually more housing is not needed. The need for affordable housing should not be used as an excuse for a large estate.

Trevor Johnson - The fact sheet circulated was misleading in suggesting that this is the only Plan on offer and if it were not accepted it would lead to large scale development

Gary Kirk: This Plan has been two years in the making. If it is not approved, and a new Plan had to be developed, then it would expose Hallaton to uncontrolled development. The Parish Council is not being asked to give it final approval, just to allow it to proceed to the stakeholder consultation stage. The Plan can then be adapted to respond to comments made. Amendments can be made to the Plan at several of the future stages.

Trevor Johnson - This was not made clear in the fact sheet, it was presented as a finished document which was unfair to parishioners. The Neighbourhood Plan should build on the existing Parish Plan which favours infill over a single development. It is hard to understand why this site has been chosen when the criteria for assessment are not available along with other appendices.

Gary Kirk, Linda Jones: The appendices are not normally available until the PC has approved the draft Plan. We understand that, as the Plan has already been released, people have questions and we are all working hard to complete the appendices and make them available to the PC.

4. NP Factsheet – responses.

Linda has analysed the responses received from the 3 November to 6 December following the Open event, from 17 December to 28 December following the delivery of the Fact sheet, and from 7 January to 17 January. A summary has been provided to members of the Advisory Committee and will be sent to the Parish Council via Rosie Warne.

A very detailed email has been received from LB. It goes through the Plan and raises a number of queries. The errors in the Plan have been dealt with but the questions give a fair reflection of the types of questions that we are receiving from other members of the public. It was decided that we would try and produce a Q&A document that can be made publicly available and that we would submit it first to the PC before circulating.

5. Meeting with Hallaton Parish Council

Minutes produced from the meeting are agreed. This was thought to have been generally helpful. It allowed people to express concerns and the agreed actions will take the process forward.

The issue of communication is better understood.

Concerns over the Limits to Development line will hopefully be addressed at the meeting with the agent and land owner at a meeting next week. Any developments from this meeting will be communicated to the PC.

Other actions required included forwarding copies of SSAs and landowner letters to Rosie. This has been done.

6. Programme for Next steps

a. Appendices: These are not normally done at this stage but a huge amount of work has been done on them. Your Locale have produced some, as have the Environment Group. Thanks to all for those. The tree photos might need completing. Action Melisa Brucciani.

Site assessment work is being completed by Derek Doran at Your Locale. Linda has kept a record of errors noticed in the Plan to date in order to ensure they are amended in the next edition. John Morison has confirmed the number of listed buildings and will email John Martin at Your Locale to confirm details.

A meeting with the land owner and agent is also imminent.

b. Parish Council Meeting on 28 January

Rosie has sent through another list of information required by the Parish Council. We will endeavour to assemble the information. Actions to be sorted out by email.

The progress of the Plan will depend on the outcome of the meeting with the land owner and agent. If the outcome is not satisfactory it may lead to a standstill. In order to pass examination, the Plan has to be objective with detailed supporting evidence which will be hard to produce if amendments are subjective. There has to be an audit trail for any policy in the Plan which will be challenged. Hopefully some feedback will be forthcoming from the PC prior to the meeting on 28th January.

c. Next steps and allocation of tasks, if Plan approved for next stage

There will be the formal consultation with stakeholders - letters, records of comments received, responses to them. Gary will provide draft letters, and pro forma for us to record stakeholders' and individuals' comments. These will form part of the evidence base for the Plan. All comments received will be recorded (private information removed); in turn we will have to respond to each of them and record it. Comments received to date cannot be included as they must be made in the formal six week consultation period. We can ensure that villagers are advised that they need to submit comments afresh, through flyers, posters etc. It is normally the Clerk to the PC who sends out the letters to the stakeholders and records responses. The NPAC will have to consult with the PC about this.

Outstanding appendices will be completed and submitted to the HPC

7. Finance

A request was made to the PC for funding as the grant for this stage in the process has been spent. Further funds are available for subsequent stages. HPC has asked for a breakdown of expected costs to account for predicted expenditure. Action Gary and Linda.

8. Any other business

None.

9. Actions forthcoming

Question & answer sheet

Tree photographs

Confirmation of number of listed buildings to YourLocale

Response to email from HPC Clerk

Predicted expenditure to take us to the next stage of the process.

10. Date of next meeting

To be decided following the PC meeting at the end of January.

Meeting concluded at 20.25