

A NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN FOR EGERTON

WORKING GROUP

Minutes of meeting on 5 December at 7.30pm in the Sports Pavilion

Present: Jane Carr (Chair), Jerry Crossley, Elaine Graham, Ian Mella, Claire Stevens, Lois Tilden (Secretary)

1. **Apologies for absence** Graham Howland, Richard King.
2. **The minutes of the meeting on 25 October** were approved.
3. **Action points from meeting on 25 October** not covered elsewhere on the agenda:
 - a. Progress report from steering group members on roles allocated under the headings Protect, Sustain, Develop – All were invited again to look at the detailed wording of the revised draft strategy. **JC and LT would review comments and ensure the wording met all needs.**
 - b. Heritage assets & green sites – **CS would consolidate the ideas** submitted by group members to date, in readiness to put a list and photos on the website, and in Egerton Update inviting residents to suggest additional ideas of their own.
 - c. Key views - **GH had the map** and would need to ensure it accurately identifies the views and vistas residents wish to protect.
 - d. An audit of wildlife sites - JC had spoken to Cathy Hill and Steve Kirk about the scope for this; **they were considering it and would let us know their views.**
 - e. Footpaths, hedgerows and trees - **GH was concentrating on this topic** (as EPC's Tree Warden).
 - f. The website needed updating regularly. LT had ensured that approved minutes were included promptly. **GH to add his gloss and provide input** with mapping etc.
 - g. Review of timetable – it was acknowledged this had slipped; **JC would update it.**
 - h. Infrastructure - EG reported that she had obtained some information about gas supplies to the parish - more detail would be needed once development sites had been identified.
 - i. Finances - IM confirmed receipt of £721 from Groundwork and had downloaded more forms for further grant applications. This would be held by EPC, to be used by this Group for specific projects within the NP process.
 - j. Recreation facilities - **CS would be contacting Mr& Mrs Wilkinson** about their proposals for a MUGA sports facility to see how this might be integrated into the NP process. JC had raised with RK a site with potential in the Forstal for recreation, and scope for a leasing arrangement. This would be to address the need identified through residents' views about the lack of such facilities in this part of the parish.
 - k. Audit by consultants of the Group's work – **JC was in touch with SN** about this and would report back.
 - l. Key tasks - compare issues of local importance with policies in Ashford 2030 Plan – to be carried out when we have more material as outlined in points above.

4. Housing Needs Survey - preliminary results

It was pleasing that the Survey had generated a 40% response rate - significantly higher than the average expected from such a survey. It was agreed that ACRK's analysis of the Survey had been thorough and comprehensive, but there was a lot to digest in the report and a few points in the text need a little more clarification. The summary gave a good idea of current needs over the next 5 years – a total of 27 additional dwellings - and it was considered that this may need to be augmented further to take account of needs over the next 15-25 years, taking into account migration into the parish as well as needs from within ("future-proofing"). The New Road site in ABC's Borough Plan 2030 would be for about 15 dwellings; the additional Orchard Nurseries (Sunpatch) site would be for up to 8 dwellings; and the shortfall would be for a range of dwellings in small numbers. (Affordable houses, private sector houses, older people's housing in either category, self-build, and shared-ownership. All modestly-sized dwellings, not large detached.)

It was concluded that on the face of it, the report reinforced the Group's philosophy and provided clear evidence that the Neighbourhood Plan would be justified in identifying sites for development to cater for those needs over the next 20 years or so. It was agreed that further study of the report and wording for a summary that could be published on the website should be carried out. All were invited to comment on the report, in particular the executive summary and comments from respondents. This would help develop a line to take, subject to further discussions between JC and ACRK. **Action: JC to establish if there is any further data from ABC; All to study the report and comment to JC**

5. Development sites – allocated and potential

JC had noted some concerns from residents about the New Road site such as additional traffic, site access and, height of buildings that could restrict views; the need for a mix of housing types on each site; and that such observations would have a read-across to other proposals for development. The Group recognised that it might need to identify some sites not previously suggested by landowners - and preferably small sites with limited development on each, in view of comments from residents.

The larger sites could either be reduced in size or eliminated if more small sites came forward. The criteria for development were crucial in demonstrating objectivity and reasoning. Letters issued to landowners had made this clear. This Group should also be in a position to provide a policy on layout and design, based on the comments from residents and the Parish Design Statement. JC had asked our consultant SN to look further at our work to date on the criteria, and, subject to the outcome, LT and JCr would take this further forward. JC had received a letter from a developer about some proposals, to which she had replied that we were still considering the housing needs for the village and would respond once these had been established.

Action: All to give this further thought and submit comments

6. Parish Design Statement review

JCr had identified the last 15 years' worth of planning permissions for new buildings, replacement buildings, adaptations, extensions and conversions in the parish with a view to determining how far they had met the principles in the Egerton Parish Design Statement. It was agreed he would look at a few prime examples to see how far the planning officers had taken the PDS into account and what might be done to improve or update the PDS. **Action: JCr**

7. Village confines exercise

LT reported that EPC had decided to approve the NP Group's recommendation that this exercise should be conducted by the Group as part of the neighbourhood planning process, rather than ABC lead it. LT drafted a letter for EPC to send to ABC confirming this and asking ABC to state that as a consequence this exercise would not have to meet the standard deadline being set by ABC for comments on their proposals. EPC had earlier material that would be of use to the Group; PR had promised to provide it. **Action: LT and PR**

8. Dates of next Steering Group meetings and proposed meeting with the Parish Council

EPC had suggested Tuesday 22 for a meeting with the NP group. It was agreed after discussion that it would be appropriate for this to be a meeting of the NP Group, for which a presentation to EPC with a Q&A session would be set up. The aim was to motivate and engage proactively. EPC would need be advised and a venue to be identified. **Action: LT & EG respectively.** The next meeting of the NP group would be Monday 14 January at 7.30, preferably in the Pavilion. **Action: EG to arrange.**

The meeting ended at 9.40pm