

## Notes from Neighbourhood Development Plan Meeting – 9th March 2016

Present: Liz Connolly, Brian Barnett , Kate Darby, Robert Chitham, Jo King, Brian Bloxsome

Apologies: Audrey Bott, Barrie Morgan, Andrew Thompson, Peter Furneaux, Tom Rogers, Mark Richards,

1. Bill Bloxome presented his second draft plan and indicated that he wanted to concentrate on the housing numbers and sites.
  - (a) Bircher. He felt that in order to convince Herefordshire Council that we could reach our targets it would be better to treat sites 19 and 27 as an allocation capable of taking 5 dwellings. This was accepted.
  - (b) Lucton. Nothing proposed
  - (c) Yarpole.
    - (i) There was much discussion about the site at the end of Croft Crescent. It was noted that we have included 5 houses in our total because that reflects the current planning application. All present felt that more houses could be included along with the retention of a green area. Bill suggested that we should define this site as capable of taking up to 8 houses with a stated percentage being retained as green area. This was accepted.
    - (ii) The possibility that two smaller houses could be accommodated adjacent to the pub was accepted
    - (iii) Robert presented his outline example of what could be done at sites 10 and 18. Although welcomed by all there remained a number of concerns relating to both vehicular and pedestrian access and it was clear that the scheme as presented would require the owner of site 10 ( Jeff Woodfield) to accept that much of the remaining site would be kept as a green area/orchard as well as the section 106 land. Bill indicated that the final position of the 106 land could be negotiated. It was clear that discussions are needed with Jeff. ( After meeting note: Kate is happy to be involved and others wishing to join her should contact her.) It was agreed that the wording of the section in the draft should be strengthened to ensure that no more than 14 houses would be provided even if access issues could be satisfactorily resolved. It was also accepted that if an alternative access is provided this should not provide a through route into the village.
2. There was some discussion of the Leintwardine Appeal decision which might have implications for the Price site. This led to a brief debate about the position we might now be in if Price is approved. Bill's new figures have a maximum total of 51 and

Price`s site could add 6. This gives 57 against a target based on expressed wishes of the community of 42. ~~Even-Even~~ without Price we therefore have more houses than needed. This issue needs more discussion.

3. In order to ensure we can keep to timescale it was agreed that :-

Robert would send the design brief to Bill

Liz would do likewise with the heritage document and settings

Kate would take some photos particularly of trees at site 5

We would all provide comments on the draft in order to let Bill have something by Sunday. He in turn felt he would then be able to get something off to HC next week. This would allow time for Gemma Webster to look at the SEA and HRA before she departs on leave on 18<sup>th</sup> April. ( Gemma has confirmed this timescale).

Jo confirmed that the PC had agreed to fund a Biodiversity analysis.

Thanks expressed to Bill.

Meeting closed 9.20pm.