



## Buckhorn Weston and Kington Magna Parish Council

### Buckhorn Weston & Kington Magna Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2022 at Kington Magna Village Hall

Attendees: Linda Munster (LM) (Chairman)

Peter Townsley (PT)

John Westbrook (JW)

Richard McDougal (RM)

Felicity Beck (FB)

Richard Smith (RS)

John Street (JS)

Apologies: Lisa House (LH) Secretary

Serial		Action
1.	Apologies received and noted from LH and SG expressed their condolences on her loss.	
2.	The minutes for the meeting held on the 16 <sup>th</sup> November were agreed and signed. LM to give to Nigel Osborne to post on the PC website	LM
3.	There were no declarations of interest.	
4.	SG looked at the consultants report from the results of the settlement boundary survey and agreed that the new graphs were much clearer. These have now been posted on the PC website. The consultant has recommended that the SG consider the comments made and address them and add any clarifications to the tables to show our response. We should then consider whether any changes are needed to the proposed boundaries. Our response should show the criteria that we have used for setting the proposed boundary. The consultant felt that this was an exercise that would benefit from being carried out whilst the event was still fresh in our minds. The SG looked at the comments and responded with the criteria that they adhered to, as shown at the Consultation Event. These responses will be included in the NP.  On discussing the comments, it was noted that the SG were working with the results of the village survey that was carried out in March/April, where people wanted to see some development but not large scale development. There were comments that more houses needed to be built on suitable sites but it was acknowledged that the desire, from the majority of people who expressed a preference, was that infill development only was appropriate. JS commented that he felt some people did not fully understand the criteria that the SG were working to even though this was on display at the consultation events and FB agreed saying that there was an	

enormous amount of information to read through and understand. JW also raised the point that some people did not understand what the NP was and that as they were outside the proposed settlement boundary it did not affect them. JW also raised the subject of the land opposite the former Cross' Garage site as a potential site but following a previous discussion with the planning officer this was discounted due to its being agricultural land. PT commented that he felt a large majority of the people in KM still did not fully understand what the NP was all about. RM said that as he understood it, the consultant required us to answer the planning aspects of the comments and that we should do this with diligence following the criteria as laid out. LM will check with the consultant on how this process will be laid out. FB suggested that we add up the comments and group together similar responses to answer as one, the same with negative and positive remarks, so as not to give a misleading response. The subject of class Q applications was discussed and accepted that agricultural land has its own planning criteria which is separate to the NP. Comments such as "It will maintain the relative integrity, developmentally, of the village", "It will support a level of development proportionate to the existing village" and "It should help control development" were noted and agreed as very positive. LM said she felt that people were very passionate about their villages as was obvious from their comments.

A number of comments from KM residents mentioned the lack of infrastructure, the narrow roads and the volume of traffic using these roads. It was accepted that quite a lot of traffic was from cars cutting through the village to access other areas. The issue of flooding was mentioned and PT & JS pointed out the large number of springs that crossed the land in KM, it was noted that this was the case in BW as well. All agreed it was necessary to reiterate that any proposed development would be of small 2 bed houses that incorporated a garden with necessary off road parking with policies in place to support this.

The discussion then centred on the importance of getting the right policies in place to protect the village whilst also allowing some small development. Once the NP has passed referendum and been adopted, it will become planning law in line with the NPPF and any applications that are submitted to the Parish Council will be judged against the policies that have been set out.

There were comments raised about agricultural land that is now used as garden and if this should be included in possible development but it was confirmed that although the land may now be used in a residential capacity it is still designated agricultural in planning terms. The subject of IOWA (important open or wooded area) was raised as this was shown on the 2003 SB, these areas will still have to be designated to protect them from development in the NP. FB commented that there was some confusion at the consultation event as to why the houses with larger gardens were identified and it was explained that these areas had been looked at but were either not suitable for any development for the reasons given or only suitable for maybe 1-2 small properties.

LM highlighted again that everything in the NP must be evidence based and PT suggested that when we respond to the comments we do so on in the format that the consultant has forwarded, so that we are demonstrating that we have considered everything that has been sent to us. RS also suggested that where the responses are very similar that we group these together and respond as one. PT pointed out that the consultant had asked us, based on the comments, to consider whether any changes need to be made to the proposed SB. LM reported that there had been an error when drawing the boundary around Court Farm but this had now been corrected and the boundary is now the same as it was on the 2003 map. This had been confirmed by email to the property owners and the SG copied in. PT reiterated a previous comment, that none of the SG are qualified planners but that we have good advice from our Planning Officer and consultant who we can approach for clarification on anything we are unsure of. FB said how good the planning officer was in that he responded very quickly to anything we sent to him. JS reported that we had followed the advice of the planning officer and the consultant in keeping

	<p>the proposed SB as tightly around the settlement as possible to avoid any 'village sprawl' and also that we had followed the 2003 SB with what we had included with the exception of including gardens, adding the Cross' Garage site (BW), extending along Church Hill (BW), small extension on Shepherd Hill (BW) and along Common Lane (KM). The SG said again that the Conservation Area &amp; the sites of Archaeological Importance remain unchanged from the 2003 plan so their protection is the same. It was noted that only 1 house in KM had been built in the last 25 years.</p> <p>The question of knocking down a property and redeveloping with more than 2-3 houses was raised in the comments and the consultant felt that this could be answered by a policy on plot density. The SG felt that with the value of larger properties in the village this kind of development, having to be limited to small 2 bed houses and with the issue of suitable access, would not be cost effective but LM would seek clarity from the consultant. LM mentioned that at Rishi Sunak's first PM question time on the 26<sup>th</sup> October he said " that we need to make brownfield site development a priority over greenbelt" which is what incorporating the Cross' Garage site in the NP would achieve, we have not included any agricultural land in the proposed SB. There were some comments on why agricultural land could not be included in the NP and the SG responded that it was in the criteria that we could not include this type of land and that if we did this would lead to large scale development which the communities had already said they did not wish to have.</p>	
5.	Discussion on the policies has been put back for discussion at the next meeting due to lack of time. To be added to the next agenda.	LH
6.	<p>The SG confirmed that they had read the draft Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) as carried out by AECOM and LM confirmed that she had sent this to the consultant who had incorporated the relevant information into the draft NP which has since been circulated to all SG members. The report showed a need for:</p> <p>1 Bed houses 36.5%  2 Bed houses 54.6%  3 Bed houses 8.9%  4, 5 or 6 Bed houses 0%</p> <p>which was in line with the need that our survey results showed. This report will be included in the NP. The SG confirmed that they were happy with the draft provided and LM said she would confirm this to AECOM.</p> <p>RM confirmed that he was happy for the age statistics to be incorporated into the Introduction page in the NP, LM will pass this onto the consultant. It was noted that not all of the census statistics will be available until 2023 but the consultant will work with what we have to date.</p>	LM
7.	<p>Items for next agenda to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Read the draft NP and review the policies.</li> <li>• Confirm meeting dates for 2023.</li> </ul>	LH
8.	Date of the next meeting 21 <sup>st</sup> December in the Committee Room of BW Village Hall at 7.00 p.m.	All

Meeting closed at 8.55 p.m.

These minutes are approved as a true reflection of the meeting:

Signed: .....