

OTTERY ST. MARY and WEST HILL PARISHES NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING GROUP

Minutes of meeting held Friday 13th January 2017 @ 2.00pm

1. Present

Jo Talbot (Chair), Glyn Dobson, Josefina Gori, Geoff Pratt, Jessica Bailey, John White, Dave Moss, David Boyle, Dr Margaret Hall, Martin Thurgood, Mick Kock, Martin Nancekivell, Peter Faithfull.

LDA: Spencer Powell, Francesca Laugharne.

Historic England: David Stewart (for period of presentation).

2. Apologies: Anne Edwards, Elli Pang.

3. "The Villages Issue". Policy 26 p. 81.

Discussion took place on whether to delete reference to Tipton .

Decided a)- that with reference to "Exception Mixed Market and Affordable Housing" the wording should indicate "no more than 5 (five) dwellings" rather than the stated "up to or around 15 dwellings".

b) That the reference to Listed Buildings be corrected to reflect the actual numbers of Listed Buildings within the NP area. action Nigel Sadler

4. MH – Meeting with AECOM stressed need for coherent message including recognition of current and potential constraints eg if Cranbrook development slows, this could increase pressure on OSM & WH.

MH & JB – need to "beef up" Project sections (confirmed by AECOM)

5. Consideration of Written Comments Received from MT, MH, DB, & DM and General Group Discussion

- *Foreword* – LDA to write.
- *Front Cover*- Delete *Pixies and Gate*, and replace with *Tar Barrels and Church of St Mary*. Remove *NP Logo*, and re-site *LDA*
- Chapter 3 –Replace photos of Alfington, TSJ & Fenny Bridges. Action - DM & DB
- 3.4– Demographics – the current development of family homes in OSM is likely to involve a significant increase in the number of young families. This para therefore needs to reflect the trend.
- 3.7 – *Wildlife Sites* - check whether reference should be to Fluxton of Tipton.
- 3.8 – Wording needs checking
- 3.9 – "higgledy- piggledy" to be replaced by "medieval type layout". Delete "central square" of OSM and replace with "centre of".

- 3.11 – “care facilities” to be replaced by “Over 55 apartments”.
- 3.12 – delete sentence “Sites at Canaan Way – excellent facilities” Include full list in *Appendix 5*. Mt to redraft.
- 3.9 to 31.14 - Wording needs to be more positive eg “, the facades of those shops where care has been taken to preserve original features, the substantial houses on Paternoster Row and the contrast to the smaller traditional terraces, the dwellings hidden away down narrow alleyways, the grandeur and setting of the Grade I listed church, the only Grade I listed building in East Devon (I believe), its contrast to the grade II non-conformist chapel in Jesu Street, etc, etc. “
- 3.14 – needs rewording with ref to age of various buildings. Action Dave Moss.
- 3.16 – “bus service” - concern at it being deemed “adequate”. Action – MT to redraft the first sentence.
- 3.17 – *Car Parks* “Sainsburys on Hind St” to become “Hind St.”
- 3.20 – Mention of a network of footpaths linking our various settlements, should be included in Chapter 4 *Vision and Objectives*.
- 3.21 – need to include *mobility scooters* along with *walking and cycling*.
- 3.24 – 26 – Community Facilities – since EDDC 2014 survey, there has been significant additional housing development, which has raised population levels by 25% and changed demographic mix. Few additional services or amenities however. Action – AECOM ?
- 3.25 – Titpton’s post office has been closed.
- p. 22 - delete picture of dilapidated Mill building
- Issue of whether to name commercial companies. Action retain ref to *Otter Nurseries* in para 3.32, and *Sainsburys* in 3.33.
- Create more specific references and linkage between chapters 3 & 4.
 - 6.4 – concern expressed by MY re use of “anticipated” re new housing outside of existing settlements, when Local Plan is far stronger. MH and DB felt being over-restrictive could make us vulnerable to Inspector review.
 - NP1 JB to redraft to reflect concern not just with *mature trees*.
 - NP3 & 6.13 – ensure clarity re restriction on backlands development and BUAB
 - NP4 Editorial consistency – Use of bullet .points as in NP4 should be avoided (cf NP5)
 - NP5 – open spaces within new developments currently under way have not all been included.
 - 6.25 – “significant changes in river flow” to be added.
 - 6.29 – rogue text
 - Project 3 – delete *stakeholders* and insert *others*.
 - 7.2 – 7.4 – *Housing Requirement*. Debate over strength of these paras., and on rural/ urban location of some development sites. Action – to be referred to AECOM.
 - 7.5 *Neighbourhood Plan Approach* – a weak position. To be referred to AECOM.
 - P.63 Project 8. – *Tourism* – re-instate former NP20, and retain proj. 8

- NP 18 – *Employment* – needs to be worded more positively – welcome employment opportunities in Industrial Estate.
- NP20 *Working from Home* would be better sited in Ch. 3
- NP21 & Project 9 – consistency of wording eg shop front (GP)
- NP23 -& Project 11 - projects need to be more specific in relation to solutions and sites. GP to check Land Registry re exact boundary of DCC land adjacent to Kings School.
- Pp79 – DM to rewrite re *Listed Properties*; and p. 81 NP27 – Change “no more” to “up to”.

JW 15/01/17