

HOUGH ON THE HILL PARISH COUNCIL

Rose Cottage, Honington Road, Barkston, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG322NE

Telephone: 01400 251459

E-mail: abaparishclk@hotmail.co.uk

Chairman: Councillor Mrs S Morgan

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PROJECT TEAM MINUTES OF MEETING HELD 10th February 2014

The eighth meeting of the Hough on the Hill Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Project Team was held on Monday 10th February 2014 at Brandon Hall, Hall Lane, Brandon NG32 2AS commencing at 6.30pm.

Present: Roger Kingscott (RK), Parish Councillor
Marilyn Taylor (MT), Resident
John Halton (JH), Resident
Penny Milnes (PM), Resident
Louise Barrett(LB), Resident
Roger Twelvetress (RT), Resident

Apologies: Jane Orchiston, Resident

1. Public Forum

None present.

2. Declarations of Interest

None were declared.

3. Minutes of Meeting held 7th January 2014

Agreed as a true record. Under matters arising:

(a) Issues & Approach Report: MT continues to update/amend

(b) Maps: RK outstanding to explore Parish Council's ability to use Ordinance Survey maps, and MT to approach SKDC for assistance when requirements, if any, are known.

(c) Outstanding Invoice Payment: RK to process payment of Leaflet invoice asap

(d) Assistance through Locality: MT had applied for the government support package available through Locality, and the application has been confirmed as approved. The support will take us through all the steps necessary to prepare for final submission and referendum stages, especially completion of the Basic Conditions Statement, running between now and August.

4. Next Steps: Moving Forward

Short exchange on successful turnout at the Workshop, especially that the farmers attended. Questionnaire response numbers felt to be reasonable. The meeting then worked through the written report of options for next steps on each of the key issues. Part way through this discussion, Globe Consultants joined the meeting.

An updated summary of the report is appended, incorporating all agreed actions.

5. Globe Consultants

Agreed that their input would be focused on drafting the Policies section of the Plan. They will send a written outline of their programme to MT, for formal confirmation of the appointment (3 days, 21 hrs, at £60 per hour plus VAT).

Globe will produce draft proposals and ideas by w/c 10th March and attend the next meeting on 12th March to discuss. This will enable a clear update to be provided to the next Parish Council meeting on 13th March.

6. Any Other Business

MT reported that the 2nd Monitoring Report on progress and expenditure of our Locality Grant is required by 14th February. She has been liaising with the Parish Clerk to ensure expenditure up-to-date. The Parish Council may be able to reclaim VAT, which is currently part of the Locality grant. MT will enquire about any implications. At the moment, given the need to probably increase the budget for publicity costs, and the overspend on the LCA, we are approx £150 over the total grant we are receiving. There will be an option to apply for the balance of the £7k available at a later date.

7. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 12th March at 6.30pm; to be held at Brandon Hall, Hall Lane, Brandon NG32 2AS
Globe Consultants will attend to discuss their draft of the policies.

SEE ATTACHMENT

Neighbourhood Planning Project Team

Meeting 10th February 2014

Next Steps: moving forward

The table below explores the main issues about which we have undertaken further consultation through the questionnaire (35 returned) and which were discussed/raised at the January Workshop (attended by 33 people).

It reflects discussion at the Neighbourhood Planning Project Team meeting held on 10th February, and the actions agreed for Globe Consultants.

Issue	Commentary	Action/Decision
<p>1 Design Guidance</p>	<p>Almost universal support for this from the Questionnaire responses (33 in favour and only 2 against). From the Workshop discussions, people would seem to favour a positive approach based on examples of what is good, rather than just listing what's not permitted, and an approach that does not rule out modern design. Some aspects of the Conservation Area status enjoyed by Hough could perhaps be extended to Gelston and Brandon. Hedgerows were also raised as important at the Workshop, as were key views.</p> <p>(Strong ties into Section 7 'Renewables' below in relation to solar panels.)</p>	<p>JH's draft Design Guidance has been incorporated into the 'Issues & Approach' draft, and was welcomed.</p> <p>Some concern about finding good examples of design in such a small parish, but a couple of examples were suggested.</p> <p>Globe Consultants suggested they explore the possibility of an Article 4 designation within the Conservation Area which would remove rights for 'permitted development'. The NP could raise this, but it would be for SKDC to action.</p> <p>Globe will look at existing Conservation Area policies to see if its possible to add further detail to that suggested by JH.</p> <p>Globe to draft suggested policies.</p>

Issue	Commentary	Action/Decision
<p>2 Local List of positive unlisted structures and buildings</p>	<p>Majority support for this proposal in the Questionnaire responses, although quite a few against it (20 in favour and 10 against). Much of what people have suggested is in fact already listed, or identified within the SKDC Conservation Area reappraisal. Others include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - old well in Brandon - stone walls on Hough High Road and Grantham Road; well doors and brickwork surrounds - cobbled pathway (India Rubber Hill) - Hough Grange cluster of buildings 	<p>Agreed we should draw attention to some of the unlisted, but distinctive, features or buildings that people have identified as being of value (which in turn adds weight perhaps to design guidance).</p> <p>Globe will explore possible policy relating to settings of unlisted distinctive features. Also key views.</p>

<p>3 Recreational hard-surface facilities on the Playing Field in Hough on the Hill</p>	<p>Majority support for this proposal in the Questionnaire responses (23 in favour and 6 against) However, one of the discussion groups at the Workshop were not supportive of the proposal. Some people didn't support it because they felt it wouldn't be used, or they wouldn't themselves use it.</p>	<p>Globe to advise on whether proposals for recreational facilities on the existing Playing Field require a NP policy.</p> <p>Globe to add to possible uses for any CIL monies.</p> <p>In due course, SKDC to be approached for advice on possible MUGA schemes, size, costs, maintenance, etc.</p>
---	---	--

<p>4 Improved Access to the Countryside</p>	<p>Very strongly supported by the majority of respondents to the Questionnaire (30 in favour and 3 against) and the issue featured strongly in the Workshop discussions with widespread support. However, the challenges currently faced by our local farmers because of walkers and others not adhering to footpaths was also raised.</p> <p>Improved signage was suggested as a helpful approach for walkers and farmers alike.</p>	<p>Improved access requires partnership and co-operation with landowners, which may best be pursued through the PC. Improvement of existing paths is an Enforcement Issue and can be raised outside of the NP.</p> <p>However, NP should flag the issue, and also identify improvement of stiles for access as a priority expenditure for any CIL monies.</p> <p>We have not flagged up the ending of the Permissive Paths (and field-edge</p>
---	---	---

	Several people have also strongly objected to the current 'BOAT' status of the Loveden Hill track, asking if this could be changed so that it is open to walkers and horse riders only.	boundary treatments) in 2016 – MT to add this into Issues & Approach report. Globe to investigate how BOATS are changed, and whether this is something the NP can propose.
--	---	---

Issue	Commentary	Action/Decision
<p>5 Local Green Space</p>	<p>Almost universal support for the designation of Loveden Hill as a Local Green Space in the Questionnaire responses (32 in favour and 2 against).</p> <p>Several other areas also suggested, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the old Priory field in Hough on the Hill - the Wilderness in Hough on the Hill - Bosom Hill - Fox Wood - old quarry workings to the east of Hough - Brandon village green adjacent to the church - Protection Wood 	<p>Our Plan should highlight the very positive actions undertaken by current landowners in and around Loveden Hill (ACTION MT).</p> <p>Globe to include the proposed LGS Designation within the Plan.</p> <p>Other areas which could be considered are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the old Priory site/field in Hough - the Wilderness in Hough - Bosom Hill in Hough - the Green at Gelston <p>However, including these has implications because we would need to write to all landowners etc. Is there strong enough evidence to include these?</p>

<p>6 New Housing Development</p>	<p>Current SKDC policy prohibits new development other than 'rural exception' affordable housing (in perpetuity) on brownfield plots.</p> <p><i>Social Rented is housing for rent from Local Authorities and Registered Providers (Housing Associations)</i></p> <p><i>Intermediate Housing is housing that is part sale, part rent under shared-ownership schemes offered by Housing Associations</i></p> <p>Views on this issue are almost evenly divided (16 in favour and 17 against). Most of the people who support the provision of more affordable housing do so because they want a balanced community. Those against do not believe the villages are appropriate</p>	<p>We will not be proposing development or identifying sites in the NP.</p> <p>Globe will check precisely how SKDC define 'local need' and also check implications of new policies for barns (eg black barns).</p> <p>Otherwise, its down to design guidance for any schemes which come forward.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>locations because of lack of public transport and other facilities.</p> <p>One of the discussion groups did favour allowing one or two owner occupier starter houses to be built, affordable to young couples, in each of the villages. Inevitably some people raised previous planning applications they have made for development that have been refused. However, development of this kind is currently prohibited in the Local Plan.</p>	
Issue	Commentary	Action/Decision
7 Renewable Energy Provision	<p>There is majority support in the Questionnaire returns for small-scale renewables, but only if they are not visually intrusive (21 in favour and 12 against). Some people also remain opposed to energy schemes that are unviable without subsidy.</p> <p>Community-energy schemes were seen as favourable at the Workshop, and are now being actively supported by Government, both in terms of policy and funding. New Policy just announced - see https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/community-energy-strategy</p> <p>At the Workshop it was commented that the need for farmers to be 'carbon neutral suppliers' means they are finding it necessary to install renewable energy in the form of solar panels and turbines to meet this demand.</p>	<p>Our NP should be positive about a community energy, based on solar, were one to come forward (which will help our case for meeting the Five Basic Tests).</p>

8 Roads & Transport	<p>Quite a lot of support at the Workshop for trying to get speed limits (and weight limits) down on the COO1, or some more signs (like the flashing ones).</p> <p>Also support for continuing to do press for action on potholes and verges – but absolutely no support for road widening.</p> <p>There is some support for the creation of passing lanes on verges.</p>	<p>It has already been suggested the PC ought to be considering installing some flashing signs in partnership with the County, possibly using a precept increase to fund it (but with maintenance by the County).</p> <p>The NP should raise all these issues, including traffic calming measures, as strong condenders for any CIL expenditure.</p>
--	---	--

