

CONFIDENTIAL**Minutes of Team Meeting – 10am 16 January 2019 in the Village Hall.****Spatial Options Modelling**

Attending: Giles Baxter (Chair), Jerry Moscrop, Simon Russell, Glenn Pereira, Ricardo Rios (SODC), Cheryl Soppet (SODC), Sharon Crawford (SODC) Officers, Neil Homer (Consultant)

Apologies: Jaqi Mason, Debbie Croft, Laura Buxton, James Hammond, Chris Neill, Annette Godfrey

Ser	Item	Action	Action By	Due Date
1	<p><u>Welcome (GB)</u></p> <p>Main purposes of meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve appointment of Barclays Bank for the CLT • Conduct spatial modelling exercise 			
2	Appoint Barclays Bank (GB)	Appointment approved OOC by email. Meeting with Barclays held on 17 Jan, attended by GM, SR, GB		

<p>3</p>	<p><u>Spatial Modelling</u></p> <p>The policies set out in the Site Option Modelling Assessment sheet was accepted as the basis for the modelling exercise.</p> <p>■</p> <p>The meeting discussed the implications of NPPF Green Belt policy, taking particular account of the SODC position:</p> <p>There are essentially three routes that the NPPF allows for new development in the Green Belt of the type we are hoping to achieve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • §144 – the Very Special Circumstances (VSC) route, assuming the scheme is by definition ‘inappropriate development’ in the GB • §145 – being one of the 7 exceptions to ‘inappropriate’ in this para, i.e. here clauses e) limited infilling and/or f) limited affordable housing consistent with the development plan are potentially relevant • §146 – being one of another 7 exceptions to ‘inappropriate’, but provided the ‘preserve openness’ and ‘conflict with GB purposes’ tests are met, with CRTBOs being clause f) <p>Guided by NH and the SODC officers and noting the site options identified from the outset, the meeting noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We should try and avoid the §144 route on both sites, as meeting the VCS test is notoriously difficult. The officers noted that housing could not be used as VSC, but that the need for a new surgery potentially could. • The proposal for Site 2A could not be defined as infilling as per clause 145e) and as a result, could not conform to clause f) as the Core Strategy CSEN2 policy on the GB reverts to policy CSR1, which is also clear in only allowing for infilling (and only on sites of less than 0.2 Ha). 			
----------	---	--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• However Site B potentially meets the definition of infill, in which case §145e is engaged, and the scheme can proceed as a normal planning application or CRTBO.• §146f CRTBO route is the easier, in that it does not have the Core Strategy problem of ‘infill’, but harder as it does require the two GB tests to be met. The SODC officers agreed that sites A and B had the potential to pass these tests provided development was appropriately scaled and sited. <p>Key decisions taken within and actions arising from the meeting:</p> <p>SEA probably not required as NP will not be making site allocations. Scoping opinion to confirm.</p> <p>Green Belt conditions around preserving purpose and openness still apply to sites brought forward under s146.f. Two sites were identified (A and B) that SODC officers may be able to support if brought forward under section 146.f. A map showing the 9 sites considered is attached to these minutes.</p> <p>Of these sites, the following were identified prior to the meeting: A, B, C, D, E and F.</p> <p>During the meeting, three further sites were identified and assessed:</p> <p>Site G, being a natural extension of B [Afternote: corrected a typographical error in previous versions: delete ‘H’ insert ‘G’]</p> <p>Site A+ being a natural extension of A</p> <p>Site H. The owner of this site has approached the committee to ask it to be considered. The committee felt it should therefore assess this site against the NPPF criteria, and for the avoidance of any doubt as to conflict of interest (as two members of the committee would be impacted by it). (SODC officers noted that this site had previously been discussed on a number of occasions, and that they had been unable to support it a) because it did not comply with green belt purpose and openness tests, and b) because of access considerations).</p>			
--	--	--	--

Ser	Item	Action	Action By	Due Date
	<p>Only Site A and B were potentially compliant with s145 and/or s146. The SODC held view was that no other sites could meet the openness test or infill tests and were discounted.</p> <p>If the committee agree the recommendations, then GB will consult with landowners, content as advised by NH.</p> <p>This meeting could should be treated, in terms of confidentiality, as a pre-application meeting with SODC.</p> <p>GB to update project plan, to include informal consultation with residents on proposed solution</p> <p>We should now consider combining two potential CRBOs into a single Neighbourhood Development Order.</p> <p>NH to produce sketches for the two site schemes to be shared with SODC to confirm everyone is 'on the same page'. These will be shared together with the minutes of this meeting as a formal record of the joint SODC/NP Committee position going forward.</p> <p>Committee to have informal discussions with surgery partners to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss operational viability of identified site • Understand financial model and potential implications for CLT 			
4	<p><u>Approach to Landowners</u></p> <p>Identify landowners who may be able to offer land that meets selected option or options</p> <p>Agree key points for letter from chairman</p>	<p>Close Hold</p> <p>Rolled over</p>		

Ser	Item	Action	Action By	Due Date
5.	AOB: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request SODC to amend status of NP from 'stalled' • SEA/HRA 	SODC have already actioned. Informal advice was that SEA/HRA unlikely to be needed as NP will not be making site allocations, but scoping opinion will confirm		
6.	Next Committee Meeting: 29 th January			

Attachment: Map