

## **OPC REPORT FROM THE NPSG INFORMAL QA MEETING WITH OPC WEDNESDAY, 18TH MAY 2016 AT 7.30 PM**

### **Present:**

**OPC:** Jon Hale, Mark Faulkner, James Robinson-Giannasi, Craig Worboys, John Bell

**SG:** Stephen Blandford, Nicholas Frome, Gill Warsop, Pam Verdon, James Harvey.

Members of OPC were invited by NPSG Chair Stephen Blandford to an informal QA meeting to better understand the extensive changes that have been made to the plan by the NPSG since the pre submission consultation document 6 months ago.

Being informal this meeting had no decision making remit. Any proposed changes to the plan would require consideration and then come back to OPC for Full Council approval within the NP document

### **GENERAL UPDATE**

OPC were briefed that it was highly likely that Hart would review and change the numbers of homes that our area would be asked to deliver. A revised number could not yet be supplied which adds uncertainty and risk.

OPC were also briefed that it was highly unlikely that the proposed C2 care home would count towards the housing numbers (45) as originally assumed. This adds much greater uncertainty and risk that the Plan will be able to deliver the housing numbers that Odiham will be required to by Harts local plan. The initial advice from NP consultants, RCOH was to provide a healthy buffer of housing numbers in our plan given the original uncertainty. With the C2 not counting, this significantly increases the uncertainty and risk of additional housing sites being required in the future.

Given the significance of this development - and acknowledged risk it poses to our community, the NP SG are recommending that the community are informed and asked how they would like to proceed. It was acknowledged that this follows a similar initiative proposed by OPC in a EGM a few months ago when concern over the Communities understanding of the Care Home was flagged

### **PLAN QA**

It was explained to OPC that the changes have been made to take into account consultation feedback and input from the recent meetings with Hart and East Hants District Councils. It was acknowledged that the plan had already changed since the draft version previously circulated to OPC Cllrs by Cllr Fellows. Updated hard copies of the latest version (7.2) were circulated that could be reviewed alongside the draft version already circulated.

SG member Nicholas Frome went through the revised plan page by page explaining changes and allowing Councillors to comment and ask questions with a brief summary on the main areas as follows:

Consultation section: Why has this been taken out?

SG response: It is no longer relevant in the submission plan as the document is published by Hart and they will publish their consultation/feedback details.

Para 1.4: Why change in words?

SG response: Following advice from Hart, this is to reflect more fully "Basic Conditions"

Development of the Plan: Why has this been taken out?

SG response: It is no longer relevant as there will be a separate Consultation Statement document for submission which provides full details.

Para 1.9: To be discussed more fully later in the evening Para 1.12: Why is this in?

SG response: It is an explanation of how Odiham is considered in planning terms – urban or rural.

History and Profile, Para 1.14: Why is this included?

SG response: It is a section inserted to provide background on the development of the Parish.

Plan Preparation Process, Para 1.27: Why is this different?

SG response: It only requires a shorter version as the detail is in the Consultation Statement that is an accompanying document in Submission.

Monitoring and Review, Para 1.40: Concern was expressed by Councillors about this section. What does it mean, how will it be carried out, what sort of changes can be made?

SG response: It was explained that although ultimately it would be entirely a matter for Hart's discretion, in the meeting with East Hants Vicki thought it was quite likely that Hart would seek some degree of informal discussion with the Parish Council if additional sites were to be required. An example would be a choice between 2 or 3 additional sites shortlisted by Hart. It was also standard good practice to allow for the review and updating of the plan to fit with changing circumstances, such as changes in national or local policy. It was noted that OPC wish to review this paragraph further.

Goals and Objectives, Para 2.2 i), last bullet: after some discussion it was suggested that it would be better to finish the sentence after "Parish" so as to take account of any existing as well as future supply of pre-school places.

Paras 3.14, 3.15: To be discussed more fully later in the evening.

Policy 2 Housing Development Sites: Nicholas explained that although it appeared that there were many tracked changes to some sections the basic content is the same but has been tightened up to be more consistent and take into account advice from Hart, Historic England and other statutory consultees etc.

Policy 4 Housing Mix: Councillors asked whether the Policy in the NP was the same as Hart Policy.

SG response: It was explained that the NP was different as the NP proposes a greater proportion of smaller houses which from consultation was an important point for the community. Hart has not raised objection to this to date.

Policy 5 General Design Principles, ix: some Councillors thought this was difficult to understand and accomplish.

SG response: It was explained that this was recommended by Historic England and a Conservation Area consultant and it would be readily understood by developers and planners.

Policy 6 Odiham Conservation Area: This has been reworded for consistency and to take into account recommendations from Statutory Consultees. It was suggested that section viii needs rewording to make clear that the Deer Park is in the Conservation Area.

Para 3.32: Where is the list of such assets? The separate SEA document gives this list and is attached as a separate document to the NP. A hard copy of pre-submission plan SEA was shown with a detailed Appendix that included this detail.

Policy 8: Duplication of Hart maps and why is there no map number 1? It was suggested it was confusing and needed to be checked and if no map 1 needed (maybe outside of Parish) and if necessary provide an explanation.

Policy 9 High Street: Is there anything different to Hart's policy?

SG response: Yes, it relates only to Odiham and is not a national or local policy.

Policy 11 Local Green Space: Why 'very' before special circumstances"?

SG response: It was explained this is rCOH wording and recognised planning terminology that reflects NPPF wording. However, it was thought by those present that it would be better if sentence finished after "circumstances" and not include examples.

Policy 12 Natural Environment: Why is wording not as strong as in other policies?

SG response: It was explained that the flooding section has been added as suggested by Hart's flooding expert and tends to reflect standard planning conditions and NPPF guidance.

Policy 13 Assets of Community Value: Why not include The Old School? It was agreed that this would be re-examined by the SG, having been excluded after consideration for its inclusion in pre-submission.

Section 4 Aims and Proposals: Councillors were concerned with wording of "will" in many sections as it may not be possible for OPC to carry these out and some of the aims needed more detailed analysis.

Mark Faulkner volunteered to suggest alternative wording for the NP for section 4 with changes such as "will endeavour", "where practicable" and provide this for the SG to consider.

## **HOUSING NUMBERS:**

Given the significant update previously supplied an open discussion took place in the impact and risk of housing number uncertainty

Nicholas explained that following strong advice from both Hart and East Hants District Councils, there is no longer a definite target of dwellings proposed in the NP. It was noted Hart have yet to decide on the overall allocation of housing in the emerging Local Plan.

Nicholas also explained why the 45 equivalent homes allocated to the care home can no longer be counted directly as housing. The SG will continue to try to gain recognition from Hart/East Hants about the amount of development that has already taken place in the parish and the contribution a care home would make to the recognised need by Hart for an additional 940 registered care places in the district.

In view of the above developments the SG proposes to send out to the community information

about the changes in the Plan and set out both the risks of continuing and the risks of delay. This would include asking a question if the community wish to continue with the NP going onto

submission as it is, or consider making major changes which would result in a delay of many months.

It was noted that some SG members and Cllrs did not think including a care home in the Plan was in the best interests of the Parish based on a variety of expressed views including:

- it no longer counting towards housing numbers thus placing risk on the need to select future housing sites in the future.
- community misunderstanding over what the Care Home will be
- Placing a large and visible building at the gateway to the community.
- Against the advice of our Health Centre with concerns flagged about the impact to the services the community receive
- No cost benefit analysis

Several Cllrs suggested that the question that the SG has recommended is posed should not just focus on Hart's position that it will no longer contribute 45 dwellings towards approximate total contribution from the 7 selected sites in the NP, but also cover the concerns initially flagged by OPC at its EGM on the topic several weeks ago.

OPC Chairman Jon Hale was asked to compile feedback from Cllrs on an early draft of the SG recommended question and create a question for OPC approval that could be used.

The SG were asked what would happen if the public wanted the risk surrounding the care home properly explored to ensure that housing wasn't allocated elsewhere by Hart, where the community might not want it.

Nicolas explained that if the care home were to be considered for removal from the Plan before submission it would initially require discussion with the landowner/agent to confirm what the site could deliver. Removal of the care home and the substitution of housing would require a further formal pre-submission consultation. However, it would very much depend on what approach was considered after feedback from the question was known and it was therefore difficult to anticipate how long this could take. There is also the possibility that the landowner may choose to submit an application for a care home in any event.

The meeting concluded with OPC thanking the SG members for the time and effort informally going through the plan in such detail.