Eaton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Minutes of meeting 21st November 2014.

## First meeting.

Present: Leon Wolverson; Astrid Mick; Tim Coleman; David Richards; Erika Lyons

This meeting was designated an initial spontaneous brainstorming session to familiarize ourselves with the tasks before us.

We looked at the map to ascertain Eaton Bishop's parish boundary.

Leon began to go with us through the plan template he had produced, which had already noted some listed points as 'done'.

The pros and cons of combining our neighbourhood plan with one or more of neighbouring parishes was briefly discussed, but we realised that this is too late for us, as those parishes around us have either done their work, or are in the throes of doing it. Going it alone would make our task for Eaton Bishop much simpler, we thought.

It was stated and generally agreed that Eaton Bishop is a parish consisting of agricultural businesses and residential sections, with no industrial units, touristic features (although the Eaton Camp may become an attraction in due course, once the National Trust launches it as a site to visit), or other notable businesses that might have to be considered.

Leon reported that the **Environmental Assessment**, which has been received from Hereford Council, has some mistakes and omissions that need to be addressed. For example, Eaton Bishop is NOT connected to a mains sewerage system (only partial in 1958), as most residents have septic tanks or similar. It was also mentioned (by us) that Ruckhall is at a limit of water supply, hence additional residences might put a strain on the supply.

There was no mention of the hillfort (National Trust) in the Council's Assessment.

We discussed the **Terms of Reference for the Steering group** and identified potential volunteers for certain roles within the group present at this meeting. General consensus was reached on who might do what.

Leon Wolverson Chairman Astrid Mick Secretary Tim Coleman Finance co- ordinator David Richards Volunteer co-ordinator Thus the possible roles, as shown in the Council's "Appendix 1 – Steering Group Model Terms of Reference" was perused and roles defined.

We are presently a "Working Group" (as per page 2 of Appendix 1). Regarding future meetings, the potential issue of having to hire the village hall for **public** steering meetings (also funding?) were discussed. It was suggested that we hold "working group" meetings at people's houses. We might tag public steering meetings onto the monthly parish council meetings at 7pm, before the main parish council meeting at 7:30pm. (To be decided)

We would make a presentation of these, our results of this meeting, at the next parish council meeting in December. David Taylor (local councillor) would be present.

## **OTHER POINTS:**

We might need 'parts' of the parish to bring in certain kinds of information.

We need to know the 'certain' number of houses the parish is required (by H. Council) to build by 2031.

The initial Public Meeting of parishioners (to be set and leafleted in the New Year) would include those present at that public meeting (or by mail) stating a 'Wish List' of future developments, amenities etc for the parish.

We get a bigger percentage of development money (levy) for the parish if we have aNeighbourhood Plan.

We need to know the base data (from <u>when</u>) for the new houses already built in the parish. (Possibly half of the number of houses are already built?) Check. (Note: Leon has done some research on this and sent us an e-mail with results and thoughts, but these figures are not certain.)

Also there is the factor that H. Council has not decided yet upon its "Core Strategy", leaving many matters in 'limbo'....

The question was raised: If land for building on is not specified in the Neighbourhood Plan, could H. Council 'impose' an area.

It was emphasized that any development should be *appropriate to the parish*.

It was decided that we needed to find the "Village Envelope" document. (It was again stressed that Ruckhall is not suitable for further development because of infrastructure problems, see above.)

We should look at the Callow & Haywood draft plan's "Vision" statement as a template for our future plan.

Leon had contacted the Parish Clerk of Callow and Hayood, who told him that Kirkwells (consultants) had been "brilliant" with their help and advice. Their

plan had cost in the region of £7-8,000. They had produced questionnaires for the parishioners and then held an open day at their village hall with Kirkwells and H. Council, and display boards etc were supplied.

We should put a notice of any prospective public meeting at 7pm, <u>before</u> the P.C. meeting at 7:30pm, **on our parish website**.

Leon would try and get hold of neighbourhood plan drafts of our neighbouring parishes, for information.

Astrid Mick