

# Lanchester Parish Council



## Neighbourhood Plan Working Group

Lynwood House  
Tuesday 6 December 2016  
7.00pm

**Present** Councillor Mike Wardle (Chair), Councillor Paul Jackson, Councillor Keith Harrison, Chris Phillips, Michael Horsley, Terry Coult, Brian Naylor, Steve Bailey, Elaine Hogg, Mike Gladstone, Jill Gladstone, David Friesner,

### 1. **Welcome**

Councillor Mike Wardle welcomed everyone to the meeting.

### 2. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Ossie Johnson, Stuart Carter and Fiona Green,

### 3. **Declarations of Interest**

Paul Jackson declared an interest as having business interests in the Parish.

### 4. **Notes from the last meeting**

The notes from the meeting held on 2 November were received.

### 5. **County Durham Neighbourhood Plan Group**

Members were informed of the outcome of the recent county wide Neighbourhood Plan meeting. The meeting had proved frustrating as the main agenda items concerning the Sedgefield Neighbourhood Plan examiners report and the update from County Council officers did not take place.

Information on the process of appointing an examiner for a Neighbourhood Plan was provided.

## **6. County Durham Plan – Preferred Options Paper**

The County Council have delayed the release of the County Plan Preferred Options Paper until the publication of the Governments Housing White Paper in January.

It was agreed to ask the County Council if there are any examples of a Neighbourhood Plan being approved where there is no County Plan in place

It was agreed to circulate the website link to the article on the Swanwick Neighbourhood Plan referendum rejection.

It was agreed to ask the County Council for the Terms of Reference for appointing an examiner

## **7. Heritage Audit**

The final draft of the report and gazetteer is being checked.

Following the printing of the audit it will be necessary to consult / present the audit to the community.

It was agreed that a community event should take place which will include speakers, displays, printed documents, update on the Neighbourhood Plan etc. A March 2017 date would be convenient, however this would depend on purdah restrictions prior to local elections next year.

## **8. Topic Papers**

Work is progressing on the topic papers undertaken by small groups of the working group.

Information on progress was provided by each of the groups.

The 'Housing' and 'Historic Environment' topic papers have been written by consultants and were discussed by the group at the last meeting. It is now necessary to continue progress with policy development.

It was agreed that a consultant is engaged early next year to assist in writing the housing policy.

Information was circulated on housing (A) and Design of New Development (B) (information attached to the minutes)

Discussion took place on the 'Historic Environment' and the production of a 'Local List' and how the Heritage Audit information can be used. It was

agreed to ask the North of England Civic Trust for advice how the Heritage Audit can be used to produce a 'Local list'

The group working on the Business & Employment topic paper gave an update. There are two distinct areas of the village and the wider Parish.

Policies across all topic areas had to complement each other and be written carefully and appropriately

## **9. Next Steps**

- The County Council are asked if there are any examples of a Neighbourhood Plan being approved where there is no County Plan in place
- The website link to the article on the Swanwick Neighbourhood Plan referendum rejection is circulated to the group
- The County Council are asked for the Terms of Reference for appointing an examiner
- The North of England Civic trust are asked for advice how the Heritage Audit can be used to produce a 'Local list'
- Members work in their small sub groups to progress work on the topic papers and policy development

## **10. Date of next meeting**

The next meeting of the group will be in mid-February on a date to be confirmed at Lynwood House

Meeting ends 8.30pm

## TOPIC PAPER -New Edge of Settlement/Village Boundary for Lanchester

### 1. What do we call it?

- Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB)
- Built Up Area Edge (BUAE)
- Edge of Settlement Boundary (ESB)
- Built Edge Boundary (BEB)

### 2. What is it's Purpose?

There is a need for a clear distinction between the built area where certain forms of development are likely to be supported in principle and the countryside where restraint and protection are of the most importance. The purpose of the boundary is therefore to

- define areas within which planning permission will be normally be granted for new development
- enable the best use to be made of existing infrastructure, services and community facilities
- protect the setting of Lanchester village
- allow some flexibility to permit development outside where it is justified and compliant with policies in this plan.

### 3. What land do we include?

The test for inclusion is whether the use of land is more connected with the village than the countryside. The following land uses are deemed to be more connected with the village and are therefore included within the boundary,

- The main existing residential areas
- Community sports grounds and play parks
- Cemeteries
- The village green along the by-pass
- Petrol Stations
- The Green School and bowling green
- The Lanchester Valley Way where it passes through the village

### 4. What Land do we not include?

The test for exclusion is whether the land is more associated with the countryside than the village. The following land uses are deemed to be more connected with the countryside and are therefore not included within the built up area boundary,

- Groups of houses close to the village to include Ornsby Hill, Margery Flatts (Newbiggen Lane) and The Hemmel (Peth Bank) in order to protect their separate identities within the countryside.
- St Bedes School and playing fields because the playing fields, which comprise the majority of the site are not built on and are more connected with the countryside where they are integrated into the field pattern.

### 5. What should the line follow?

- Physical features
- Garden boundaries ie all land in the curtilage of residential properties.

### 6. Still to do:

- walk the boundary, draw a line on a plan, debate with the working group, discuss with DCC

## **Settlement (Village) Boundary - DRAFT**

### Objective

- To provide design advice for any development outside the village boundary and next to existing housing estates (i.e. edge of settlement development).

### Considerations

- They should be small scale (i.e. small numbers)
- They should have screening planting on edge (e.g. native hedgerow)
- There should be no loss of (significant) trees
- There should be limited visibility when viewed from outside the village
- There should be limited paintwork at eaves level and above
- Roofs should be simple pitched, not hipped
- Ridge lines should be parallel to edge of settlement
- They should be no higher than 2 storeys and with no dormers
- They should be ‘vernacular’ – see VDS
- There should be no loss of valuable wildlife habitat or good quality agricultural land
- They should be sustainable by being close to a bus route
- They should have footpath access to the village
- Roofs should be of a dark colour, tiled or slated
- There should be no rendering or pale or primary coloured walls on edge of settlement
- They should not jar with neighbouring buildings