

## **Minutes of the Meeting of Ashton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group held on**

**Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> May 2017 at 7.30pm at Ashton Primary School.**

**Present:** G.Otto, S. Lemon, J. Roychoudhury, C.Johnson, P. Joyce

**Representing Kirkwells:** M. Wellock

3 members of the public

### **46. Approval of apologies for absence**

None. L. Godfrey has resigned from the group since the last meeting due to other commitments. The group thanked her for her contribution.

### **47. Declarations of interest -None**

### **48. Approval of the minutes of previous meeting**

The group resolved to approve the minutes of the meeting of April 20<sup>th</sup> 2017.

### **49. Matters arising from the minutes of last meeting.**

A list of Ashton's green spaces, historical assets etc has been forwarded to M. Wellock. The vacancy arising from L. Godfrey's resignation was discussed. A.Beber was accepted onto the group, having been nominated by G.Otto, seconded by J. Roychoudhury and voted on unanimously.

### **50. Michael Wellock**

The 'Discussion Draft' previously circulated was discussed. This includes no photographs; these are to be added at a later stage. Page 6:- Introduction (pen-picture) – M.Wellock's version and ours are to be merged into one. Page 7:- the Objectives need to be made more specific to Ashton.

Section 5:- this is the 'heart' of the document and this will be the subject of particular scrutiny by SNC and the examiner.

5.1.5 refers to the review of the village confines boundary. M.W. suggested two possible options:- either (a) let SNC define the new confines, or:- (b) the group seek to identify the new confines via this Plan. If the group intend to identify the confines through Ashton's Neighbourhood Plan, this would need to be discussed with SNC. The group would need to use SNC's published methodology for any changes to be acceptable. The group would need to show that any representations are carried out in an open and correct manner. M.W. assumes that SNC will publish their new confines boundary as it is nearly at that stage, but that the group's results could be included as a representation. It was proposed by J. Roychoudhury that the group would draw up our own confines boundary in the Ashton Neighbourhood Plan. This was seconded by S.Lemon and agreed unanimously. S. Lemon agreed to let J. Johnson at SNC know of this intention.

5.1.6 refers to allocating sites for housing development. The group must decide whether or not to allocate sites. This would involve writing to landowners and issuing a 'call for sites'. There would also need to be site appraisals, using published methodology. M.W. mentioned that not many villages tend to allocate their own

sites. The group voted 3:2 not to allocate sites. (1 abstention).

M.Wellock suggests that informal consultations be conducted concerning opinions gathered from the questionnaire. The confines boundary should be a central part of this. Residents could be encouraged to point out on a map what their preferences are, and also to make written notes.

Objective 2 – to promote a balanced, healthy community. 5.2 M.W. advised that dealing with this topic is not ideally suited to a neighbourhood plan. It may be better for the parish council to gather feedback from the residents regarding how to spend money (from wind farm, grants etc).

6.3 Local Business. M.W. advised we need a list of business premises.

6.4.4 Local Green Space Assessment. M.W. suggests an audit is done using the table in appendix 3. Of the 6 designation tests, the important ones are tests 3, 4 and 5.

6.5 Community Facilities. Here M.W. suggested that the rugby club is better protected as a recreational facility. The allotments could be either a green space or a recreational space. Also the pub garden need not be listed separately – it is part of the Old Crown. Similarly, the graveyard is part of the church. The post-boxes lie outside planning control but could be listed as non-designated heritage assets.

6.6.3.f. Views. The group need to identify the significant views, if any.

Page 29. Non-designated heritage assets - need to be identified.

6.7 Transport. M.W. suggested that the group identify known current problems and possibly longer-term aspirations e.g. footway-widening scheme on Stoke Road.

## **51. Update on Grant Application.**

The latest tranche of funding has now been received.

## **52. Actions before next meeting.**

Already dealt with in section 50.

## **53. Items for next meeting.**

To discuss matters raised under section 50.

## **54. Date of next meeting.**

Monday 19<sup>th</sup> June at 7.30pm. (no M.Wellock)

The meeting closed at 9.10pm