**RECORD OF A HOYLAKE FORUM MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 28 JANUARY 2016**

*Present:* Cllr John Hale (JH) Rose Kirkby (RK) Mark Howard (MH) Chris Moore (CM) Richard Stowe (RS) Philip Barton (PB) (Independent Planning Consultant)

*In Attendance:* John Entwistle (JE) (Wirral Council)

*Apologies:* Peter Edwards (PE) Cllr Gerry Ellis (GE) Mrs Jackie Hall (JaH)

Stewart Lowther (SL) Vaughan Williams (VW)

|  |
| --- |
| **ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**1. In wishing the committee a happy New Year, CM tendered apologies for absence, as listed.

**ITEM 2. FINANCIAL POSITION**1. RK reported that Hoylake Vision funds stood at approximately £5,000 with all bills up to date.

**ITEM 3. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**1. Representations. JE was thanked for analysing and producing a digest of the 17 representations received as a result of the public notification of the NDP which had expired on 22 Dec 15. The comments had been circulated to the committee. JE confirmed that the NDP was legally compliant and met the basic conditions of the legislation. There was no obligation for Vision the comment on the views received at this stage but the representations would be passed to the examiner, under a covering letter from the Council which would explain the context of some of the comments and draw attention to the wider background within which the NDP had been developed. The examiner would, when appointed, assess the process undertaken and then the content. If necessary, the examiner could call a hearing on any contentious issues but this was thought to be unlikely. The examiner could be expected to make recommendations to change any of the policies based on his knowledge and experience and on the submitted representations. These would then be applied to the plan.
2. Appointment of Examiner. JE had also evaluated the bids from three candidate examiners who had been nominated by NPIERS. All three were considered suitably experienced to fulfil the role but, based on PB’s professional assessment, from paragraphs 6.67 to 6.79 of the Branston examination report, it was noted that  Examiner Heselton had dealt with a very similar policy dilemma to that facing the committee in relation to the identification and protection of non-designated heritage assets, including the potential creation of a 'local list'. Given that it was NDP Policies DI1 and DI2 that would probably be those most likely to require some refinement, Examiner Heselton's experience and approach would be most useful to the committee.  For example, he had expressed support for including such policies in a NDP at paragraph 6.73, which stated:

*"While national Planning Practice Guidance confers responsibility for identifying non designated heritage assets (which may be referred to as ‘locally listed’ as opposed to designated or statutorily listed assets) on Local Planning Authorities, there is nothing to prevent locally valued features, buildings, structures and spaces being protected through neighbourhood plans. Arguably that is one of the main purposes of the neighbourhood approach to planning."*Examiner Collinson had dealt with a similar issue in the Arundel NDP examination but his approach was far less rigorous, appeared a little less supportive in principle than Examiner Heselton did and related to a very different context (i.e. within the South Downs National Park).  Similarly, although Examiner McGurk dealt with the issue in his examination of the Ringmer NDP, it was not covered as thoroughly or as positively in comparison with Examiner Heselton's approach. Examiner McGurk who had a good reputation for his robust views was well known to PB but his submission undersold his experience and skills.So, having paid careful attention to all three Examiners' applications and their respective sample examinations, PB’s recommendation to the committee was that it makes a formal request to the Council to appoint **Terry Raymond Heselton BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**to conduct the required statutory examination of "*Hoylake Vision - a neighbourhood development plan for Hoylake 2015-2020*".After discussion in which JE’s views were sought, the committee unanimously accepted PB’s recommendation to appoint Mr Heselton. In the unforeseen event that Heselton was unable to accept the task then Mr McGurk was identified as the preferred reserve examiner. The Council would be so advised.*Action: Hon Sec (CM)*1. Next Steps. JE would establish an NPIERS contract date with Mr Heselton which would agree the timescale for the examination. Realistically, the examination would take 3 to 4 weeks. Thereafter, there would be a need to amend the plan as required. A date for a next meeting would be arranged once the examiner’s report was to hand.

*Action: Wirral Council ( JE)*1. Local Listing. CM had been in touch with Locality to establish grant eligibility for technical assistance in producing a supporting appraisal for policies DI1 and DI2. It was prudent to await the views of the examiner before making an application.

*Action: Hon Sec (CM)***ITEM 4. PLANNING APPLICATIONS*** 1. Presbyterian Church, Alderley Road. In its letter of 1 Dec 15, Hoylake Vision had objected to APP/15/01502 which sought to demolish the Presbyterian Church and build new town houses on the land. A public meeting about the application had demonstrated the level of local opposition to the scheme and it was understood that a petition had been initiated in order to express that opposition. GE had advised that he had requested that the application be removed from delegation so we should expect the application to go to the Planning Committee. Both GE and JH would be able to speak at the hearing as well as seek a site visit. Various comments were re-iterated about the unconvincing economics of the application as well as the poor design and lack of consideration of retention of features and conversion.
	2. Hoylake Golf Resort. The Hoylake Golf Resort was not yet a planning application; indeed, it may still be 18 months before the proposal reached the application stage. There was some impact on NDP Policy CL2 arising from the proposal which overlapped the NDP area at its eastern edge. Much more detail was required and we should also await the examiner’s assessment before taking any precipitate action. The committee confirmed that it would be inappropriate at present to conduct a public debate either on-line or at a meeting. In due course, such a step could be taken to allow Forum members the opportunity to engage with the relationship between the NDP and the developing resort plans.
	3. Offer of Technical Planning Advice. The committee welcomed the offer from Hoylake resident and architectural technician Mr Julian Priest (JP) to advise the committee on planning applications and particularly on the Presbyterian Church application on which he was well briefed. It was hoped that JP would be able to act as spokesman for the petitioners at the Planning Committee. Under Clause 4(vi) of the Constitution it was agreed to co-opt JP onto the committee pending nomination for election at the next Forum AGM. CM would approach JP accordingly.

*Action: Hon Sec (CM)***ITEM 5. OTHER MATTERS**1. Offer of Website Assistance. An offer from a student with IT skills and a particular interest in local planning was gratefully received in order to assist MH and the committee with the HV website. MH agreed to contact the student accordingly.

*Action: MH*1. Next Meeting. As per para 5 (above), no date was set for a subsequent meeting.

C T MOORE 31 January 2016HV Hon Sec |