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| i 05.23 | **Chairman’s’ Welcome & Introduction:**  **Apologies:** Mike Button(PC), Penny Kirkman(PC), Gemma Cleave(PC), Julian Harris, Matt Hawcroft, Sarah Taylor, Beccy Morris (all STEND\_HWG)  **Attending:** David Lynsey, John Quilter (Chair), Sam Isaacs (Comma 12), Nicola Williams (PC), Ian Dodgeson, Mark Graham, Pippa Hyam (EA), Cheryl Webster (PC), David Raynor (PC), Roy Clifton (STEND\_HWG)  JQ welcomed attendees and introduced DS & MW. He outline the project and STEND\_HWG work, and urged all to keep forefront of all discussions the urgent need to provide affordable dwellings for local people to live and work in the parish otherwise community as we know it will die. |  |
| ii 05.23 | **Presentation Glebe Development:**  Dave Slatter RIBA Dip TP. Chartered Architect, Town Planner & Director/Access Planning and Design Ltd.  Michael E. Westley C.M.L.I.,  Landscape Architecture, Inclusive, Urban & Garden Design  F.H.E.A. Director: Westley Design Ltd.  Our guests introduced themselves and briefly outlined their interests.  Pippa Hyam introduced herself as a rep from for an emerging Glebe Farm users group. She asked it to be noted that she was representing a number of interested parties at Glebe and this did not mean they automatically supported the project. This was duly noted and their participation welcomed as we see them as a vital stakeholder in the ultimate success of the project. She expressed dissatisfaction over lack of consultation. It was explained that until the report is ready, STEND\_HWG has had no basis for consultation.  DS opened the presentation by outlining the Heritage approach, identifying the key Heritage Assets. MW addressed the sensitively of the landscape and setting of St End, illustrating the key areas sensitivity to any development with shaded OS maps. Over the next hour they illustrated their methodology for differing layouts over 3 Glebe fields to the SE & N of the yard. Varying strategies could be employed to reduce harm/fewer hard landscape interventions/no street lighting to preserve the night sky/ drawing the layout focus into the yard to create active spaces with connections/explaining the intention to ‘make a place’. |  |
| iii 05.23 | **Questions from the floor:**  Financial costs of each proposal and how much would they vary by design? DS, replied the more compact the cheaper to build. The project aims to keep highway's interventions minimal as suits a rural location.  There is a difference in each which would be taken into account in the evaluation. A SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis will be tested the results of which could be weighted depending on finance available, or the importance other factors of design upon the overall project and surrounding environment outlined in stakeholder workshops. Discussion followed on the merits of the approach, which included constraints/land ownership/artisan unit opportunities/balanced against over provision. Invitees challenged that the proposal lacked evidence of need for the commercial offering. NW responded how established business re purposed or reused and expressed a comparison with Hawksfield, which went through several iterations and is finally established with a range of artisan businesses, was drawing like to like. MG & SI agreed.  DS is keen to consult with SEFT/EA to understand how they currently use the yard spaces, and what opportunities might emerge with more active space. He referenced the historic SEFT Masterplan for the site, which wasn’t realised, and wants to understand how enriching the connectivity of the site could enhance the ambitions of that plan.  Other question related to housing type, DS & NW addressed the choice of a CLT as a partner to ensure all housing was 100% affordable & explained how affordability is calculated over the wider area and referenced how the Parish falls into the lowest third percentile of deprivation. Although the area includes Rock it also includes Delabole and inland areas, the parish economy is largely a seasonal and low waged.  Scale of the project? The proposals plans for 24 housing units – this would satisfy 50% of the current demand, inclusive of 29 in need but not registered evidenced in STEND\_HWG’s 06.22 housing needs survey analysis, but not registered. Homechoice registrations stand @34/there may be some crossover.  DS explained the approach to consultation, how stakeholder groups would be engaged, and the number of layouts reduced post feedback, before a larger consultation event.  Highways: Concern was raised re current traffic speeds. DS expects speed reducing measures, but they must avoid highly engineered solutions. A reduction in speed to 20 mph in the immediate locale would allow more pedestrian access/crossing to Trevathan and improve safety. MS suggested he’d be amenable to altering access to Trevathan. |  |
| v.05.23 | **Actions:** Contact with Meryl Webster to set up a Teams/Zoom meeting with SEFT  **NB:** DS would prefer a round table discussion to include Estates Management & SEFT. NW agrees this is the best approach, because ‘we’ are not actually the drivers for any development of the yard. We can merely outline the constraints and opportunities, and suggest layout schemes that invite participation in an active spaces. |  |
|  |
| iv.05.23 | **Chairman’s Thanks and Meeting Close** |  |
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