

DRINKSTONE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

Minutes of the meeting on

Tuesday 26 February 2019 at the Old Rectory, Drinkstone

Members present:

Ian Cooper (IC)
David Craggs (DC)
Jane Hill (JH)
Peter Holborn (PH)
Diana Hollins (DMH)
Graham Todd (GT)
Daphne Youngs (DY)
Jeremy Wiggins (JW)
Ian Poole (IP)

ITEM		ACTION
1	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE There were none. JS has a very young baby	
2	The minutes of Last Meeting There were no minutes taken at the last meeting, as it was a brain-storming session.	
3	Item 3 Do we go ahead with specifying sites? IP advised that we should meet the housing requirements in full; when the local authorities run out of sites, the NP can fulfil the need and thereby we avoid rogue sites being approved. Numbers of sites? If we had a baseline of 20, and take 1 st April 2019 as the starting point, we have already done 6, and therefore would only need to specify a further 14. If we can demonstrate that 14 sites will come forward, we should be covered. DY asked what we could do to influence development if we don't allocate sites. IP said that we would need to show how we think that those (approx) 14 might be deliverable. Are we looking to specify one site and then rely on windfall for the rest? Do we identify set criteria? The Character Assessments will certainly influence decisions. Identification of sites reflects on the impact of the settlement. Inevitably there will be compromise. The most important factor to remember is that the DNPSG must show absolute impartiality.	

	<p>Suggestions put forward by residents through the Consultation process must be treated equally, and all subjected to the same basic criteria.</p> <p>IP advised that it is possible to get site assessments even before we know what numbers will be required. We can get a technical assessment through AECOM, to use in conjunction with the other assessments already undertaken.</p> <p>It was asked whether AECOM would ascertain the interest of land owners; IP said that ownership was probably unlikely to be addressed. However, if we consulted the owners to see if they minded their land being assessed, sites could be eliminated or included at this early stage.</p> <p>Do we give AECOM our criteria before asking them to do the assessment, even though the criteria have not been tested by residents? Is it better to get AECOM to do their standard work and then afterwards apply our criteria at the next Drop-In Session?</p> <p>There followed further discussion on the pros and cons of identifying sites; whatever is decided, it will be “Difficult Decision Time”. There may be a situation where we have to say to residents that we think certain sites should not be included and show what is then left.</p> <p>The consensus at the end of a lengthy evening’s discussion was in favour of moving forward on identifying sites, but with the caveat from PH that there is very close management of AECOM re sites. He is concerned that their standard forms are too desk-bound. DY reassured PH that the two of them would accompany AECOM when looking around the village for sites.</p> <p>GT reminded us that we are at greater risk from no sites being identified, as it opens up the possibility of rogue applications.</p> <p>Expenditure on AECOM assessment already included within the funds we have.</p>	
4	<p>Item 5</p> <p>JH & JW reported on the spend to date, and the income. Up till now we have spent £463. Although the residue must be returned at the end of the financial year, it is immediately re-allocated to us, by filling in the requisite forms on line.</p> <p>IP said that his bill up to now would be £3500, incl VAT</p> <p>DMH will contact Liz and Tony Schmitt re submitting an invoice for printing costs.</p>	<p>JH, JW</p> <p>DMH</p>

	<p>Item 4</p> <p>Feedback on draft plan. GT reported that he has done the first draft and shown it to IP. IP acknowledged the hard work put in and has added some extra details, as well as some restructuring. He advised that certain elements may need to be removed from the main text and included instead as reference documents.</p> <p>It was agreed that IP, GT and DY should meet to go through the draft in advance of the next meeting.</p> <p>DY asked IP if there is anything outstanding that he needs from us. IP said no, just the evidence documents.</p>	<p>GT IP</p> <p>IP GT DY</p>
6	<p>Ongoing Publicity</p> <p>PH commented on the Village Website; he would like to see more straight-forward links to the NP. DMH will liaise with Tony and Liz. It was suggested that the improvement should then be flagged up by Jungledrums</p>	DMH
7	<p>Next Steps</p> <p>Drafts for submission by 22.06.19; we would therefore anticipate the Referendum to take place in January 2020.</p> <p>IP 6 weeks are needed after submission before the next step, which takes us to early August. Given it is in the middle of the holidays, we need to assume an 8 week gap.</p> <p>IP will accompany JH to Parish Meeting on 3rd June 2019</p> <p>Oct 7th – after amendments, the PC will have to approve sending the NP to Mid Suffolk DC. PC will need to have it 7 working days before the meeting. We could send them the original plan with list of pending amendments.</p> <p>The plan then goes to Mid Suffolk; they consult for 6 weeks, so the NP is likely to go for Examination just before Christmas. It is probable therefore that the Referendum will take place in February. We need 5 weeks between the calling and the holding of the Referendum. Mid Suffolk will dictate the date; DMH to advise Liz Schmitt re use of Village Hall</p>	<p>IP JH</p> <p>DMH</p>
8	<p>AOB</p> <p>There was none</p> <p>The meeting closed at 9.55pm</p>	

These minutes are accepted as a true record of the meeting

Signed _____

Date _____