

## Drinkstone Neighbourhood Plan

### Minutes of the Meeting of the Steering Committee held on Monday 25<sup>th</sup> June 2018

**Present:** Daphne Youngs, Peter Holborn, Duncan Hannant, Louise Sharpe, Jane Hill, Diana Hollins, Lyn Hannant, Paul Bryant

1. **Apologies:** Tim Moss, Graham Todd, Ian Cooper, Jeremy Wiggins

2. **Introductions:**

Daphne introduced new committee members Diana Hollins, resident since 2002 and Louise Sharpe, resident since 2004, who is Regional Director for RIBA, (though not an architect herself). Daphne then introduced Paul Bryant, Planning Officer for Mid-Suffolk District Council (henceforth MSDC) since Sept 2010, who was to advise us on our passage through the system.

3. **Minutes of last meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2018**

Daphne referred to the minutes of the previous meeting, concerning the need for expenses funding before grant income is received.

4. **Matters arising**

- Following Louise's introduction, there ensued a discussion on local architects resident (or prospective), who we hope might be interested in supporting the NP development: Joe Stebbings, who has bought Cora's house, and Liz and Tom Miller, who are in Gerald's house.
- Peter Holborn referred to the elements of the Natural Environment and the Built Environment which must be considered closely in tandem. He reported that a draft list of data layers needed has been drawn up, including information on soils and drainage. Peter thought that Colin Canfield might be able to help on the soil aspect.

5. **Paul Bryant – Planning Officer for MSDC**

Paul outlined his experience in various sections of the Planning Department at Babergh and then Mid-Suffolk District Councils. He then ran through the procedure that we must follow if we are to be successful in driving through the NP.

- We need to enlist the help of groups, volunteers, individuals with specialist skills
- The community needs to feel engaged
- We must be realistic about the length of the process

- The outcome should be a plan fit for the community
- The DC gives guidance
- All policies we develop must be fully supported by solid evidence
- Keep all evidence together and accessible
- Secondary evidence can be referred to, as supporting documentation; there are specific documents which must be submitted; the rest can be peculiar to Drinkstone

Paul ran through the processes which we must follow. These are summarised succinctly in the Memorandum of Understanding document which Paul circulated at the end of the meeting to each committee member.

- Area Designation
- Plan preparation and evidence gathering
- Draft document; Regulation 14 pre-submission documentation
- Minimum 6-week consultation period, after which we must look at the representations made, and if necessary then modify the plan
- The document must be shared with MSDC before sending it out for consultation; we can meet Paul to discuss the plan prior to this
- Consultation Statement says what we have done, showing the evidence leading supporting the plan
- We must show that we have complied with all environmental obligations
- The DC re-consults on all aspects for 6 weeks, and then send everything to an independent Examiner (appointed by them)
- The DC pay for examination costs
- We then get a draft report for fact sharing, which is confidential
- The report returns to the Examiner for the final version
- Paul advises following the Examiner's recommendations; it will make the plan's passage through Cabinet Committee smoother
- We then go to Local Referendum, for which 28 days' notice must be given
- If the referendum finds in favour of the plan, it will go forward for inclusion in planning guidance
- Lawshall took 2 years to get to this point; they did use the services of a consultant

Paul then gave us further helpful hints

- Use all means possible to keep the public informed
- Financial support: various sources – [www.neighbourhoodplanning.org](http://www.neighbourhoodplanning.org) is a useful source of information
- Basic grant is £9000: access is through Locality.
- The DC will not give financial support other than paying for the Examiner and Referendum
- Make grant applications water-tight. We can apply for chunks of money, rather than all up front
- Awards for All, ACEOM worth considering
- Use local skills to minimise expenses

Paul then answered some of our questions

- Daphne asked about energy efficiency on new builds; can we include it in our plan? Paul gave a positive response
- Paul promoted a Community Energy and NP workshop at Claydon on 4<sup>th</sup> July 2018, at SALC offices, from 9.30 – 12.30, to include lunch, limited places available.

He also suggested looking at UTube videos for extra information.

There is going to be an event in Lavenham celebrating Rural Housing in Suffolk.

He also suggested that we look at national, local and district level planning and strategy documents.

- Louise reported that Suffolk Design, launching on 9<sup>th</sup> July, will be looking at the future of design
- If Drinkstone is re-classified as a hamlet, there is information on what the policy will be on development
- Peter suggested that we need to consider which features we want to enhance
- Daphne asked how we square 10% recommended development with windfall development (which could prove to be limitless)? Can the NP take a view on cumulative development?
- Paul circulated copies of the 2011 Census information regarding Drinkstone Housing and Population Profiles
- Paul gave us information regarding provision of OS maps

- Duncan asked Paul if there is a negative impact if the process takes more than 2 years
- Paul suggested having a drop-box for all documentation in one secure place. Louise will ask Tony to organise it.

Daphne thanked Paul on behalf of all the committee members for his valuable input at the meeting. We then moved on to the rest of the agenda.

#### **4. Jane Hill**

Jane gave an overview of the project plans and terms of reference, succinctly and clearly presented in a document which she circulated. Jane's sections are consistent with the NP roadmap. She felt that it is well worth taking the good parts from other villages' documents, with which the committee agreed. Lawshall's NP was praised.

Peter said that we should think carefully about identifying sites; maybe we should concentrate on criteria.

#### **5.Appointment of external consultant to support the process**

It was agreed that we should get everything done in appropriate planning-speak, hence the need for a professional consultant. There was discussion on the proposal from Ian Poole. Jane will check the grant requirements to see if we are obliged to put the position out to tender; if we do not, the feeling was that we would prefer to go straight with Ian. Peter felt that Ian would not want to go down the route of identifying sites. Louise wondered if we need to keep money in reserve for contingencies, and if so, might we be able to negotiate a reasonable fee with Ian?

#### **6.Appointment of a committee member to act as PR and communication strategist**

Graham was assigned to this post in his absence.

#### **7.Setting up of questionnaire-development group**

Daphne will take on this task.

#### **8. AOB**

There was no further business

#### **9. actions**

**Louise** to approach Joe Stebbings and Liz and Tom Miller to establish built character working group; to work with Liz Schmitt to set up a drop box for steering group documents and communication not needed on the NP website

**Peter** to contact Colin Canfield about soil study

**Jane** to draft TOR and check if we need to put consultant appointment out to tender

**Daphne** to sign and return MOU to MSDC; set up questionnaire working group; negotiate fee with Ian Poole

**10. Date and venue of next meeting**

Monday 6<sup>th</sup> August 2018 at **7.30pm** in the Small Room at the Village Hall. Apologies to [dianahollins@hotmail.com](mailto:dianahollins@hotmail.com), please.