

Minutes of the 10th Meeting of the Lawshall Neighbourhood Plan Team

Moat Farm, 6/12/16, 7:30

In attendance:

NPT members (first tier): Ric Edelman; John Kent; Laura McClelland; Tom McClelland; David Page; Debbie Thomas; Jamie Whatley

1. Preliminaries

- **Apologies:** Karen Wilcox; Laura Williams; Claire Osbourne; Cathy Acheson; Lucy Kent; Emily-Rose Debenham; Bryan Adams.
- **Declarations of Interests:** none
- **Minutes and Actions from last meeting:** All actions completed. Minutes of last meeting approved.
- **Matters arising:**

20th October: Ric Edelman and Andy Irish visited Babergh District Council to discuss the draft of the plan. The meeting was a great success and planners had examined the draft in great detail and were able to provide astute comments on the policies.

16th November: conference call with Ian Poole. Because of this input from Babergh, it was agreed with Ian that it wouldn't be advisable to pay for an independent 'health check' on the plan. As well as the time and cost of such a process, by having this input from Babergh we can be assured that the plan is in an acceptable state. Ian confirmed that this check is optional and that it would not reflect poorly on the NPT not to commission one.

24th November: Ric met with Rachel Hogger our Babergh liaison for further advice on Character Assessment refinement, compilation of the Pre-Consultation comments and some ambiguities in the Policies.

Vol Hours: Ric noted we will need to update these for the Submission Draft.

Action: team to clock up any further work hours for November and December.

Tom reported that there are fewer than 20 comments online, and that there are currently no hard copies waiting to be inputted. The group highlighted that this is broadly a good sign: at this stage, villagers would only be likely to comment if there are concerns, so a small number of comments indicates that the draft plan reflects the village's wishes.

Ric explained the recent planning proposal for a development of 15 houses on Bury Rd next to the Foundry. Parish Chair Jon Kidd recommended we invite a proposal document from these developers, which Ric has done, and which will be discussed at the next PC Meeting. Ian Poole has looked at this document and commented on how it relates to the NP, and suggested there are some aspects that don't sit well with the plan. It was noted that as self-builds they would not be subject to the community infrastructure levy. It was also noted that it is important the plan is in place soon so that a planning application for this development will have to be judged against it. Ric highlighted that this matter is

being dealt with by the PC, and that the NPT are not engaging with the developer, and have not agreed to meet with them.

2. Reports

Funding: Debbie reported that the lottery funding applications was unsuccessful. Although the funders stated that the NPT could re-apply, the 3-month lead time would mean that a successful bid would provide funds too late. David reported that the School House Fund have provided a further £300. Ric has sent a letter of thanks.

Treasurer: David noted the forthcoming expenses he is expecting: printing costs for submission and for hard copies of the completed plan, and consultant costs which will reflect Ian Poole's work on; the Bury Rd development proposal; his possible participation at an NPT meeting in January; and his work on comments from the consultation process. Whether these costs are within budget depends on exactly what the printing costs are and how many hours Ian is needed for. Debbie noted that there is an outside possibility of acquiring a final few hundred from Groundwork/MyCommunity. Ric suggested this could be pursued if extra work was required in light of response from the independent examiner. Ric noted that Rachel could, after all, still be invited for free advice. Tom suggested the cost of printing copies of the final plan might be covered by those who want copies, such as the PC.

PR: Laura reported that she will keep Facebook posts and R&A contributions. Where news is thin, retrospective stories can be reported. Laura reported that Lucy Kent made an excellent Christmas tree for the All Saints Church Christmas Tree festival, shared with the Lawshall Archive Group.

3. Preparation of SUBMISSION DRAFT NP

a) Revision of Pre-submission Draft

Tom and David explained how all the consultation comments results will be put into a table, with a column allowing the NPT to provide their responses. Ric noted that several comments had been received from outside bodies. It was agreed that these would be added to the end of the table with a clear label showing that the comments are replies to requests for comments rather than inputs from the villagers. Ric explained that the table would go directly into the consultation statement.

Action: Karen to email comments to David, ccing Ric and Tom, and David to add them to table.

b) Supporting Documents

Ric outlined the consultation statement framework and requested that contributors complete it before Christmas.

Action: Ric and contributors to complete Consultation Statement by 24th Dec

c) Delivery Schedule

Tom reported that progress is still on schedule. Our timetable specifies that the plan will be submitted in December or January. Specifically, submission by Friday 13th January

2017 would keep us on schedule. Ric commented that if we continue work on the consultation statement, the character assessment and the basic conditions statement, there is no reason we shouldn't meet this deadline. Rachel had informed Ric that the NPT is not permitted to make general changes to the draft Plan before submission that are not directly a response to comments made during the consultation period. There is, however, latitude to resolve ambiguities and to correct drafting errors. This will allow the team to make adjustments including refining the maps. Such changes would be recorded before submission. Ric requested that if the team read through the plan for any ambiguities/drafting errors then these could be corrected in due course. David asked for clarity on his and Debbie's contribution to the Consultation Statement. Ric explained that they will be doing the form recording changes/responses in light of comments received during the consultation period.

d) Last use of Ian and Rachel

Ric noted that we have support from Rachel up to the Submission Draft, and that Ian will continue to help as needed. Ric suggested that, regardless of whether Ian and/or Rachel will be invited, we should schedule a meeting for early January.

Action: Tom to email round asking team to pencil in provisional date of Monday January 9th to make decisions about replies to consultation comments and final changes to plan.

3. Completions AOB

Thanks were recorded to Bryan for use of the Portakabin

Thanks were also offered to Tom for taking the minutes in Karen's absence.

Important Dates:

Tues 13 Dec – PC meeting looking at ZCERO proposal

W/c Mon 2 Jan – Heads Down / Consultation Comments (provisional date)

Sun 15 Jan – Deadline for completion of Submission Draft (provisional date)

The meeting ended at 8.40.