

## Minutes of the 6<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Lawshall Neighbourhood Plan Team

Lawshall Village Hall, 22/03/16, 7.30pm

### In attendance:

**NPT members (first-tier):** Tom McClelland; Laura McClelland; Andy Irish; Bryan Adams; Ric Edelman; Jamie Whatley; Amber Brouder; Debbie Thomas; David Page; Cathy Acheson.

**Non-members:** Clare De'Ath; Brian De'Ath; Peter Marsh.

**Special Guest:** Ian Poole

### 1. Preliminaries

- **Apologies:** Laura Williams; Lucy Kent; John Kent; Karen Wilcox; Claire Osborne.
- **Declarations of Interests:** None declared
- **Minutes and Actions from last meeting:** Tom reported all actions from the last minutes have either been completed or are ongoing. No corrections were proposed.

### **Matters arising:**

- **Reshuffle:** Ric Edelman reported that due to his and Tom's growing work commitments, a reshuffle of responsibilities in the group was in order. He explained that Karen Wilcox will be taking over as Secretary from Easter. Tom reported that he will be taking on the role of 'Schedule Overseer', with responsibility for maintaining a clear schedule for the development of the Plan and for ensuring that members of the team are aware of various milestones that must be reached in order for the Plan to be delivered in a timely manner.
- **Community Engagement Strategy:** Ric raised the possibility of writing a Community Engagement Strategy. Ian confirmed that writing such a strategy goes above and beyond the obligations of the NPT, and offered to help write a strategy if the NPT chose to. The team agreed this would be a good idea.
- **Action: Ian Poole to draft a Community Engagement Strategy**
- **NPT Profile:** Bryan raised a worry about villagers not knowing who the team are, and proposed that we put together a document with a picture and brief profile for each member of the team. The team agreed this would be a good idea.
- **Action: Karen to oversee development of profile sheet after Easter.**

### 2. PROGRESS UPDATES

- **Treasurer:** David distributed his financial report and a report summarising our use of the Groundwork Grant. He noted that certain costs, such as the UCS analyst's fee, were above what we had originally budgeted for but were within acceptable parameters.
- **Funding:** Debbie noted that the Groundwork Grant requires us to complete a record summarising the team's progress so far. She also noted that we need to start thinking about our next Groundwork Grant bid, and suggested that we avoid conservative estimations of future costs.
- **PR:** Laura reported that all PR activities are continuing as normal and requested that people continue to like/share the NPT's posts on Facebook. Ric noted possibility of having a Neighbourhood Plan noticeboard at the village hall.

- **Young Peoples' Drop-In:** Amber reported that the drop-in on Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> March had fewer attendees than was hoped, but that the NPT's message was successfully communicated and that the people who came were very much engaged. Ric thanked Amber for her help in delivering the event. Amber noted that the age range of attendees was around 15-23. Cathy noted that an 18 year old villager displayed great enthusiasm for completing a questionnaire.
- **School Programme:** Amber read out Claire's reported on the Special Features group's school programme activities. For the full report see *APPENDIX A*.
- **Infrastructure:** Bryan reported that the sub-group had had their first meeting and apportioned jobs. Minutes of the meeting were given to the Secretary. Bryan reported that he had a positive and productive meeting with headmistress Claire Lamb. Claire explained at the meeting that she wants to work with the NPT. She reported that in planning circles 100 houses were predicted to bring in 25 more children to the school. And she suggested that having the school increases property values in the village. Regarding school parking, Bryan noted that the current situation is dangerous, though the new school bus had gone a small way toward alleviating the problem, as has a campaign to encourage people to walk. Claire had explained that the County Council were supposed to build a pavement on the pub's side of the road up as far as the school. Bryan asked Andy to bring up at PC to put pressure on our County Cllr to get this done as it would make parking in that area more feasible.
- **Action: Andy to raise issue of pavement construction at next Parish Council Meeting**
- **Special Features subgroup:** Ric reported that although he knows progress is being made by the group, a report on their progress will be postponed until the next meeting as the members were not present.

### 3. QUESTIONNAIRE

- Laura read out Karen's report on the progress of the Questionnaire. For the full report see *APPENDIX B*. Cathy highlighted the efficiency of Jamie's delivery headquarters. Ric emphasised that this is our last chance to encourage people to fill their questionnaires in.
- Bryan asked if Ian knew an average return-rate for questionnaires. Ian replied that he did not, but noted that Hartest had a return of around 25%. He agreed that 50% would be good. Clare De'Ath noted that having leaflets in advance of the questionnaire worked well.
- Tom explained that the next stage would be to input hard-copy questionnaires into Survey Monkey. David raised the question of how we should deal with the possibility of inputters altering the data. Ian suggested that all hard copies be kept in a box for a period of time. It was agreed that each inputter will put all the hard copies they input into an envelope which they seal, sign and date. If queries are raised, the seal can then be broken in the presence of an observer and the questionnaires examined.
- **Action: Inputters to put all hard copies that they input into an envelope which they then seal, sign and date.**
- Tom asked if anyone present would be unwilling to be inputters. Ric and Andy said they would prefer not to input. It was also agreed that Cathy and Tom should not be inputters due to their position as potential investigators for the complaints procedure.
- **Action: If needed, Tom to email any team members not present to ask if they would act as inputters.**
- Bryan asked what the deadline was for inputting. Tom said that the goal is Two weeks after Easter (Sunday 10<sup>th</sup> April) at which point we will also close the online survey.

#### 4. LOOKING AHEAD: The Next NP steps

Ian Poole was invited to talk the group through the next four steps of the schedule, which are:

- 1) Analysing Questionnaire Results
- 2) Scoping Options
- 3) Developing Village Character Assessment
- 4) Presenting Options / 2<sup>nd</sup> Community Consultation

- Ian recommended reflecting on what the results tell us, but also on what we still don't yet know. He suggested that he come over for a meeting to analyse the results once they are all in, and after Will Thomas has presented his findings.
- Work on character assessment, and on infrastructure, should be done in tandem with results analysis.
- The NPT can then scope options, before presenting them at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Community Consultation to hear villagers opinions.
- At the event, villagers can mark large maps, which can then be photographed.
- **Action: Meeting early May for NPT to think about what results mean.**

*Open questions to Ian:*

- Andy asked about the two sites in Lawshall that have been designated by the SCHLAA for potential development. Ian explained that the SCHLAA is distinct from the Local Plan. It identifies sites that could accommodate housing. Whether these sites then get allocated depends on wider strategy, such as the Local Plan and any relevant Neighbourhood Plan. Ian gave the example of the SCHLAA identifying three times as much land in Bury that was actually going to be built on. Only sites of 2 hectares or more are considered – these are for larger developments of around 60 houses. The NP might entail that such a development is inappropriate (within confines of the Local Plan). We're ahead of Babergh's Local Plan. 1050 target for Hinterland doesn't mean that many per hinterland, so grounds for resisting. Land allocated in the SCHLAA has to be 'available' and suitable for development privately. Invariably, the it is not Babergh who do the development.
- Ric asked about if and when the NPT should ask landowners to express any interest they might have in selling land for development. I suggested that we should wait and see what the results of the questionnaire are, since whether and how landowners are approached will depend on what the questionnaires reveal, and on wider findings regarding capacity, infrastructure etc. This could be done with a simple form that landowners submit.
- David asked whether Ian knew whether there was an infrastructure report for Lawshall. Ian reported that one should be ongoing at Babergh. David reported that he had been back and forth with Babergh on this and may need some assistance.
- **Action: David to contact Ian if assistance needed in retrieving the infrastructure report.**
- Andy noted that the Neighbourhood Plans he had read placed significant emphasis on village character, and asked whether we too should be focussing on this. Ian explained that listed buildings and valued spaces can restrict development, even within the planning boundary. The village's proximity to areas of outstanding natural beauty might be used as leverage. The village of Kirdford near Chichester is using a report on special features to shape their NP and Lawshall could do the same. It is advisable to highlight sites that are appropriate and inappropriate for development ourselves, rather than waiting for developers to propose sites then trying to convince them to relocate.
- A guided walk through the village might also yield valuable evidence. Cathy suggested that this could be done in tandem with a talk from Elizabeth Clarke about history of the village.

## **5. Completions**

### **AOB:**

- Cathy noted that although a complaints form was sent out to a villager, no complaint has yet been received. Andy reported that the complaint has instead been made to the PC. The complaint will be addressed by Babergh, who have requested that neither the PC nor the NPT engage with the complaint.
- Ric reported that he would be on holiday and unavailable until April 3<sup>rd</sup>.
- Date of BDC housing workshop: 1<sup>st</sup> April 4.30 – 7.00 Village Hall
- Date of next PC meeting: Tues 12 April 7.30 Village Hall
- Date for next NPT meeting: tba

## **APPENDIX A: 'Child's Eye View of Lawshall' at All Saints Primary School with Year 3 (22 pupils)**

### **Report by Clare Osborne**

Initially Ric and Claire met for a short discussion with Ellie Duffety, the year 3 teacher and we agreed to visit the class twice.

The first visit was a short session to introduce them to a simple Neighbourhood Plan concept. We got the class thinking about past, present and future by showing old and current village photographs and by telling stories based in the three different time periods. They loved the old photos and passed them round amongst themselves. The children had to guess if each story was set in the past, the present or the future. They listened very intently but they didn't always agree with the time periods!

At the end of the first session we showed the class our simple map, described the route we planned to take on a walk around the village and how we wanted them to note any good or bad points onto their copy of the map.

They were totally engaged throughout the session and we were very impressed with their obvious interest in the project.

On the second session the children were placed in pairs with maps, clip boards and pencils and we set off round the village to look for ideas. The maps were soon covered in notes and we all stopped several times to look around and write things down. They often pointed out tiny details and were all very keen to keep the play area.

We had to make up time with a run through Golden Woods and the last part of the walk was perhaps less productive, energy nearly all spent, but they had already done the hard work.

The class looked at all of their maps as a group in class and, with help from their teacher, collated their ideas onto the large map. They did very well!

## **APPENDIX B: Questionnaire Subgroup Report.**

### **Report by Karen Wilcox**

Beginning in January the group joined together on 6 occasions to prepare the questionnaire ready for delivery on March 13th.

At the first meeting we looked at other villages' questionnaires and decided what we wanted Lawshalls to look like.

We looked at the results from the Consultation event and based our questions on what was important to the population of Lawshall.

Laura & Tom also met with BDC's Special Needs Housing Officer Gill Cooke and Survey Analyst Dr Will Thomas. They hammered out a compromise between the bureaucratic & statistical needs of the council, and the user-friendly needs of the village.

Meanwhile feedback was also received from Rachel Hogger our new BDC support person and Ian Poole our independent Consultant. Several drafts then went back and forth between the subgroup members, and the penultimate draft was prepared to go to the Parish council and full NP team for feedback.

One final meeting was then held to finalise introduction letter, envelope wording, and the delivery process.

Then following final tweaks, the Questionnaire was also passed to a group of village guinea pigs to see everything was clear and made sense. Very helpful comments came back with generally a positive response. Special thanks to Jean & Derek Clements, Doreen & Ace Cunningham, Karen & Martin Hart, Lyndsey & Trevor Elmer, Marion & John Payne and Katie Edgar (representing young people!)

FINALLY after being proof-read by Nigel – the Questionnaire went off to the printers!

2 events were also held in the village hall:

1. A Young People's Drop-In to explain why the Questionnaire is important to them too.  
Amber led on this and 3 young people, showing a lot of interest, attended.
2. Questionnaire Clinic for anyone needing help or support filling it in. This was held over a 4 hour period with 8 team members on a rota. Only 2 villagers came – newcomers to the village.

Hopefully, all the hard work paid off as we have received very positive feedback to date and returns are coming in.

Special thanks must go to Tom for the formatting and all his hard work in ensuring both parts look so professional, to Laura for the design, to Vincent for his hard work on Survey Monkey to get the online version working efficiently, and to Jamie our Postmaster General, whose house became the delivery depot. Not to forget the 21 deliverers whose aim was to knock on doors and speak to every household in person [list accompanies minutes]