

Meeting Number	45
Date Of Meeting:	15 th May 2017
Location:	Brigstock Village Hall
Purpose Of Meeting:	Committee meeting
Minutes Prepared By:	Chris Allen
Date & Location Of Next Meetings:	Tuesday 23 rd May, 7.30pm. 2017 Brigstock Village Hall meeting room
Attendees:	M D Smith, M Smith, C Allen (Chair), L Spencer, N Schofield, , S Brown (second half), R Fincher, S Wilks
To be notified	Mike Burton– ENC Planning. Colin Wilkinson - Consultant
Copies to:	Committee members, Parish Councillors plus Website and those expressing an interest

Item No	Subject
45.01	<u>Public Forum</u> John Leech and Dianne Harcourt present
45.02	<u>Apologies</u> Colin Wilkinson, N Searle,
45.03	<u>Declaration of interests</u> CA and LS declared an interest regarding the specific issue of site selection and the land at the rear of Woodyard Close.
45.04	<u>Minutes of the previous meeting (44)</u> They were approved and will be signed as a true record of the meeting
45.05	<u>Outstanding Actions</u> Chair reviewed the outstanding actions from previous meeting.
45.06	<u>Accounts</u> The next grant claim was made by CA and NS and this has been successful. Grant we applied for was: £6,195.00 Grant amount offered: £5,318.00. the difference was that they removed the VAT element off the application as the PC can claim this back. It needs the Diligence forms to be completed before we get the money. This should see us through to the end of the Plan but needs to be spent in 6 months from receipt. ACTION CA / NS.
45.07	<u>Review of Public Meeting</u>

45.07ia	The meeting with the developers was attend by all 4 developers and 109 residents. It was agreed that this was a good turnout and that the developers had put on a good show.
45.07ib	Since the meeting, it has been confirmed that the Housing Assoc for Graftton Rd would be submitting an application in July for 10 houses.
45.07ic	SW agreed to write to the WI to thanks them for doing the tea and cakes ACTION SW
45.07id	Agreed that the developers should be written to thank for their attendance and good work. ACTION CA
<u>45.07ii</u>	<u>New site submission from P Singlehurst</u>
45.07ia	On 26 th April, after the public meeting and email was received from Mike Burton ENC, saying that Mr Singlehurst would like his site on Stanion Rd considered for development. This was submitted to ENC as part of their call for future sites. After discussion, CA wrote to the developer's agent asking for more detail of the site with full data backup. The land owner had been contacted earlier on in the NP process, but had not responded or attended any meetings.
45.07iib	On 15 th May, some further information was received which showed the site and 5 possible plots, but not all the requested backup information
45.07iic	The committee scored the site against the site criteria and it scored below the other main sites due to fact that it was in flood zones 2 or 3. Also due to its location adjacent to the Harpers Brook corridor, it was felt that this put it well below the other sites and would not be considered further at this time. CA to write to the agent to explain the situation. ACTION CA
45.07iii	<u>Questionnaire results and discussions</u>
45.07iia	284 questionnaires were returned, with about 200 electronically submitted. The paper copies were added by Malcolm Smith to Survey Monkey.
45.07iib	The committee went through the results and had detailed discussions over each question. They then went back and agreed the following: QUESTION 1 – as the majority of respondents voted for 35 future houses, with the comments from the NOs split between more or less, it was agreed to stay with the 35. QUESTION 2 – GLADMANS – 99% agreed that this was not an appropriate development - the committee agreed with this. QUESTION 3 – BUFFER 96% agreed that there should be a buffer - the committee agreed with this

	<p>QUESTION 4 – CAMP UNSUITABLE FOR HOUSING – 72 % agreed with this and the committee agreed with this</p> <p>QUESTION 5 – RANKING OF SITES. The order of the sites was Grafton Rd, Stanion Rd, Woodyard Close east, Lyveden Rd, Woodyard Close Full. Grafton Rd and Stanion Rd were clear favourites in the results. All agreed that Grafton Rd and Stanion Rd would be the considered sites for future development. If Stanion Rd owners did not want to have a reduced number of plots down to 25, then Woodyard Close east would be approached.</p> <p>QUESTION 6 – FURTHER SITES – quite a few sites were recommended, with the Pocket park coming up several times, but none by landowners or developers. Having already considered the new Stanion Rd south submission, the committee agreed that no further sites would be considered.</p>
45.07iic	<p>The data was not circulated to all the committee before the meeting due to its late availability. It was agreed that this would be circulated to give all members a chance to see the comments made to the questions and the generally points made at the end for their review. If it was felt that these could have influenced any of the decisions, they are to contact CA and NS asap. ACTION ALL</p>
45.07iid	<p>It was agreed that CA would contact the Stanion Rd developers to get their response to a reduced development of 25 houses and for a new site area that would be required. It is expected that this will be smaller in size than the last submission to reflect the smaller number of plots. They were also to be told that there was no employment allocation to this site. ACTION CA</p>
45.07 iv	<p>COMPLETION OF THE DRAFT NP</p>
45.07iva	<p>Malcom S felt that proscriptive details of future houses should be included in the plan – e.g. Houses for Life. After some discussion, it was agreed that SW, MS And MS would meet to put forward some proposals. ACTION SW, MS, MS</p>
45.07ivb	<p>CW to be asked to draft site specific sections based on the 2 sites agreed by the committee to go into the NP. ACTION CW</p>
45.07ivc	<p>The Buffer Zone was discussed and a plan marked with the suggested buffer zone. CA to send to ENC to get included on the layers. The site selections and the revised village envelope to be sent once the Stanion Rd size is confirmed. ACTION CA</p>
45.07ivd	<p>The question of the Green Space adjacent to the Church Paddock was discussed. It was agreed that the land that is being sold with the Rectory should not now be included. CA to revise the drawing to ENC. It was also agree that the land owners of the green areas would be contacted for their comments as part of the Draft NP consultation. ACTION CA</p>

45.07ive	It is hoped to get the Draft NP completed and signed off by CW by 8 th June so that it can go out for consultation. CA to draft update and details as to where the Draft NP can be seen and way to comment on to go into the next newsletter out on 4 th June. ACTION CA
45.07ivf	There is money in the budget to get some professional advice for the layout of the NP. RF and SB to talk to some professionals to assess availability. Malcolm S to send them some good examples of other NPs for guidance ACTION MS, SB, RF
45.07ivg	It was agreed that it is better to delay the publication if necessary to ensure that all our requirements are included. It is hoped to finalise most of these at the next meeting.
45.08	Programme
45.08i	This was covered in the previous section
45.09	Publicity
45.09i	Draft NP to be publicised in the Newsletter and will be sent to all the statutory bodies.
45.09ii	Add to village website when available - ACTION NJS
45.09iii	Advertise on village Facebook site when available - ACTION CA
45.10	<u>Correspondence</u>
	Nothing extra to report
45.11	<u>AOB</u>
	It is anticipated that the parish council will have to have an extraordinary meeting in August to sign off the plan
45.12	<u>Date of next meeting</u>
	Then 23 rd May 2017, 7-30pm to sign off as much as possible of the NP for next stage.