**Chelmondiston Neighbourhood Development Plan (CNDP)**

**Steering (Working) Group**

**Meeting:** CNDP Steering Group\*

Michael Wellock (MW - for Kirkwells - Planning Consultants)

**Date:**  Thursday, 4th April, 2019

**Location:** St Andrews Church Hall, Chelmondiston

**Ref:** Review results of ‘Informal Consultation’ and agree way forward.

**\* Steering Group:** John Deacon (JD), Johnathan Rapley (JR), Peter Ward (PW), Philip Evans (PE), Nathan Waller (NW). [Absent: Sarah Markham, Philip Evans.]

**Main Points Discussed/Agreed**

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Philip Evans.

**2. Election of Chair and Vice Chair**

Rosie Kirkup having resigned from the Group since the last meeting a new Chair was required. PW was unanimously elected.

PW having previously acted as Vice Chair, there was now a need to elect a new Vice Chair. All agreed to hold over this appointment until new members join the group at the next meeting.

**3. Approval of notes on the meeting of 31st January 2019**

Agreed by all.

**4. Matters arising not on this agenda.**

None.

**5. Steering Group issues**

***Status of the Steering Group.*** JD reported that since the last meeting of this Steering Group the status of the Group has been slightly amended by the Parish Council (April 2nd 2019), so as to be formally recognised as a ‘Working Group’ rather than as a ‘Committee’. The advantage (relative to a Committee) of remaining as a Working Group is that less bureaucracy is required; the downside, however, is that there are more constraints on autonomous action by the Group; in particular: 1/ Spending Money, and 2/ taking ‘key’ decisions particularly in publishing material to the wider Community. Such activities need to be agreed by the Parish Council before actioning.

***Revised TORs*** (see Appendix 1) to reflect the formalised status, as proposed by the Parish Clerk, were discussed. These were generally agreed with the exception that the ‘Constraint’ listed under 4.1 was felt to be too wide, potentially preventing the Group from taking any actions at all. A suggestion to revise this point to cover ‘key’ actions only will be made to the Parish Clerk. **Action: JD.**

***New Members.***  Two extra members are required to bring the number of people on the Group back to the desirable 8 (as per the TORs). Two people (Russell Stanley, a member of the Parish Council, and Simon Brown, of Seagulls, Pin Mill) have indicated their willingness to join the Group and were unanimously agreed subject to the further agreement of the Parish Council. **Action: JD to liaise with the Parish Clerk.**

**6. Review responses from the Informal Consultation process**

A summary of the results (see Appendix 2) produced by Kirkwells (MW) was reviewed:

* A total of 90 responses was received - this is nearly an 18% response rate, which compares very favourably with similar surveys in other parishes.
* In general the responses support the themes in the draft Plan.
* Going forward, 4 actions were agreed:
  + Update the draft in accordance with feedback received. **Action: MW**
  + Create a Summary for release to the Community. **Action: MW to create draft for review by this Group, (then review by the Parish Council before release).**
  + Create a list of actions (not appropriate to the Plan document) for forwarding to the Parish Council to consider for separate action. **Action: JD (review with MW - then this Group)**
  + Investigate the option to title our document ‘*The Chelpin Plan’.* This in order produce a snappier title than *‘Chelmondiston Neighbourhood Development Plan’* - this latter to become the subtitle. **Action: PW to liaise with Community Council, etc over the use of the term ‘Chelpin’. Then to refer back to the Parish Council.**

**7. Lessons learned from the Informal Consultation process**

The process was a bit rushed, so give ourselves more time with the next consultation, especially since we need to allow opportunity for PC review.

We know that at least a couple of dwellings were missed off the distribution of the door-drop. Be more specific over interface between drop areas next time - (though note that advice from MW is that the door-drop distribution process is classed as a ‘best endeavours’ activity, so that the inspector will not mark us down if a few houses do get missed off the list.)

**8. Future action to progress the Plan towards ‘Formal’ consultation**

On the assumption that the draft BDC/MSDC Local Plan is made available in the Summer (maybe June), it was agreed that we have to wait until that time to make any further moves, as it is particularly important that we see what housing implications for our Parish there are in that document - specifically, is Chelmondiston classed as a ’Core’ or ‘Hinterland’ village? **Action: PW to chase availability of Local Plan.**

Should availability of the Local Plan drift much beyond June, then in order to maintain Public awareness/interest in the process we should consider publishing a Newsletter to the Community. (JR tabled an interesting example from the Stutton Working Group.) **Action: Review at the next meeting.**

**9. AOB**

None.

**9. DONM**

Wednesday, 26th June, 2019, 19:00. Venue tbc (probably St Andrew’s Church Hall)

John Deacon,

6th April 2019

**APPENDIX 1 - Revised TORs - DRAFT**

**Chelmondiston Neighbourhood Development Plan**

**Steering (Working) Group Terms of Reference**

**1. Background**

For 7-8 years now the Government has been trying to persuade local governing bodies to create a Neighbourhood Planning document that would define how the local community would like to see developments managed in their area. Chelmondiston PC did consider this but the cost at that time was thought to be too high (particularly due to the need for a local referendum and formal inspection), and instead it was decided to create a Village Development Framework (VDF) document, which Babergh promised would be officially incorporated into the Planning documentation suite.  In 2016 the VDF was completed, and 2017 was spent trying to get BDC to adopt the document, but this process has been delayed with no indication of when progress might be made.  Given this lack of success the only option now available to give the community some control on developments in the Parish is to create a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) for Chelmondiston & Pin Mill as quickly as possible. The data gathered for the VDF will be used as the basis for this NDP.

**2. Purpose**

The Steering Group’s purpose is to design, implement and oversee the Neighbourhood Development Plan process in order that this will then progress to Independent Examination and a successful community referendum, ultimately being adopted by Babergh District Council to become planning policy.

**3. Scope**

The scope of this plan is the whole of the area within the Chelmondiston Parish Boundary, and as defined in the Area Designation notice agreed by Babergh District Council on 23rd March 2018.

**4. Constraints**

1. Any recommendation for action will be proposed to the Parish Council before commencement.
2. The whole process will be undertaken in a democratic, transparent and fair fashion, all eligible parties being allowed and encouraged to inform and shape the outcome through active consultation.
3. The process will be positive and constructive with the objective to strengthen the community through encouraging communication.
4. Comply with all regulations relevant to a publicly accountable organisation, and consistent with the management of TheParish Council.

**5. Tasks and Activities**

1. Prepare and maintain a project plan to set out how the NDP will be created.
2. Meet regularly (as required, but not less than once every 2 months) to agree on actions and discuss issues that arise, in order that the plan is progressed in an efficient and timely manner.
3. Produce notes/minutes from Steering Group meetings and forward to the parish clerk for circulation to the Parish Council. The Steering Group will keep its members and any others as agreed to be appropriate, informed. The minutes will also be made publicly available on the Parish website.
4. Undertake actions as required in the Plan.
5. Inform and engage eligible parties in the community (residents, businesses and those who work in the Parish) on a regular basis, and at all key stages in the Plan.
6. Work with the Parish Council and ensure that: a) they are fully informed throughout the process, and b) financial arrangements and budgets are agreed.
7. Liaise directly with the supporting contractor (Kirkwells) for the purpose of receiving on-going help.
8. Confirm services received from the supporting contractor to the Parish Council to enable their invoices to be approved for payment.
9. Expenditure of sundry costs such as room hire and stationery will be limited to £50.00 per invoice.

**6. Membership of Steering Group**

1. Members must reside within the Parish of Chelmondiston.
2. The Steering Group should consist of no less than 8 Members.
3. The Steering Group shall be quorate when at least 4 members attend.
4. A list of Steering Group (SG) members will be held by the Parish Clerk and contact details will be maintained by the steering group.
5. Any changes to SG Membership must be agreed by The Parish Council before confirming the appointment.
6. Officers of agencies appointed by the Council to support the process will be encouraged to attend meetings and contribute to the discussions.

**7. Roles within Steering Group**

1. The Steering Group shall elect a Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary keeping the Parish Clerk informed of their appointment and any changes to these roles.
2. If the Chair and Vice Chair are both unable to attend a meeting, then a temporary Chair (selected from the Steering Group members) will be elected for that meeting. Likewise for the Secretary.
3. A focal point to liaise with the supporting contractor (Kirkwells) will be appointed.

**8. Steering Group Meeting Arrangements**

1. The Steering Group (and any sub-groups) shall meet regularly as necessary.
2. Meetings will be advertised to the public.
3. The public can observe the meeting and speak at the Chairpersons discretion.
4. From time to time other stakeholders or interested parties may be invited to attend a specific Steering Group meeting to give a presentation and/or discuss their interest in the proposed NDP.
5. Recommendations from sub-groups should be relayed back to the full Steering Group for agreement, before a proposal to the Parish Council.

**9. Finance**

1. Requests for expenditure to be agreed by majority agreement of the Steering Group.
2. Subject to 5.9, expenditure will be subject to agreement from the Parish Council.

**10. Changes to the Terms of Reference**

Any amendments to these terms of reference may be proposed to the Parish Council but will require a majority agreement of the Steering Group.

**11. Dissolution of the Group**

1. The members will agree by a majority vote at a Steering Group meeting, to recommend that the Steering Group be dissolved. This decision will require ratification at a future Parish Council meeting.
2. Upon dissolution of the group any remaining funds shall be returned to the Parish Council for the benefit of the community. No individual member of the group shall benefit from the dispersal.

**APPENDIX 2 - Summarised Survey Results**

**RESULTS FROM MARCH 2019 ‘INFORMAL SURVEY’ - 90 REPLIES IN TOTAL**

Numbers in (brackets) indicate the number of times the idea was mentioned by respondents - where there is no number given, the idea was mentioned only once.  *Italics* are items added additional to the original list from MW.

**What do you think of the Vision Statement?**

* Comprehensive but not sure what it is trying to say
* Not a lot
* **General Support (60)**
* No need to make jobs a target, less worried about appearance of housing, surrounding environment more important
* PinMill shoreline – upkeep. Enforcement
* Not a vision
* Should mention development
* Resist urbanisation of village and Shotley peninsula
* Remove “thriving” could be used to justify endless development
* Not grammatically correct
* *Should include sustainability concept*
* *‘Unique’ may be overdoing it!*

**Future housing development and where should it be?**

* Adjacent Mill Lane, Richardsons Lane, Beside Hill Farm Lane
* **Affordable (13)**
* Bungalows
* Maisonettes
* Not too many big houses
* **No more (7)**
* No need
* Only within current village boundary
* **Limited (4)**
* **Infill (15)**
* **Starter and retirement homes *- 3 room houses for c£150K needed (4)***
* Not estates
* Adequate car parking
* No second homes
* **Small-scale *- incremental build (26)***
* **High standard of energy efficiency (2)**
* Not executive home
* **Sympathetic to the surroundings (11)**
* **Social housing *incl’ council housing* (6)**
* Small terraced houses
* Junction main road, beside Meadow Close, not whole area!
* **Not in AONB (26)**
* **No building in RAMSAR or SSSI (7)**
* Allow for downsizing
* Organic
* Fit with superfast broadband
* Traditional pitch roof and materials
* **No street lights (2)**
* Hill Farm development – sprawl
* Retain compactness
* In keeping with surroundings
* Already to many approved in pipeline
* Any large development should have amenity space
* Generic brick should be opposed
* Protect views
* Extend Meadow Close to White House Farm
* Electric charging points
* Less brick and block more timber and weather boarding
* No development in Conservation Area
* Eco-homes
* South of main road and east of village
* Low rise
* Build upwards
* Houses at 80% of market value – not affordable
* Enough is enough
* Hill Farm could be sensitively developed
* **Develop only brown fields (2)**
* *Low density*
* *High density*
* *No hi-rise*

**Environment?**

* Recycling
* Litter
* Enforcement
* No visual impact on landscape
* Housing in keeping with local styles
* Protect AONB
* Development should include wildlife areas
* Encourage bird nesting
* **More trees (5)**
* **Hedges (2)**
* No development of agricultural land
* Encourage local area to foster pride
* Conservation of wildlife
* Environmentally friendly management of farmland
* Resist attempts to classify Chelmondiston as a core village
* Too many heritage assets
* Wildlife needs inter-connected areas
* *Respect open spaces*
* *Manage footpaths*

**Community Facilities?**

* Bus shelters
* **Footpaths (2)**
* Box in the commercial rubbish bins at Pin Mill
* **Maintain playing field(2)**
* **More Play areas (7)**
* **Increase use of village hall (2)**
* Update sports pavilion
* Better wheelchair access to local shops
* Holbrook Academy – need for expansion?
* Value of local shops
* Changing facilities/toilets at playing fields
* Post Office not a planning issue
* **Need a Post Office (4)**
* Protecting churches not political decisions
* Establish a team of helpers with a base to help keep the village tidy
* A more visible meeting place
* Something for older children *eg, skateboard area*
* *Better promotion of existing facilities*
* *More benches to sit on*
* ***Youth clubs (3)***
* *Café*
* ***Public toilets on the Playing field (3)***
* *Art in the Community*

**Infrastructure?**

* **Bus service (16)**
* Road repairs
* Water and electric supply *- reduce outages*
* **Broadband (6)**
* Better car parking - in Meadow Close
* **Doctors (11)**
* **Improved mobile (3)**
* Generally fine
* **Traffic calming/management in village centre + Speeding and safety on B1456 through village (18)**
* Speed restrictions
* No need to increase local business
* Improve access to sports field
* **Extend school (7)**
* **Better Car parking in village (9)**
* **Cycling (6)**
* Pedestrian crossing
* Footpaths in village centre
* **Cycleway Ipswich to Shotley (4)**
* Traffic lights/mini-roundabouts at Woodlands and Pin Mill Lane
* Attracting tourists
* Put cars last – create pinch points through village
* By-pass around the village
* *Dentist*
* *Ensure extended High School for children to go on to*
* *Upgrade the road to ‘A’ status to ensure better repairs*

**Other comments**

* Houseboats – poor state, enforcement required.
* Need to be advised well in advance on proposed development
* Suffolk being spoilt – because not enough thought being given to historical influences, agriculture and natural environment
* No street lighting
* See houseboats as a positive
* Repair village signs
* Foresters is a lost opportunity and an eyesore
* Pavement outside Methodist Church should be widened *- unsafe*
* *Take account of this survey!*
* *Better communication about the NDP - better signposting on the website*

**Additional Details**

There are, in addition to the above, some specific suggestions for heritage buildings, etc that should be preserved.