

**Minutes of the Meeting of
Staverton Neighbourhood Development Plan Committee**

Tuesday 28th March 2017

Staverton Village Hall

Present: K Edwards (KE) J Gilford (JMG) Chair, T Glover (TOG), J Vale (JV)

I Weaver (IW),), Jay Holliday (JH) Members of the public – One

1 GOVERNANCE

1.1 No Interests declared

1.2 No dispensation requests

1.3 Agreed that all votes will be registered on an individual basis as per standing order 3R

1.4 JMG advised that she had contacted NALC and was still awaiting a reply from NALC re clarification of standing order 7a.

2 APPROVE MINUTES of the Meeting held on 14th March 2017

IW requested to change ‘force’ to ‘encourage’ more house building. JMG asked that the following be inserted “JMG clarified that only those on the list would be taken into account who had a close family member living in the village.

IW then proposed that the minutes be approved as an accurate record of the meeting. JV seconded. 5 votes for. JH abstained as she did not attend the meeting

3 MATTERS ARISING

3.1 The Parish Clerk will be getting dates for Code of Conduct training in the near future.

3.2 TOG has placed leaflets on the village notice boards asking for a volunteer to take minutes. Also several individuals were identified and will be asked by committee members if they are willing to take minutes at future meetings.

At this time the member of the public present was asked and agreed to take the minutes of this meeting

3.3 JH offered to remove the acronyms in the draft Plan by the next meeting

3.4 JMG ~~stated~~ advised that DDC had chosen not to comment on the methodology used to produce the Fast Track Housing Need statement and that they would recommend Staverton Parish Council undertake a Housing Needs Survey.

4 BUSINESS ARISING

4.1 & 4.2 A general discussion took place re the SNDP Project Plan and the timetable

JMG set out the priorities and Wants v Needs.

JV advised that a document audit trail is needed, and any changes to the SNDP would mean revisiting work already done which takes time.

JH commented that that would be the case whatever route was taken.

KE stated that some of the tasks listed had already been completed at least once - and it would help if a % complete column was included. JMG agreed to include this.

KE asked what needed to be produced for various tasks and who had been allocated to each task, and that all sub-committee members need to be prepared to individually undertake a range of tasks.

JMG advised that it was a statutory requirement that all plans were supported by ~~need to include~~ a consultation statement that detailed who and how residents were consulted about the Plan, along with any main issues and concerns which had arisen as part of the process and how they had been addressed. She also advised another statutory document was a Site Environmental Assessment which would be produced by DDC. JMG then went on to report that Weedon's Neighbourhood Plan had been rejected in its entirety on the basis that (1) They found too many of the plans policies and proposals including site allocation methodology lacked robustness or evidence to support them: (2) The policies lacked precision and clarity and did not conform to national policy: (3) DDC had raised many concerns about the plan and there had been no dialogue between Weedon & DDC: (4) The plan was not compatible with EU regulations and: (5) The SEA was not appropriate even though it had been produced by consultants. She therefore recommended that the following documents also be produced to enable a robust audit trail: (1) Site Assessment Statement (2) Housing Need Statement and that dialogue be entered into with DDC as scheduled and that all the documents being produced would be subject to changes as the Plan progressed.

JH mentioned the extremely high 69% return of Parish questionnaires gives a good representation of the Parish

JMG mentioned that the data is now 12 months old - the DDC survey will be current and that the Inspector in the Weedon examination report had said Weedon Parish Council's Housing Need selection had not taken into account the latest evidence of housing need.

JH stated that once the Daventry Housing Survey data is known, the SNDPC will have to change the existing documents, plans and tasks , and said that it would be better to wait for these results. KE agreed with this.

KE reminded the Sub-committee that the whole ethos is a Neighbourhood Plan for Staverton Parish only.

JV reiterated that the correct processes have to be followed with a solid traceable audit trail , otherwise the Plan will be rejected. And that any reference to sustainable development is needed in economic, social & environmental terms.

JMG then agreed to distribute via email Weedon NDP's Independent Examiner's Report stating that a good plan needs to be produced. And that funding ends at the end of 2017.

JMG also agreed to email to the sub-committee members 3 made (accepted) NDPs along with the accompanying Consultation documents. (Kilsby, Braunston + 1 other)

JMG advised the committee that she had attempted in the production of the project plan and meeting schedule to sequence & prioritise all outstanding tasks and hopefully all will be made clear in the meeting schedule:

Sat 1st April - Site Meetings at Silver Birch (10:30am) & The Beeches (9:30am)

Wed 5th April - Site Meeting Braunston Lane (6:30pm)

Wed 5th April - Workshop Site Meeting evaluations (7:15pm) at IW's

Thurs 6th April - Site Meeting - behind school (6:30pm)

Tues 11th April - Key SNDP meeting (7:15pm) at JFG's - Docs to be readied to send to DDC.

Further workshops / meetings in April & May will be arranged on a regular basis

JH PROPOSED That we accept both the Project Plan and the Timetable up to 11th April. IW seconded the proposal. All voted in Favour - Passed 5-0.

4.3 JMG advised that DDC had sent out a letter to all Parishioners giving details of the DDC Staverton Housing Needs Survey. This should be completed by the end of April. Posters & printed copies will be received by the Parish Council; the posters to be prominently displayed and the printed copies of the survey to be given to parishioners who are not online who ask for one.

4.4 JMG advised that The Beeches & Silver Birch have agreed to the dates for site meetings. The Group had already agreed at a previous meeting that there is no need to meet again with The Croft as nothing has changed for them. and that any further consultation could be undertaken via email.

JV said that both the School Site & Braunston Lane must be included in the site visits so as to be fair to all. And the 3 larger sites need to be asked whether 5, 10, or 15 homes on their site is achievable and where they would be built.

KE queried what new information would be received

JMG advised that a condition of including sites within a plan was that they were deliverable and a way of doing this and evidencing it to DDC was to have a response in writing that the site is deliverable for the type / style / and numbers (5 or 10 or 15)

A lengthy discussion then took place about the options & reasons for face to face meetings.

KE stated that 15 houses on a site has never been discussed before and that SPC had doubled the large site number from 5 to 10 - not 15 therefore we should not discuss 15 with the site developers.

JH added that there is no evidence for 15 houses on a site. 5 or 10 is what has been mentioned in the past.

JV stated just visiting the sites will not provide the sub-committee with any solid information. They need to do detailed calculations to evaluate how much land is needed to deliver the requirement options. So what do we get out of the site meetings?

JMG advised that in order to ascertain if a site was deliverable within the plan the landowners/developers would need to know the policies they would have to develop within and what the housing need was and that this information should be furnished to them with a view to having a site meeting to enable any further clarification on said information. ToG said that they need to know what is required on each site

KE said that it will help everyone to go and see the sites. To speak to the representatives, and to understand their challenges & solutions.

JV then read out the Northamptonshire Housing Density Policy ie 35 per hectare.

KE stated that DDC had confirmed that in their Call For Sites they had used a figure of 25 per hectare. But had added that they would expect this to be lower in rural areas.

JH asked if the sub-committee were opening themselves up to a later challenge, by visiting sites with developers.

JMG advised that it was DDC who had suggested that the advised SNDPC be met and engaged with developers prior to the submission of a NDP

KE stated that up to £9,000 can be claimed to fund professional assistance eg. defining development boundaries and assessing sites. None of the sub-committee are qualified to complete such tasks, and by using professional planners it will give greater credibility to our plan.

ToG stated that this will take more time

JMG suggested that the site visits should still go ahead as planned.

JV said that a draft plan for 5 or 10 houses on each of the larger sites could be obtained from the developers

JMG reiterated that all the site meetings will be on a "without prejudice" basis.

The letter to the developers was then reviewed.

KE asked for 2 sentences to be removed

JMG asked for some wording to be changed.

The letter was revised and the content agreed.

The Housing Needs Table was then reviewed and a few amendments made resulting in the following:

The Croft - 2 Houses/ Bungalows Maximum

The Beeches - 3 Bungalows Maximum

Larger Sites:

Scenario 1: 5 - 1 x Affordable, 3 x 1/2 bedroom house, 1 x 3 bedroom house

Scenario 2: 10 - 3 x Affordable, 1 x 1/2 bedroom house / bungalow,

3 x 2 bedroom terrace properties, 2 x bungalows, 1 x 3 bedroom house

ToG PROPOSED IW SECONDED

‘That we send the letter, relevant policy details and the Housing Needs Table to the site representatives’. TOG – FOR. KE – ABSTAIN. IW – FOR. JV – FOR. JH - FOR. Carried 4-0

IW PROPOSED ToG SECONDED

“That we send the other 2 larger sites the same information and arrange dates to meet on site with them”

IW – FOR. ToG – FOR. JV – ABSTAIN. KE – ABSTAIN. JH – ABSTAIN. Carried 2-0

5 FINANCE

ToG explained that the final tranche of funding can be claimed up to October, and all funding ceases at the end of December 2017.

£669.14 has been spent from the 3rd tranche of funding, and £615.86 will be returned. This will be on the SPC agenda on 4/4/2017

KE agreed to investigate the Expert Technical Help funding which is available and report back to the sub-committee

5 DATE OF NEXT SNDP Committee Workshop – Wednesday 5th April 2017 at IW’s (Home Close)

KE requested that in future all documents are sent out to sub-committee members at least 3 days before any meeting, as per the SPC standing orders. JG agreed this should be the policy and that she would try to adhere to it but found it difficult due to the amount of actions tasked to her.

Meeting Closed: 9:50pm