



**MILBORNE ST ANDREW
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY**

**MEETING HELD ON 3rd NOVEMBER 2016
IN THE VILLAGE HALL COMMITTEE ROOM**

No. 27

1. Present: Mike Brown (MB), Sue Cherry (SC), Susan Gould (SG), David Gould (DG), Ronald Hogg (RH), Michael Hopper (MH), Richard MacNair (RM), Quentin Miller (QM), and Pam Shults (PS).
Apologies received from: Georgina Carrington (GC), and Jo Witherden (JW)).
2. The Minutes of Meeting No. 24 of the 6th October was approved with no amendments.
3. Matters Arising:
 - a. 1 – MH has had a phone conversation from the agent of David Wyatt (who attended as observer at the last meeting). MH updated him on the actions of the group at this stage.
 - b. 8a – It was agreed that the expertise of RM has greatly helped the start of analysis of all the questionnaires.
 - c. 8d – MH stressed that we should be soon firming up on sites put forward for development.
4. There was a Declaration of Interest from QM based on item 5a on the Agenda of the meeting.
5. SHLAA Activities
 - a. QM has updated the group on his wishes for development of a small parcel of land behind Fox View. Since the initial presentation before Christmas 2015, an Ecological Survey has been carried out, with no issues found. Advice sought from Steve Clark of the NDCC who noted that the land was outside the settlement boundary, and an inspection by an arborist only highlighted one possible protected tree that was actually outside the potential building area. Using the question list put together by the NPG for potential developers, the following issues were raised.
 - i. What is the purpose of this presentation? – QM wishes to be completely open with the continuing progress to development. He would like feedback on this venture, and to this end will be also presenting (with Richard Bagnall) to the Parish Council on 16th November 2016. He is happy for the NPG report and the initial paperwork he included to be made public. QM said, “The purpose of the presentation was not to determine whether the principle of development was acceptable or not but to update the community on the progress made on the project and most importantly present an opportunity for the community to comment on what it would like to see included in the formal application.” The family has spoken to some of the residents of Fox View.
 - ii. Parking – the planned parking meets county standards, the ratio of parking to bedroom is not enormous, as they are all smaller units. The group suggested to change garages to carports, so that space is used for vehicles rather than storage, as the village has a problem in areas with congested onroad parking. (NB RM reported that there is an average of 0.61 vehicles per bedroom in the village). There was no parking provision for visitors and this should be considered.
 - iii. Flooding – Sewage could be linked into Fox View, with a soakaway to slow down any rainwater impact. QM had no information about reuse of grey water.
 - iv. Affordability – the number of dwelling is below that which determines the building of affordable housing, but as they are smaller units, it is envisaged that they should be affordable in the private market.
 - v. Design – the design of the building may possibly follow on from Fox View in type (brick and flint).

**MILBORNE ST ANDREW
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY**

Supported by



- vi. Sustainability – QM hopes to investigate the viability of fitting solar tiles (panels) at time of building.
 - vii. Privacy – The design of any building should endeavour to ensure existing buildings are not overlooked.
 - viii. Bin storage – not yet designed in, the road would probably be unadopted, so bins therefore would have to be taken down to Little England (as in Fox View). QM was asked to look at the issues surrounding the management of this issue.
 - ix. QM was thanked, and once again informed that all info would be shared.
 - b. Letter received from Savills on behalf of David Wyatt regarding potential development of land above Huntley Down. NPG will reply (SG to draft) and will include the same “potential developers” questions used above.
 - c. Email received from Mrs A Hurst asking that any correspondence regarding her land should be sent directly to Mrs Hurst. SG has acknowledged.
6. Questionnaire
- a. RM has carried out a parking analysis for RH, where, using the data given by residents in the questionnaire, it seems that there is an average of 0.61 vehicles per bedroom in the village.
7. **Workshop day – Sunday 27th November, Sports Pavilion. Booked from 10.00am to 3.00pm, start at 10.30pm. Break for lunch at 12.00pm, finished no later than 3.00pm. All please bring a plate of food. MH to book.**
- a. There was concern about the purpose of the workshop, which RM has offered to manage. It is hoped that the day will result in a clear list from our existing research/questionnaire analysis, which will be included in the Draft Plan; it will also show areas that still need research, if any.
 - b. RWM stressed we have the data, now we need to define the plan. We need to put down ideas/needs for the future. The format centres on the areas of research. Where, instead of the single researcher making decisions based on findings, it will be discussed and argued by the group as a whole, thus spreading the load of responsibility as many heads are better than any one!
 - c. RWM has requested that we each of the topic owners use a large sheet of paper, using short phrases, bullet points, or single words to pull out the main findings as they see them from:
 - The main survey outputs as published
 - Their review of the qualitative responses (pulling out those areas which are mentioned significantly by respondents but were not covered by the questionnaire itself)
 - Any wider research they have done
- In the workshop we will use these, along with print outs of the key tables from the report, as the basis for discussion and group prioritisation of areas for a. inclusion in the plan b. in need of further research. For instance, in Business and Employment, the findings showed that all business units were used, so maybe we need more units, the questionnaire showed folk were keen on a particular type of unit, and the qualitative comments highlight a wish for some other commercial ventures. RWM has offered to print out sheets on A3 for the NPG, please send by email.
- d. The outcome of the workshop should be that if we are challenged about aspects of our plan, we could defend those decisions. When asked for advice, RM said that we were probably worrying and fretting too much over the process, think of it as nothing more than a structured discussion
 - e. If anyone wants to discuss their bit ahead of the session or is worried, to please get in touch with RWM.
8. Reporter Article – thought that an article should be inserted this month, SG to compose.

**MILBORNE ST ANDREW
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY**

Supported by



9. AOB – Flooding: Martin Hill has been surveying, it is understood that a pipe will be placed from the Milton Road junction manhole to the culvert under the main road to take away flood water more efficiently. Also that the low road area outside of Stileham Bank, where water pools, to be addressed.
10. The meeting closed around 8.55 pm. The next meeting should be 1st December 2016, however, this does not give time for any meaningful report of the workshop to be put together, MH to investigate possible 8th December, 7.00pm, in the VH Committee Room, **to be confirmed.**