**MEETING HELD ON 8th DEC 2015 IN THE VILLAGE HALL COMMITTEE ROOM**

No. 16

1. Present: Mike Brown (MB), Georgina Carrington (GC), Sue Cherry (SC), David Gould (DG), Susan Gould (SG), Ronald Hogg (RH), Michael Hopper (MH), Pam Shults (PS) and Jo Witherden (JW).
2. MH introduced Michael Miller, together with sons Quenton and Justin. The family had requested the opportunity to come and talk about overall plans for the family owned land.
	1. The primary site of interest abuts Fox View, the landowner states that the piece of land is “unsustainable” commercially for the farm business. The only entrance is through the new development, and the agricultural traffic is of concern to the nearest resident. The land is about ½ acre, an architect has been employed, and a rough plan of potential buildings has been drawn up, although no formal representations to the planning authorities have yet been made. An ecological survey has been carried out with nothing of significance found. It is suggested to including bat boxes in the residential scheme. The land is very approximately 10 feet above the flood plain.
	2. 7 units are planned, of around 71/72 sq.m, and having 1 to 2½ bed. They wish to try and retain the young people of the village. The buildings include semi-detached units, and a flat above a group of garages, access will be through Fox View.
	3. The original site (Fox View) had permission for 10 units when sold, but the developer resubmitted plans for 13. The Miller family stated that the land has not been developed in the way they originally thought, as wished to cater for all, but that they needed to gain capital to develop the farm.
	4. There are 2 barns left, and are almost obsolete as they are not big enough for tractors. At present they house calves, the least offensive option (bar storage). There is very little space between the barn and the fence of Fox View House (about 4 feet).
	5. Asked why they wished to see us, they responded that they wished to talk about this “embryo plan”, they felt it would be useful to gain feedback from us about nature/style etc. They felt it advantageous to present this in a scope within our prerogative.
	6. Other reasons why they wish to remove the barns, 2 years ago “kids” were found in the barn, used for storing straw at the time. They had made a den at the top of a stack, and were smoking. The dangers were only too apparent, Quenton said.
	7. Regarding the larger plot of land behind Homefield and reaching the A354. The “Miller” land has been left as a trust, split amongst the family. There is an amount of land not in Michael’s and his sons control, as it has been left to another family member. This includes land above Homefield, and behind Hurdles and Orchard Villa, thus any development would be set back from the existing buildings. There are no concrete plans for this area, but a long-term wish (within 15 years) exists to progress this development.
	8. The larger plot is 20 acres, and access would probably be off Lane End. Any development would be phased, with the family maintaining control of type and amount of development.

i. The other land identified as within the family is once again not in control of Michael and his sons. This is behind the Garage, and abuts the land leading to Dewlish and is about 6 acres. As far as he is aware, there are no plans to develop this land. Other land identified is rented, and not owned by the family.

j. Flooding/Design/Parking as with the last presentation by Messrs David Wyatt, we put forward our concerns about the use of grey water systems, permeable surfaces, sympathetic design with adjacent buildings, allowance for bin storage etc. . We requested that they consider flood mitigating systems be built into any development. As the plans are not at the same stage as the D Wyatt land, some questions could not be addressed at the moment. Following highlighting the problem in other areas of the village, where parking is a problem, due in some part to the separation of rental property and rental garage (one was offered without the other), They suggested that they would try to created a covenance to ensure that new properties would remain as they had been planned e.g. that garages, if not integrated could not be sold off separately; also that rental properties would remain available as rental, not sold off.

1. Michael Miller feels that if more dwellings are built, it would enable Wessex Water to use some of the money they have been taking from new developments to upgrade the sewage system (with the increased revenue). Wessex Water has upgraded the sewer system to a certain extent, but this has not alleviated the problem.

The Miller family were thanked for their attendance; as with the last presentation, no comment was made to them about any disapproval/approval or any compliance/noncompliance with our research.

1. The Minutes of Meeting No. 15 on 10th November 2015 were approved with no amendments.
2. There were no Declarations of Interest based on the Agenda of the meeting (MH declared an interest in any development of the land above his property in the presentation above.)
3. Consultant support – Sallie Lloyd-Jacobs has withdrawn her offer of help due to time constraints. JW has contact Richard Eastham (RE) and colleague Antonia Morgan (AM). He has submitted a quote for the design guide aspect of the plan, involving preparation, running of, and compilation of results and conclusions. (attached). After discussion, it was agreed, dependant on success in grant application for funding, to go forward with his quotation. After confirmation of acceptance, a date and venue will be arranged late Jan or early Feb 2016, finally, we will be seeking volunteers for this one day workshop to complete the task. MH also requested that JW consider taking on an area in the New Year on a paid basis.
4. Progress on Scope and Initial Project Plan research:
	1. Parking Policy RH/MH. Research completed, draft policy written as base to work from.
	2. Housing – MH – The research has returned a multitude of various results, the next challenge to gain meaningful information from them to contribute to a policy. JW to pass on contact details to gain the Affordable Housing Needs Survey from NDDC, also the Number of Persons on the Housing Register. The gaps in information will be hopefully filled by the questionnaire.
	3. Facilities – Following research, the facilities that could have the most adverse effect: G.P. practice, school, Ladybirds, P.C.C. (size of cemetery).  Most other facilities presumably would benefit from extra housing; Shop, P.O., Royal Oak, Village Hall, Sports Club etc. A draft letter has been composed along the lines of the following:

“Milborne St. Andrew Planning Group have been gathering ideas, information, had open days and discussions, we now need feed back from various organisations / facilities within the village  who may have valuable comments with regard to extra pressure or benefits an increase in housing may bring. Consideration being given to the following :

1. Size of building needed to accommodate an influx of population.
2. Infrastructure for access and parking.

Please inform the planning group of any effects either beneficial or detrimental extra housing may mean for you. Please alter, add or delete anything you like.”

1. Sites – JW will be contacting NDDC to ask for addresses for landowners identified through the SHLAA.
2. Flooding – GC/MB – The drainage gully in The Causeway has now been connected to the stream. JW suggested working towards a joint meeting with all authorities (Wessex Water, Environment Agency, NDDC) to discuss the sewerage/flooding/drainage issues and what we (the NPG) could do. By having all agencies together there would be less likelihood of refuting responsibility. The next step could be involving the local MP. JW also suggested that thought be given to changing the settlement boundary to exclude flood areas.
3. Character – PM presented comprehensive findings (attached) on the housing stock in the village. She has planned a meeting with two long-term residents, with family connections going back over several generations, it is hoped to get a view on the way the village has evolved over the past. PM will also contact the conservation officer.
4. Employment – The five known employers in the NP area have been contacted and asked to respond to questions regarding employees, expansion, and future plans. Three have replied, and two are awaited. Richard Ferguson, of Milborne Business Centre has invited us up to chat about our needs, and the land opposite the site, the original car park for the Centre. After discussion SG will contact him and offer an opportunity to come to the meeting, offering the same facility we have given to two other landowners, a level playing field. Another landowner, Avril Hurst, has contacted MH. They have no plans at the moment, but are interested in this process.
5. Any Other Business:.
	1. Reporter Newsletter – it was decided to leave the next newsletter until the New Year, where we hope to do a call out for landowners.
	2. We have all received a letter from a resident in Bladen View expressing concern over any potential building above Huntley Down. MH has spoken with the resident, and informed him of the limit of our scope. We are fact finding and not decision making, that will be up to the village residents.
	3. Quenton Miller has offered help to the group in his capacity as a former Chartered Planning and Development Surveyor. MH will contact accepting his invitation.
	4. The group are concerned about the perception of others to some members having a “vested interest”, to this end, JW will research and present a Terms of Reference document, to be agreed by the PC, making very clear our and their responsibilities and limitations. Also the group members will be required to complete a Register of Interest. We are very anxious to be as transparent as possible in our work.
6. Date of Next Meeting.  The meeting closed at 9.17pm.  The next meeting is the 12th Jan, 7.00pm, in the VH Committee Room.