

BOTESDALE AND RICKINGHALL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – Steering Group Meeting Minutes

Monday, 11 December 2017

L Bishop's House

(Actions in italics.)

- 1) Welcome – sign in attendance and apologies for absence.

Present – Lucy Bishop, Robin Brown, Sue Coe, Clive Matthews, Di Maywhort, Phil Schofield, William Sargeant and Leeann Jackson-Eve (Parish Clerk).

Apologies from Des Bavington Lowe, Jo Broadbent and Ian Poole.

- 2) The SG thanked Lucy for hosting the meeting.

- 3) Discussion of NP content.

Ian was absent due to the weather so the brainstorm about content was deferred until the January meeting.

In the meantime, SG members agreed to take responsibility for the contents, based on the draft document structure Ian had circulated, as follows:

1. Introduction – Sue
2. Neighbourhood Development Plan – Robin
3. Rickingham & Botesdale – History and Now
 - Local History – David Eve
 - Key Census Data – Jo
 - Household Survey Highlights – Lucy
4. Planning Policy Context – Ian Poole
5. Vision and Objectives – Clive
6. Planning Strategy – Phil
7. Housing – Phil
8. Jobs – Clive
9. Natural Environment – Alison Farmer
10. Historic Environment – David Eve, David, Nic Joubert & Di
11. Services & Facilities – Ian Poole and William
12. Getting Around – Leeann
13. Monitoring and Delivery - William

- 4) Report on Survey of potential development sites undertaken by a survey group (Phil, Sue, Di and Robin) on 3 December and follow-up documents produced by Phil.

It was noted that Phil had produced a map with a summary of comments from MSDC, AECOM and the survey group.

AECOM Site 1 – An application for 69 houses – the group pinpointed an area within the cordon sanitaire which would be preferable as it would maintain the linearity of the village. It would need to be determined whether there were any restrictions to building inside the cordon sanitaire.

AECOM Site 2 – The survey group preferred the open area next to the White Horse for development, but it was unlikely that the suggested 10 would fit in a row along the street front. Any other configuration would change the character of The Street. WS noted that this was the last open space in the village. It would be helpful to know whether MSDC would oppose its loss.

AECOM Site 3 – It was felt that development here would be a terrible idea due to the visual impact from all sides. Additionally, it would be difficult to work out a safe access.

AECOM Site 4 – This site was below the SHELAA threshold and had not been assessed. It was considered whether this should be kept for additional parking for Park View. If the green bit was developed, access to garages could be through the small alleyway. There was no information on ownership.

AECOM Site 5 – The gradient here was significant and might be a barrier to development beyond the 42 houses already approved. The suggestion was 30 houses at the end of the 42 or 10 along Garden House Lane from Greenacres toward the bypass. The preference was for no more houses but given the two options, 10 along GHl would be better.

Site SS0352 – This hadn't been assessed as below the SHELAA threshold. It was unclear how this site might be accessed – possibly from GHl?

AECOM Site 6 – This was relatively inaccessible and would have a negative visual impact.

Phil had also produced an NHP working document which included a table of AECOM/survey group comments, some assumptions about proposed development sites and a table of developments approved/in progress/site allocations along with other contributions to the evidence base. It was requested that all Steering Group members read through it for the up to date position on sites.

Leeann to ask MSDC re Site 1 cordon sanitaire and development in open space next to the White Horse.

5) Application to extend the Health Centre.

It was noted that the second floor area labelled hospice would be for the use of St Nicolas Hospice as a community room. Although no further parking provision was made in the application, it was noted that the area at the back was marked for overflow parking.

Leeann to circulate the application.

6) Progress from Alison Farmer on Landscape Assessment.

Leeann reported that AF had indicated that the draft report would be circulated around mid-December.

7) Forum Meeting in January.

It was agreed that it would not be possible to process the information coming in by the end of December in time to prepare a presentation and/or consultation material for 10 January. The Forum meeting was rescheduled for 7.30pm on Wednesday, 21 February at Botesdale Village Hall. It could be advertised in the February parish magazine and Forum members informed by email of the change of date.

Sue to send out email to Forum members.

Leeann to advertise in the parish magazine.

8) Any other Business.

Lucy reported on progress with the survey material. She noted that one of the volunteers for the parish magazine had some desktop publishing experience and might be willing to help with the NHP.

It was noted that Ian would charge an extra £1,150 to write the whole NHP and this was agreed.

Leeann to add Mike Bishop to the SG files on Dropbox so Lucy could have access, to ask Ian for an example of a NHP he's written and look into applying for a grant for the additional writing cost.

Lucy to ask volunteer about desktop publishing.

All Steering Group members to send Lucy any information about questions that need to be answered from survey data.

9) Date and location of next meetings.

Steering Group – Wednesday, 10 January at 7.30pm, The Bell Inn.

Steering Group – Tuesday, 30 January at 7.30pm, The Bell Inn.

Forum Meeting – Wednesday, 21 February at 7.30pm, Botesdale Village Hall.

Robyn to ask about holding the January meetings at the Bell.

Next agenda: Community Land Trusts and agricultural change of use applications.

Meeting closed at 9.58.