

## BOTESDALE AND RICKINGHALL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – Steering Group Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, 5 June 2018

The Bell Inn

(Actions in *italics.*)

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

Present – Des Bavington Lowe, Robin Brown, Sue Coe, Clive Matthews, Di Maywhort, Phil Schofield, William Sargeant, Ian Poole (Consultant) and Leeann Jackson-Eve (Parish Clerk).

Apologies from Jo Broadbent.

- 2) John Lefever – Hastoe Homes.

Mr Lefever introduced himself as Hastoe's Land and New Business Manager. Hastoe is a charity and is the largest rural specialist in the country with around 7500 homes. Hastoe operates in the southern third of the country and John covers the Lincoln to Bristol region. Hastoe is a specialist in rural exception sites (RSEs) which are an exception to policy and address local housing need only. It has a development arm for low energy homes called Lowen Homes which delivers open market properties; the surplus is used to cross-subsidise other schemes.

- Projects can be underpinned by Community Land Trusts (CLTs). Hastoe is the largest deliver in partnership with CLTs in the country. CLTs can hold the freehold, extend a lease to Hastoe and make it a condition of lease that there is no Right to Buy.
- Projects can include shared ownership. Hastoe starts at 30% and doesn't "staircase" more than 80%. It charges 2.75% on unsold equity.
- There is no Right to Buy on rural exception sites.
- Projects can be hybrid schemes with part RSE and part market housing for growth. An example is in Henley, Suffolk with 15 each.
- Hastoe builds to local vernacular and commonly builds in conservation areas and national parks. It is the largest deliverer of passive houses in the country. All houses are built to a higher standard than building regulations require.
- Its smallest scheme is 1, largest is 96, largest rural exception site is 32 and average rural exception site is 10-15 homes.
- Now works on 250 year leases.
- Hastoe tries to get RSE projects completed in under 2 years.

Examples are:

- Southwold hospital site – partner in a Community Benefit Society (Southgen) – 4 affordable housing units on a 125 lease.
- Almshouses in Stoke-by-Nayland – 11 houses on a former school site – Hastoe got seven and four to add to the portfolio of the almshouses.
- Co-housing project in Norwich
- Martlesham – downsizing homes for people who are housing rich/revenue poor – open market housing is discounted by 20% and a covenant on the house is administered by the local authority.
- Ufford – units built to lifetime home standard – designed to allow people to stay in their homes.

Q/A session (paraphrased):

WS - Would Hastoe take on affordable housing as a subset of a larger development?

JLF – Hastoe does buy Section 106 schemes but with those you can't restrict housing allocation to local residents and it would be subject to Right to Buy. The Board has stopped buying national house builder development schemes as they have poor working practices and build quality. Hastoe prefers to work with SMEs (small/medium enterprises). On Section 106 projects Hastoe does not build to exceed building regulation standard.

RB – How does Hastoe fund projects?

JLF – Hastoe just went to the bond market for £120 million secured against stock, some of which is unencumbered (some has been around since 1972). It looks for around 5.5% return on capital.

IP – Do you ever get RSEs where there isn't local need?

JLF – Occasionally. There is a cascade arrangement of connection – local need, specified next villages and then out to the wider list. Hastoe has been known to go to the second tier.

SC – Can the community indicate preference when Section 106 bids are being made?

JLF – Not really but Hastoe tends to win if pitching around 60% of the open market and the development makes a construction profit (20%). Hastoe's development open market arm is prepared to go to 12%. Hastoe doesn't land bank anything.

IP – Does Hastoe have any schemes on Neighbourhood Development Orders?

JLF – No.

IP – There are potentially 60 affordable units in outline sites in Bots/Rick.

JLF – You could go the route of Thaxted PC who agreed to support a development if the affordable housing plots went to the PC, who then set up a CLT.

The Steering Group thanked Mr Lefever for an interesting presentation.

3) Village Photographs.

Sue noted that she would be uploading the rest of the photos on Dropbox over the next week.

4) Diss NHP – Request for Feedback on Consultants.

**Leeann to circulate the questions for comments on Places4People and Alison Farmer Assoc.**

5) AECOM Design Guide Report.

It was noted that the design guide report did not include site layouts as requested due to budget constraints. This would be queried as it would be helpful to have for more sensitive sites. Haughley had received 3 layout options for sites in their report and it helped to see what fitted best. It was possible this hadn't been done for Bots/Rick as most sites weren't fresh allocations. It was felt that the checklist was very useful to include in the plan as an appendix and was suggested that all new development should submit this list.

**Leeann to submit queries to AECOM about site layouts and ask AECOM to define "urban" at the beginning of the report as it gave a confusing impression when referring to a rural village.**

**Everyone to email comments to Phil by 15 June, referencing the section numbers and page numbers.**

6) Update on the Draft NHP.

Ian had included the corrections and was going through the document. He would then step back and read through it over the next week or so. The draft proposal map for the back had been completed. There would be a simplified diagram for each allocated site

The community actions list needed to be agreed and a paragraph drawn up for each action. To that aim, the SG went through the list and assigned paragraphs to the initial proposer. It was suggested that the community could add to this during the consultation.

**Everyone to email paragraphs for community actions to Phil by 8 June.**

**Everyone to read the Plan and see if it does what you thought it was going to do!**

7) Budget.

The update wasn't ready as all upcoming costs had not been accounted for including printing, launch event costs, publicity and Ian's revised fee proposal.

**Ian to email revised fee proposals including additional meetings; finish mapping for Character Assessment; desktop publishing for the Plan and the Character Assessment.**

**Leeann to circulate revised budget when costs were in – hopefully by next week.**

8) Review of Timeline and outstanding work.

The timeline had been reviewed via email prior to the meeting and it had been concluded that extra time needed to be built in for amending the document after consultation with MSDC and the public. Additionally, it was noted that it would need to be approved by the PCs after each consultation. This would happen at August and November meetings. The launch event would need to be moved back to 31 August/1 September with six weeks consultation to follow and a one month period for amendment and approval by PCs. The final submission to MSDC would be in early/mid November.

***Phil to revise and circulate the timeline.***

9) Green Space Forms.

The SG thanked Sue and Paul Macbay for their work on these and the accompanying photographs.

10) Any other Business.

It was noted that the annual monitoring report had not yet been issued by MSDC.

11) Date and location of next meetings.

Steering Group – Thursday, 28 June at 7.30pm, The Bell Inn

Meeting closed at 10.20pm.