**Neighbourhood Plan – Working Group**

**Meeting Minutes Tuesday 11th December 2012**

**1. Welcome**

**2. Attendees:** Buffy Barrington, Geof Butterwick, Jeremy Bale, Sue Bale, David Whittington, Elizabeth Whittington, Maggie Bye, Adrian Craddock, Fiona White, David Hopkins, Sam Sampson

**3. Apologies:** Cllr Andrew Corston**,** Ms Maggie Bye**,** Ms Karen Colbear

**4. Where we have got to so far**

* Formal Submission

Buffy updated the team. SCDC have our Formal Submission but have still given no feedback on it although we have been told this will be advertised along with a group of others at some unspecified time. We were verbally told this would be before Christmas but this is now looking unlikely. Buffy and Geof will continue to chase for a response from SCDC. It was agreed that it was important for the village that this happened soon so that everyone could get behind the work that needed doing. There is no official reason why this should be delayed but the reason we are being given is the delay with the Core Strategy. SCDC have also yet to work out how they are going to handle the NP’s and what their own policy is with regards to the management of each one.

* Project Plan

Buffy asked that everyone look through this carefully over the next few weeks to see how we would progress with things and also to add any of their own thoughts.

* Planning Aid

Buffy and Geof had an excellent meeting with Stella Scrivener from Planning Aid and they will be able to help us with a number of things which will save us a large amount of money we hope. They are also able to act as liason with other parties in this process and can help and advise if we get stuck on specific issues.

* Village Plan Update and how it fits in with the NP

Buffy handed round a copy of the Upper Eden Neighbourhood Plan which at the moment is the most advanced NP in existence and as such is helpful to look at for structure and what issues it covers. Important to realise that the NP is very much restricted to planning (and some transport) matters. Anything else will be used to update the current Village Plan.

* Areas of interest for WG members

We went round the group talking about particular issues / skills that people have and also why they wanted to be a part of the NP. Interesting issues that were raised included:

* **Sam** – farm management
* Worries about in-filling
* Melton is a village and so urban / industrial development is totally inappropriate.
* **Fiona** - history, wildlife
* **Sue** - editing, proof reading, publishing
* **Geof** – planning / making the complex issues understandable
* Questionnaire

Buffy asked that the group look at this as a work in progress and submit changes and suggestions. We discussed how we would analyse the results once we sent it out and agreed that here might be some software available. **Fiona** may be able to help us with this.

* Comms Strategy

We discussed various ways in which to communicate to the village and the different age groups:

* “Suffolk Business Stars” will add as a local business.
* Facebook page
* Twitter
* Door drop
* Going to different events i.e. yoga and telling people at the end before they leave.
* Church
* Timeline for comms strategy very important – big impact first and then trickle feed
* Village fete
* School
* Car stickers
* Car boot sales
* Fish and chip shops, pub, shops etc
* Word of mouth
* Neighbourhood watch?

**5. Plan for 2013**

Agreed that we needed SCDC to make things official before we started alerting residents and getting people involved on a larger scale.

**6. Christmas tasks**

Before next meeting:

**Fiona -** will draft a laymans leaflet

**Buffy / Simon** to set up a website draft (links to Parish Council etc)

***Geof / Buffy*** *to find where a parish boundary map is to e-mail - done*

***Buffy*** *to send Eden Plan out on email – done*

**Sue** to put together a List of local businesses

**Sam** to put together a List of local landowners

**Elizabeth and David** to put together a List of local organisations / clubs

Buffy also suggested everyone start thinking about things they notice as they walk / drive round the village and take photos, make notes etc. Not to worry at this stage whether the things noted are for the updated Village Plan or the new Neighbourhood Plan…. We will sift later.

**7. Date for next meeting**

Agreed on Wednesday 23rd January 2013. (Cancelled due snow)

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Neighbourhood Plan Working Group**

**Minutes of meeting on 9th April 2013**

**Attendees:**

Cllr Buffy Barrington

Cllr Geof Butterwick

Cllr Jeremy Bale

Ms Sue Bale

Mr David Whittington

Ms Elizabeth Whittington

Ms Maggie Bye

Mr Adrian Craddock

Ms Fiona White

Mr David Hopkins

**Apologies:**

Cllr Hilson

Cllr Webb

Cllr Corston

Mary George

Karen Colbear

Sam Sampson has stepped down from the working group due to lack of time. We welcome David Hopkins who has agreed to join us and help.

Suffolk Coastal have now acknowledged our Formal Submission and will be advertising it on their website soon.

We are looking at trying to get up to £7,000 of funding from the Community Development Fund

**Website:**

Simplify wording even more if possible.

Flow chart / Road map of how this process works so it’s easy to understand.

Timeline of actions.

Buffy to make live once changes made.

**Annual Parish Meeting 25th April:**

We will launch the NP at this meeting and give a short handout with contact/website details. Mention a Public Open Meeting in June.

**Next stage:** Leaflet with Melton Messenger based on Fiona’s template. Simplify a bit more and make slightly more of a ‘call to arms’ and we all need to give feedback well before 20th April so that Fiona can produce a final version.

Buffy to ring Michael Hatchett and ask if we can send out this leaflet with May issue.

**Open Meeting in June:**

Buffy to start looking at the agenda for this and how we will work it.

**Letter to stakeholders:**

Buffy to draft one for businesses and groups and one for landowners / developers to go out in tandem with MM leaflet. Just informing latter of what we are doing.

July 6th Melton Fete – a stand / leaflets etc for NP at this event.

**Questionnaire:**

We looked at the Rendlesham Questionnaires and agreed ours needed to be a lot shorter and to the point about planning. Good idea to have a Prize Draw incentive. Good idea to have a separate Business one.

We should look at the questionnaire in more detail AFTER our first public meeting as we need this to guage people’s main issues and concerns.

**Walking Survey:**

Something to do in July / Aug when weather is nice.

**Other actions:**

Buffy to look into delivery companies and also companies who can help with a questionnaire and assessment of the same. Ask ‘Locality.’

Buffy to ask SCDC if they can give us landowner details.

Buffy to send APM leaflet to all for comments.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**19th September 2013 - Meeting Minutes**

Welcome to all new members of the working group:

* Claire McBurney
* Jill Dale
* John West
* Pat West
* Diane Comish
* John Pitchford
* Richard Litchfield
* Richard Knowles

Diane Comish and Jo Ellis have also agreed to help but could not make this meeting.

Andrew Corston, Elizabeth and David Whittington, Maggie Bye, Karen Colbear and David Hopkins also were unable to attend.

Brief update on where we are. SCDC have still made no decision on whether our Parish Boundary can be officially designated as our NP area but they are having a meeting soon where they will be discussing internal procedure and how decisions about NP’s will be taken so we hope that some progress will be made by the end of the year. There were no objections to our area designation during the official consultation so there is no reason for SCDC to not agree to this. We are in the same position as everyone else who has applied recently (including Rendlesham).

Agreed that we would now split the working group into 6 sections dealing with the following subjects:

**1. New Residential developments:**

**Adrian Craddock (Leading Group)**

Claire McBurney

Mike Webb

Buffy Barrington

Geof Butterwick

* Identify sites for ‘open market housing’ (*i.e.* for sale or rent) and look at all aspects of +ve and –ve for the sites with regards to both residential and or commercial building. Also covered by the long-running SSA consultation by SCDC.
* Review sites for Affordable Housing (*i.e.* for rent or shared-ownership through a registered social landlord). Whilst this can form part of a normal development, it is also possible to identify ‘Exception Sites’ where housing would not otherwise be permitted, provided it is for Affordable Housing for people with a close link with the village. Work on this, in conjunction with Community Action Suffolk and SCDC, started some time ago but is progressing slowly.

**2. Infrastructure (**incl. traffic, transport, water, drainage etc.)**:**

**Jane Hilson (Leading Group)**

Jill Dale

Mary George

Andrew Corston

* Identify issues during ‘village walkabout’.
* Assess where we need further support and work esp. with regards to pressure put on traffic from new developments.
* Identify hotspots
* Suggest solutions
* List our needs

**3. Business Community** (both existing and new developments)**:**

**Sue Bale (Leading Group)**

John West

Buffy Barrington

* Gather information from local businesses about their current and future needs.
* Meetings / recorded feedback
* Do they see same pressure on infrastructure as residents?

**4. Built Environment** (*i.e.* Design criteria for newbuilds and conservation of historic architecture)**:**

**Richard Knowles (Leading Group)**

Pat West

Adrian Craddock

Claire McBurney

Geof Butterwick

* Record and collate key features of historic Melton. SCDC did some work on this in the Conservation Area Appraisal.
* What is listed? We have a copy of everything in Melton listed by English Heritage.
* Should anything else be listed? There is an option of ‘Local Listing’.
* Buildings of Community Importance. Suggest areas/buildings needing special protection. These can be registered with SCDC under the Community Right to Bid process.
* Design criteria for newbuilds in historic centre and elsewhere

**5. Natural Environment** (incl. formal and informal green spaces, local, regional, national and internationally designated sites within and adjacent to Melton as identified in the Natural England response to the Designated Area Consultation)**:**

**Jeremy Bale (Leading Group)**

Richard Litchfield

Adrian Craddock

Mary George

* Wildlife surveys esp. on large sites for potential development?
* Deben Estuary, river frontage, houseboats, preservation. Opportunity to work with Deben Estuary Partnership.
* Footpaths, Bridleways and other rights of way; and protecting green space around them
* Conservation area and green space within it
* Breaking up new developments with green space within and between to reduce density
* Tree Preservation Orders

**6. Public Engagement Group** (getting people interested and involved)

**John Pitchford (leading group)**

Fiona White

Buffy Barrington

Mike Webb

* Leaflets
* Meetings
* Posters
* E-mail / website
* Facebook / Twitter?
* Open Mornings and Evenings
* Create a Melton NP ‘BRAND’

**ACTIONS**

* Buffy to send round Business List and also feedback from Open Morning for new members.
* Please could EVERYONE e-mail Buffy their phone number so that they can be passed to the relevant groups.
* Any working group member who was unable to attend please could you indicate which of the 6 subgroups you would be willing to help with.
* Public Engagement Group to start work on Questionnaire / Household Survey and also look at getting round to groups, social events, clubs, church, sports events etc to ‘spread the word’ about the NP.
* Agreed Walking Survey (photos and notes of all key features of Melton) should be organised for Spring 2014
* Discussed next open morning. Agreed no point in having one before Christmas UNLESS we have significant new news to tell people or ask them about. However each group can make a good start on the work needed now.

**Current Working Group Members (24 at present!):**

Buffy Barrington

Geof Butterwick

Jane Hilson

Mike Webb

Andrew Corston

Jeremy Bale

Sue Bale

David Whittington

Elizabeth Whittington

Maggie Bye

Mary George

Karen Colbear

Adrian Craddock

Fiona White

David Hopkins

Richard Litchfield

Jo Ellis

John Pitchford

Claire McBurney

Jill Dale

John West

Pat West

Diane Comish

Richard Knowles

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Meeting 30th September 2013 – Planning Aid**

**(Stella Scrivner, Rachel Hogger, Buffy Barrington, Geof Butterwick)**

General catch up with where we are with the Melton NP

Discussion re. application for 150 houses on Woods Lane. Can we show it is an “unnatural extension to the existing village boundary?” Rely mainly on NPPF for policies.

Interesting point re. SEA vs Sustainability Appraisal. No reason for doing the latter unless specific policies require one.

**Evidence gathering:**

Approach Estate Agents and establish – in writing if possible - % of approaches for particular types of houses

Census data

SCDC should have a record (rates) of no. of 2nd homes in Melton.

Think about any places we wish to “Designate as an Asset of Community Value”

We can add buildings to a Local List even if they are not in themselves Listed.

**Communications Strategy**

Logo Competition at the Primary School

Link to Geography curriculum – local communities

Designs of houses – making a model of the village

Ideas for playground improvements

Go to Christmas Fairs and all community events

Specific Housing Needs addressed in the Questionnaire.

**Businesses**

Broadband Speed / Mobile Reception

Traffic Footfall / Deliveries

Are the people working here also living here?

List Businesses in back of plan as incentive to feedback and get involved

Shared office space in the village for those who work from home – meeting rooms for hire etc

Federation of small businesses

Do SCDC run any events for local businesses / liason / Enterprise Officer

**ACTION:** Send Rachel Project Plan

**ACTION:** Thursday pm in November – 6-9pm Rachel to run a workshop and will send dates she can do.

Many thanks to Stella for her support so far and welcome and thanks to Rachel who will now be our main Planning Aid contact.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Preparing a Neighbourhood Plan**

**Workshop – Output**

 **Melton, 7 November 2013**

**Attendees:** Melton Neighbourhood Plan Working Group

**Workshop 1 – what sort of plan do you think the Melton Neighbourhood Plan group will be?**

**Comments made**

* Not a mini local plan
* Allocation plan plus policy plan – Somewhere between the two. Stronggish support for undertaking site allocations. Let’s see! Allocations for housing, retail and employment.
* Less is more. We should focus on the priorities.
* Plan needs to focus on what benefits we can get from the development that will take place in the area during the plan period.

**Workshop 2 –where are you at?**

**Comments made**

* We have six sub-groups and these sub groups are feeding back on 7 November.
* There is a need to engage the youth
	+ Melton primary are coming up with the logo and will engage children as part of the curriculum. Melton primary will be a voting sport during the referendum.

**Workshop 3 – Site Allocations**

**Comments made**

* Initially, we were frightened of undertaking site allocations but come round to it now!
* Dilemma. A lot of work could go into preparing housing allocations (and do we have the capacity and resources?) but wil it stop undesirable development. We could end up with development on planned sites in addition to unplanned development. We could end up with too much housing.
* Goal. We should have a goal to direct development to brown field sites first. Are these sites deliverable?
* A good dialogue with Suffolk Coastal is essential.

*NB: the purpose of the discussions held during the group work was to get people thinking about the information provided in the presentations and apply the knowledge to Melton. The above comments provide a useful summary of our discussions but the output is not needed to feed into the next stage of plan development.*

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Minutes NP Working Group**

**Monday 27th May 2014**

**Current Working Group Members present**

Buffy Barrington

Geof Butterwick

Mike Webb

Andrew Corston

Sue Bale

David Whittington

Elizabeth Whittington

Adrian Craddock

David Steptoe

John Pitchford

Claire McBurney

Jill Dale

**Apologies from:**

Mary George

Karen Colbear

John West

Pat West

Check if these people still wish to be a part of the group?

* Richard Litchfield
* Jane Hilson
* Jo Ellis

We re-visited the sub groups and made sure we had the right people in the right groups.

**1. New Residential developments:**

**Buffy Barrington (Leading Group)**

Claire McBurney

Mike Webb

Adrian Craddock

Geof Butterwick

* Identify sites for ‘open market housing’ (*i.e.* for sale or rent) and look at all aspects of +ve and –ve for the sites with regards to both residential and or commercial building. Also covered by the long-running SSA consultation by SCDC.
* Review sites for Affordable Housing (*i.e.* for rent or shared-ownership through a registered social landlord). Whilst this can form part of a normal development, it is also possible to identify ‘Exception Sites’ where housing would not otherwise be permitted, provided it is for Affordable Housing for people with a close link with the village. Work on this, in conjunction with Community Action Suffolk and SCDC, started some time ago but is progressing slowly.

**2. Infrastructure (**incl. traffic, transport, water, drainage etc.)**:**

**Andrew Corston (Leading Group)**

Jill Dale

*(Jane Hilson?)*

Mary George

David Steptoe

Geof Butterwick

* Identify issues during ‘village walkabout’.
* Assess where we need further support and work esp. with regards to pressure put on traffic from new developments.
* Identify hotspots
* Suggest solutions
* List our needs

**3. Business Community** (both existing and new developments)**:**

**Sue Bale (Leading Group)**

John West

Buffy Barrington

* Gather information from local businesses about their current and future needs.
* Meetings / recorded feedback
* Do they see same pressure on infrastructure as residents?

**4. Built Environment** (*i.e.* Design criteria for newbuilds and conservation of historic architecture)**:**

**Adrian Craddock (Leading group)**

Pat West

Claire McBurney

* Record and collate key features of historic Melton. SCDC did some work on this in the Conservation Area Appraisal.
* What is listed? We have a copy of everything in Melton listed by English Heritage.
* Should anything else be listed? There is an option of ‘Local Listing’.
* Buildings of Community Importance. Suggest areas/buildings needing special protection. These can be registered with SCDC under the Community Right to Bid process.
* Design criteria for newbuilds in historic centre and elsewhere

**5. Natural Environment** (incl. formal and informal green spaces, local, regional, national and internationally designated sites within and adjacent to Melton as identified in the Natural England response to the Designated Area Consultation)**:**

**Elizabeth Whittingham (Leading Group)**

David Whittingham

Adrian Craddock

Mary George

* Wildlife surveys esp. on large sites for potential development?
* Deben Estuary, river frontage, houseboats, preservation. Opportunity to work with Deben Estuary Partnership.
* Footpaths, Bridleways and other rights of way; and protecting green space around them
* Conservation area and green space within it
* Breaking up new developments with green space within and between to reduce density
* Tree Preservation Orders

**6. Public Engagement Group** (getting people interested and involved)

**John Pitchford (leading group)**

Buffy Barrington

Mike Webb

NEXT STEPS:

**1. Statistics from Questionnaires**

Buffy has run a report from the responses to the Household and Business Questionnaires.

**ACTION:** The business report will go to Sue Bale for final analysis.

The household one needs a lot more work mainly as there are a lot of ‘free text’ responses which need sifting through.

**ACTION:** Buffy, Andrew, John and Mike will look at these and between them get the final analysis done by mid June. Buffy to send questions out via email. These final stats can then be reported on and used for the next stage.

**2. Open Mornings**

Friday pm and Sat am Open Event for the public to feedback on where this questionnaire date is now leading us in terms of themes, objectives and policies.

**ACTION:** Buffy to book Lindos of Open Events mid July before school holidays.

**3. Sub-Group ACTIONS:**

ALL sub-group leaders to get together with members of their group and start the preparatory work of collating information which is already available:

FOR 1st initial contact with SCDC Neighbourhood Planning Team please send e-mails to Hilary Hanslip and she will advise who can help you:

*Hilary.Hanslip@suffolkcoastal.gov.uk*

ACTIONS: Infrastructure Group

Start collating as much as you can with regards to:

* Traffic data
* Public transport data
* Water/Sewage/Gas/Electricity services
* Local schools and space they have
* Capacity in Doctors Surgeries / Elderly care support / Disability services etc

ACTIONS: Built Environment Group

Start collating as much as you can with regards to:

* Listed Buildings in Melton
* Conservation Area Appraisal (SCDC)
* Drafting “Design Guidance” ideas that we could use. This should be around what kind of eco friendly modern designs would work and where combined with an “in-keeping” approach for the historic centre.

ACTION: Natural Environment Group

* Start collating as much as you can with regards to:
* Wildlife surveys already done
* TPO’s
* Mapping in Melton of AONB / Conservation Area / Protected woodlands etc
* David and Elizabeth to organise the Walking Survey of Melton. Speak to Mark Girling (mark.girling@melton.suffolk.sch.uk) at Melton Primary as he has offered to host this and get children and their parents involved. We can provide a budget for refreshments and disposable cameras if needed.
* Buffy to fwd details of Ordinance Survey Map Licence so we can use this

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Re. public engagement please can everyone keep an eye/ear out for opportunities / events to use as a way of continuing to spread the word about what we are doing. Fete, School sports day etc.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Preparing a Neighbourhood Plan**

**Workshop Output**

**Melton 28 July 2014, 6pm to 9pm**

**Attendees:**

John West, Pat West, Jeremy Bale, Sue Bale – leading the Business sub group

Katy Martin, Geof Butterwick, John Pitchford, Claire McBurney, Adrian Craddock – leading the Built Environment sub group (design), Elizabeth Whittingham – leading the Rural Environment sub group, David Whittingham, Andrew Corston – leading the Infrastructure sub group

**Aims of the workshop:**

* To remind the group of the process of producing a neighbourhood plan
* To remind the group of the basic conditions and how to apply this to the policy drafting process;
* Understanding the process behind drafting good policies
* Familiarise the group with the strategic policy context (this was not achieved during the workshop but the steering group members are tasked with doing this as part of the follow up exercise).

NB Rachel arrived at 7:30 due to road accident on A14. Thank you to all members of the group and ADAM BANHAM who progressed with NP discussions in Rachel’s absence.

Prior to Rachel’s arrival, the group discussed the key issues that has been raised during the community consultation days.

**PAE presentation - making effective policies for your neighbourhood. 35 minutes.**

* PAE presentation on making effective policies for your neighbourhood plan (covering what the basic conditions mean for policy drafting.)

This included interactive discussion.

Questions raised on:

* How to present the evidence or refer to evidence that underpins the NP
* Is the National Planning Policy Framework likely to change
* Definition of sustainable development

**Workshop - Exploration of Existing Neighbourhood Plan Policies. 60 minutes (includes reporting back)**

* PAE facilitated workshop – appraising existing neighbourhood plan policies. Group work in 2 – 4 members per group. The following policies were looked at:

**Adrian’s group:**

* Cuckfield’s (referendum version) policy CNP1 - Design of New Development
* Cuckfield’s (referendum version) policy CNP7 – Housing development within the built up area boundary
* <http://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/Cuckfield_Neighbourhood_Plan_June14.pdf>
* Barnham and Eastergate’s (made) policy H4 Integration of new housing into surroundings <http://www.arun.gov.uk/main.cfm?type=MADEPLANS>

**Andrew’s Group:**

* Woburn Sands Policy (made) WS15
* Woburn Sands Project (made NP) WS3

<http://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/woburn-sands-neighbourhood-plan>

* Arundel’s made policy 10 on Assets of Community Value

<http://www.arun.gov.uk/mediaFiles/downloads/87375917/Arundel_NP_post_examination_v2_DDA.pdf>

* Kirdford’s previous submitted policy CP2 on Assets of Community Value. See the submitted plan (under Submission Documents) at the following link <http://www.chichester.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=22280> . Also see the examiner’s report to follow the reasoning for deletion of this policy at the same link <http://www.chichester.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=22280>
* Woodcote’s submitted policy on Extensions to new smaller homes. See Poplicy H9 of the submitted plan <http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Woodcote%20Submission%20Plan.pdf> . Also see the Examiner’s reasoning for deletion of this policy <http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2014-12-16%20Examiners%20report%20Woodcote%20NP.pdf> See page 30.
* Cuckfield’s made policy on Small Scale Dwellings <http://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/Cuckfield_Neighbourhood_Plan_June14.pdf>

**Sue’s Group:**

* Draft policy on proposals for infill development withint he village boundary This was taken from the Earls Barton pre-submission NP available at the website**:**

<http://www.earlsbartonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk/site/latest-news/draft-earls-barton-neighbourhood-plan-march-2014/>

* Draft policy on bringing forward exceptions sites outside but abutting the village boundary. Taken from the Earls Barton pre-submission NP>
* Woodcote’s made site allocation WNP1 01

<http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/services-and-advice/planning-and-building/planning-policy/neighbourhood-plans/woodcote-neighbourhood>

**Next steps**

Due to delay in workshop starting, the second half of the workshop was not held. However, the group are advised to work in their sub groups and familiarise themselves with the **national planning context** (NPPF) and the **Local Plan Context** (adopted core strategy and the suffolk coastal Local Plan saved policies (from 2006 but dated July 2013) – see Summary note on the Strategic Policy context for further details. )

The reason the group need to do this is because the as per the **basic conditions** refer to presentation given) the Melton Neighbourhood Plan needs to have regard to the **national planning context** and be in conformity with the **local plan context** is a key part

For this purpose, the group will be sent the following resources:

* Blank policy drafting template
* Summary one page note on the strategic policy context
* Detailed note on the strategic policy context.
* Link to the NPPF and the National Practice Guidance
* The group also have the resources circulated by Buffy summarising the key issues raised during consultation.

**Additional Actions:**

* PAE to send Adrian (design lead) an example of character assessments undertaken for NPs in order to underpin design policies
* PAE to send Adrian a workshop proposal for the group should they decide to undertake village character assessments.
* It is understood that the Group are undertaking a village walkabout. This could be used to help form an idea of the different character areas in the Neighbourhood Plan area. You do not need to wait until after the PAE character appraisal workshop before you hold the village walkabout.
* Adrian to start providing some visual material (a map!!) to support the Vision and Objectives workshop to be held with the steering group in September (date yet to be confirmed)
* Rachel to send dates around about Vision and Objectives workshop

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Developing a Vision and Objectives for your Neighbourhood Area**

**Output Melton Workshop, 29 October 2014**

**Attendees:** Melton Neighbourhood Plan Working Group

**Navigus Planning:** Chris Bowden

**PAE:** Rachel Hogger

**Aims of the workshop:**

* To help the group review their vision for the neighbourhood area in light of the 2014 consultation results; and
* To identify a series of objectives to help them deliver the vision.

Structure of the workshop:

* 3 hours in total
* Brief overview of what a vision and objectives are and why their importance/relevance to plan making (10 minutes).

The group were reminded of the adopted Local Plan Context:

* + Local Plan: ***Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan****.* ***Core Strategy and Development Management Policies July 2013.***
	+ ***Suffolk Coastal Local Plan Saved Policies*** *(to be replaced when site allocations and area specific policies, including Neighbourhood Plans are adopted).*

PAE have prepared two notes on the strategic policy context for Melton. One is quite a detailed note and the other a one page summary. For further detail on what the Local Plan says about Melton, please refer to theses notes.

The group were provided with an update of the **emerging** Local Plan context:

* + ***Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan****.* ***Site Allocations work***
	+ *Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). Lists suitable and unsuitable sites.* Participants were given a copy of the sites included in the SHLAA work. The LPA have identified only one of those sites as being suitable for development
	+ Preliminary Housing Numbers. Whilst the adopted Core Strategy makes provision for 7,900 new homes across the district in the period 2010 to 2027, the Local Plan does not stipulate how these numbers should be drilled down for Woodbridge Town (designated as a town in the district’s settlement hierarchy) or Melton Village (designated as a key service centre in the district’s settlement hierarchy. Suffolk Coastal is however developing this work as part of the site allocations work.
	+ The current housing figure for the Melton Neighbourhood Plan area is zero. On the one hand this reflects the important site constraints within the Neighbourhood Plan area (Deben Estuary, areas at risk of flooding and high quality built environment) but on the other it is a figure subject to consultation.

It is also important to note that developers continue to exert development pressure in the Neighbourhood Plan area and indeed one application is currently at appeal. The area becomes more vulnerable for unplanned development if Suffolk Coastal cannot demonstrate a five year land supply.

The Government however places considerable importance on the status of a made Neighbourhood Plan and when applications go to appeal in an area where there is a made Neighbourhood Plan, the Secretary of State is looking at such cases very carefully. The Secretary of State is giving weight to the five year land supply issue (see paragraph 49 of the NPPF)  as well as weight to the importance of determining applications in line with NP policies (see paragraphs 183-185 and 198 of the Framework). However Secretary of State is more likely to apply weight to neighbourhood plan whether that Neighbourhood Plan can be seen to be contributing towards achieving growth.

The strongest position to be in is one with a made NP in place where that NP can also be demonstrated to be a pro growth plan

PAE therefore advise the NP group to consider the pros and cons of the following options before settling on the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.

* Identifying land that can be brought forward for development through the NP
* Reviewing the Physical Limits boundary (this is a saved Local Plan policy and it would be a logical step to update it as part of the Neighbourhood Plan)
* Remaining silent on where growth should take place

**SWOT analysis of Melton**. An interactive exercise where four volunteers represented the key Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats as come forward during the community consultation to date. The following was noted by them:

**Strengths**

Community Spirit

Urban/Rural Balance

Good range of facilities

Close to Woodbridge

Close to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

River Deben

Recreation Fields

Woods

2 Pubs, 4 local shops

Railway station

Bus service

Good mix of local businesses

Primary school in middle of the village

**Weaknesses**

Traffic – A1152 and Melton Streets

Parking :

* New Developments have insufficient off street parking
* Station Road
* Parking on Grass opposite MColls Newsagents

Lack of connecting footpaths & No Cycle Path

Lack of youth provision

Lack of skilled labour

Additional comments on post it notes:

* Poor bus services
* Lack of facilities for older people
* People don’t want change
* Lack of business ‘community’ – sharing best practice etc
* Lack of money for new projects
* Communications – poor mobile signal
* Shabby Pavilion

**Opportunities**

More allotments

Better bus services

Housing that meets local needs – low cost

To attract skilled labour

Inward investment?

Additional comments on post it notes:

* Good Design for new homes
* Opportunity to ensure that new developments are sympathetic in appearance to existing
* Use brownfield sites we have available
* More affordable homes
* Better/more facilities for old and young people
* Improve infrastructure
* Land
* Will
* Momentum to improve village
* Commited village stakeholders
* Community orchards
* Location close to Woodbridge on a major transit route
* Rebuild pavilion to incorporate parish council office, café and public toilet (similar to Kinston Field Woodbridge)

**Threats**

Ageing population

Absorbed by Woodbridge

Over development

Pressure on infrastructure

Melton could lose its identity

Additional comments on post it notes:

* Imbalanced population. Older people can afford to live in Melton; younger people cannot
* Loss of green belt/farmer fields
* Current planning policies
* Suffolk Coastal District Council recognise Great Woodbridge as a concept
* Losing valued countryside
* Sports grounds may be built on
* Future development dictated by developers.

Break 10 minutes.

PAE presentation. Reminding group of the following: planning/non planning issues. Brief presentation followed by the discussion on what is a planning policy and what is not a planning policy.

**What could the NP do to protect those good things (strengths), address the bad things (weaknesses and threats) and realise opportunities to improve the area.** Interactive Exercise. The participants were asked to use the earlier SWOT analysis as a guide.

**Protect what is good:**

Left blank

**Address the Bad things:**

1. Relocation of Suffolk Coastal District Council could lead to loss of overflow parking in town centre. Melton NP group should work together with Woodbridge NP group to address this possibility and explore appropriate site allocation policy to be developed here.
2. Existing Suffolk Coast Distrit Council site could provide a housing mix that doesn’t contribute to meeting local needs e.g. luxury flats etc. Melton NP group should work together with Woodbridge NP group to address this possibility and explore appropriate site allocation policy to be developed here.

**Realise Opportunities**

**1.** Brown field sites – Girdlestones/Carters sites. Put these sites to best use

2. Traffic improvements – it was discussed that NP could identify required traffic improvements to be made prior to new development taking place. PAE advise that traffic volume of A1152 and congestion probably outside the scope of the NP but there may be smaller scale solutions that could be delivered through new development. This is an area for further work by the team.

3. Existing council office site. A site allocation could be incorporated as part of the plan setting out what would be suitable there in the event that SCDC relocate.

Ideas coming forward during the second part of the workshop were limited. This may be a reflection of the way it was organised or a failing in the way the task was presented. Rachel does however recommend that the NP Steering group complete this task fully so that the group develop a shared consensus of what the scope of the NP should be.

**What should be the vision underpinning the Melton Neighbourhood Plan**?

The group were asked to comeforward with key priorities about what the Vision should contain. Below is what was called out during the discussion……

By 2027, Melton will be a

*“wonderful environment…*

*a community that supports the old and the young and there will be opportunities for first time buyers, young families, elederly and disabilities…. new housing will met local needs…… Melton will still have a village feel……its rural roots will be respected. The community spirit will continue to thrive. New development will have contributed positively to its unique surroundings. Community facilities will have been improved*.

Earlier in the neighbourhood plan making process, a Vision had been drafted. This is on the Neighbourhood Plan website as <http://www.meltonneighbourhoodplan.co.uk/#!page4/cfvg>

:

Mission Statement:

*Mission Statement*

*"To focus on sustainable development in Melton, making sure it is appropriate to our vision, done in the right places and in the right timescale. Enhancing our strengths as a village AND a key service centre; supporting and improving the current infrastructure. Ensuring that new developments are sensitive to our housing needs and unique rural and historical attributes and our conservation area as well as protecting and improving the quality of life of our residents and their future."*

###### ***Key Objectives***

*1. Build and develop* positively *for our future*

*2. Protect and Preserve our unique rural, riverside and historical assets and heritage*

*3. Maintain and identify as a village and our strengths as a community*

Rachel recommends that the NP steering group/working group review the draft Vision and update it in light of consultation findings

**What will be the overall goals and objectives that will sit underneath the NP Vision?**

Rachel asked the group to articulate some overarching goals that could sit under the vision. As the plan has to contritbute towards achieving social, economic and environmental goals Rachel used three broad categories to kick start the process.

**Social Goals**

New housing should meet local needs

 Your housing needs evidence suggests this means affordable housing that for those with special needs

 Housing mix policy could help deliver the goal but important to develop within the context of the Local Plan policy so that the NP adds value.

 Affordable housing policy could help achieve this goal but important to develop within the contect of Local Plan policy so that he NP adds value**.**

Traffic impact of new development should be managed so that existing situation is not exacerbated

 Look into off street parking standards for new residential???

 This has an impact of where new development can be located and how it links up with existing transport network

Increase connectivity within the village (more and better pedestrian and cycle networks)

 Where new development takes place require pedestrian routes to be incorporated in order to improve interconnectivity between key services (e.g. train station, shops, schools) and residential areas

**Environmental Goals**

Prioritise the bringing forward of brownfield land before green field land (PAE note: need to provide evidence that development will not increase flood risk or affect water run off into the River Deben, could be done through wording of the policy as well)

 Could do this through revision of Physical Limit Boundaries

 Or you could do this through allocating brownfield sites for development of residential alongside/employment uses (PAE note: existing and future residential amenity should be planned for and protected)

New development needs to contributes positively to existing built up environment

 Requires a design policy to be developed that adds to Local Plan policies (character assessment of NP area will be very useful)

 Any growth on site opposite train station subject to: a) improved pedestrian safety from station to development site and other solutions to be explored including b) traffic signals with mini roundabout and c) improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists

**Economic Goals**

Small scale housing schemes (which meet local need) to come forward during the plan period where these can New housing Identify opportunities for delivery of small scale housing schemes

 As set out under Environmental goals could do this through revision of Physical Limits boundaries and/or allocating individual sites (e.g. existing SCDC site and brownfield land sites)

Opportunities for retail and business growth will be realised

 Explore opportunity on site opposite station particularly if SCDC do relocate there since this will bring workers and visitors to this part of Melton. The NP could possible identify site as suitable for new retail uses

**In terms of the Scope of the Neighbourhood Plan what are the options?**

During the workshop, Rachel emphasized to the group that the NP presents them with the opportunity to supersede saved policies of the Local Plan in order to ensure development comes forward in a way consistent with the Melton emerging Vision. The policy on the Physical Limit Boundaries is for instance considerably old and if it were to be renewed it would be logical for this to be done by Melton through the NP rather remaining out of date or being imposed on them through the Local Plan route. The group also have the option of actually allocating sites for development.

Finally the group were reminded that if little development takes place during the plan period then there will be limited circumstances when the NP becomes relevant. It is only when development comes forward that the NP could be instrumental in capturing the benefits of that growth.

**Summary of Next Steps**

**Rachel recommends the NP Steering Group:**

* Review the plan vision in light of learning to date as well as in light of community consultation results
* Reach a consensus on what the scope of the NP should be (e.g. site allocations or not, review the PLBs or not)
* Reach a consensus on what the plan vision and objectives should be
* Identify the evidence gaps that might exist under these objectives (e.g. we discussed demographic data to underpin a housing mix policy). Continue building out the technical evidence base to support the emerging themes
* Undertake a light touch character assessment of the NP area in order to inform the design policy in the Neighbourhood plan. PAE can assist with this element.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Minutes of Meeting – NP Steering Group**

**23rd June 2015**

**Attendees:**

Buffy Barrington

Nigel Brown

Geof Butterwick

1. It was agreed that for the next and final stages of our Neighbourhood Plan the management structure would be as follows:

Melton Parish FULL Council

Melton Parish Council Planning and Transport Committee (P&T)

P&T Steering Group comprising Buffy, Nigel and one other (Mike Webb?)

Resident, Geof Butterwick as Project Manager

NP Working Group

This will mean that for most day to day things the P&T Steering Group will liase with Geof Butterwick to ensure that an action plan is followed and the work is split out to nominated parties.

2. It was agreed that our Consultant Chris Bowden would be instructed to send the letter to Landowners (brownfield sites around Girdlestones) ASAP and that in the meantime we would accept the current ‘overarching summary’ Vision Statement without including it in the letter. If this Vision Statement needs to be expanded at a later date we can do so.

3. The Project Plan (emailed with these Minutes) was gone through step by step and we allocated jobs. Geof and Buffy will be doing a large portion of these and in the meantime Geof will contact Hilary Hanslip to arrange a meeting. This meeting will be for the purposes of Hilary looking at our Draft (will be Version 2 once Geof and Buffy have added their pieces) and gauging where SCDC stand in terms of how they support it.

4. The next step will be to take the Draft Plan to public consultation.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Highways Meeting 31st March 2016 9am**

*Luke Barber- Suffolk County Highways*

*David Chenery – Suffolk County Highways*

*Buffy Thompson – Melton Parish Council / Neighbourhood Plan*

This meeting takes place following the letter from Melton Parish Council in September 2015 to various parties including SCC, Highways, SCDC, our local MP etc about Working Together AND also following the recent public consultation on the Melton Neighbourhood Plan and it’s proposal to develop the Carter/Warburg site AND following the recent High Court Decision about the Yoxford Appeal which SCDC lost and which means we may well be looking at 180 houses being built at the top of Woods Lane… amongst other things.

Many of the issues highlighted are long term and have been raised by various parties over the last months and years - but things are being brought to a head by recent events.

It was agreed that a paper (below) would be drafted for the consideration of the Highways team in an attempt to:

* get some agreed actions in place on the most pressing issues
* create a more robust ‘traffic and transport’ section in out Neighbourhood Plan
* start the ball rolling with regards to what will need to be an on-going conversation between Melton PC, the District Council and County Council planners and Highways to look at the overall picture in this area and try to find ways of tackling the traffic and transport problems now and in the future

**Next steps:**

Highways team to assess this paper and work out (in priority format):

* what can be done
* how much it will cost
* when it can be done by
* also to look at the long term overall view with a possible ‘Plan of Action’ taking into account constraints of time and money

SCDC will need to look at the implications and agree what is possible - as will the planning team at SCC.

The Melton Neighbourhood Plan could then incorporate some of these solutions and actions as part of its traffic and transport section – those that are directly part of Melton.

**Current Pressures:**

1. Developments on-going at the old Girdlestones site, Cedar House site and Deben Mill. Traffic from the sites as things are built + traffic increases once they have been developed.
2. Air pollution readings high on The Street in Melton by the traffic lights and at the traffic lights on Lime Kiln Quay in Woodbridge.
3. No cycle lanes in Melton.
4. Narrow pavements making it hard for pedestrians.
5. Peninsular traffic all comes through Melton on the A1152 over Wilford Bridge, across railway, through traffic lights and up to Woods Lane roundabout. There is currently no other sensible route for this traffic including any from Rendlesham and Bentwaters (which includes HGV’s).
6. Lack of parking overall. This leads to people parking up and down roads on both sides where they can and also now on green spaces within the village.
7. St Andrews Church has no safe access for pedestrians as the entrance is straight onto the road with no pavement. People also park on both sides of this road, which can create problems when traffic volume is high and/or buses are trying to get past.
8. Traffic coming FROM the Wickham Market direction wanting to access A12 has to currently drive through Ufford and Melton (traffic lights) which at peak times can create a big tailback.
9. Parking on both sides of Melton Road up to Melton Hill. This can make it difficult for passing traffic, especially when a larger vehicle (bus or HGV) is on one side.
10. Saddlemakers Lane used as a rat-run when traffic builds up elsewhere and as a narrow lane with high sided sharp bends it is not suitable for HGV’s, driving at speed or large volumes of traffic. There have been many minor collisions recently especially on the bends.

**Future Pressures:**

1. Woods lane Development of 180 houses with only one access point onto Woods Lane directly opposite the Bredfield Rd junction which is already very congested at peak times.
2. Carter/Warburg development as part of the Melton Neighbourhood Plan of 50 houses and some small business units. Access onto the A1152 through the Girldestones business park.
3. There is a potential Yarmouth Rd proposal on a greenfield site of 120 houses, a large nursing home and 60 assisted living units. This site is not accessible by anything other than car and all traffic would go down towards the Melton Traffic lights along The Street.
4. There is a potential Notcutts site proposal (top end of Yarmouth Rd opposite Ufford village) plus development at St Audreys Sports and Social Club – an unknown quantity at this stage but like the above would increase all traffic along Yarmouth Rd and through the Melton Traffic Lights.
5. Development on Melton Hill after SCDC move. This will increase traffic down towards the Melton Traffic lights at peak times.
6. Development on Woods Lane next to Valley Farm Road. Planning permission given for 11 houses which we believe will start to be built this year. Access straight onto Woods Lane.
7. Approved development on The Street – Old School building site. 9 houses with access straight onto The Street at the traffic lights end and where the pavement is narrow.
8. New proposed development on the peninsular in general and specifically at Rendlesham and Bentwaters.
9. Sizewell C traffic during build phase over several years - if this goes ahead.

**Constraints:**

1. Money – restricted money from Highways means we would have to consider using CIL money (25% once our NP is adopted) and or other sources.
2. Time – Highways will have other priorities for the whole district and so we need to prioritise. We also need to get some of this into our Neighbourhood Plan under the Traffic and Transport section and we are under pressure to get the plan finished and to Referendum stage by year end 2016.
3. Air pollution in key spots and congestion will be made worse by some of the possible solutions to other problems. We help traffic slow in one area but create a bigger problem further along. Taking parking away from one place just moves the issue somewhere else.
4. Lack of space to widen roads or pavements means there are some things we just can’t do even if we had the resources.
5. Government pressure to enable assumption in favour of any new houses being built with little constraint = Less ability for District Councils and local people to fight what is unworkable when there is a lack of infrastructure.
6. Melton Traffic Lights have been assessed and are considered to be working at optimum efficiency for this road system. There is no room for a roundabout and this would not work anyway as the traffic is not equally heavy on all sides, it is mainly up and down the A1152.

**Possible options in order of PRIORITY:**

1. **A1152 by station – well thought out measures to allow access to and from new development need to be put in place before the traffic starts to increase. This includes the potential road re-alignment over the level crossing to lengthen the bend and a pedestrian island opposite the Station to make crossing this road safer and traffic calming in Station Road.**
2. **The latter (Station Road) is most pressing as it has been an issue for a long time. A one-way system? If so which direction? Pavement outside the Church for safe pedestrian access. Not losing too much parking but perhaps restricting it on one side. Do we have to re-route the bus? What other solutions are there? Can we do a trial period to see if it works or is this too expensive?**
3. **Survey on Melton Road and possible parking restrictions thereafter dependent on findings of survey. Also ensure a Safety ‘line of site’ at Fayrefield Rd junction as parked cars currently restrict the view as people try to pull out into oncoming traffic.**
4. **Wickham Market right turn onto A12 Southbound so that traffic from this direction is not funnelled through Ufford and Melton.**
5. **Widen/lengthen right hand funnel into Woodbridge at Traffic lights.**
6. **Saddlemakers Lane – signage agreed needs to be done ASAP plus possibly digging out the bank slightly on very tight turns to stop so many collisions.**
7. **Restrict HGV’s and heavy traffic through Woodbridge by encouraging them to use A12 as this is creating high air pollution at the Lime Kiln Quay lights.**

**Longer term:**

1. **If Primary school is moved (which the Primary School would love but SCC do not have the funds for at the moment) a left hand turn funnel can be added from Southern side of traffic lights to allow cars going into Woodbridge to drive straight through. This would help alleviate the queues on one side?**
2. **What, if anything, can be done to create a secondary access road off the peninsular? Difficult towards Bawdsey but is there any place where Rendlesham/Bentwaters traffic can be taken straight onto the A12 rather than through Eyke and Melton?**
3. **Future agreed restriction on further development on the Peninsular unless an alternative access road can be created?**

**Minutes of Working Group Meeting – Melton Neighbourhood Plan**

**16th August 2016**

**Cloghans Bungalow, SCDC site**

**In attendance:**

Buffy Barrington

Elizabeth Whittingham

David Whittingham

John Pitchford

Katy Martin

Geof Butterwick

David Steptoe

Alan Porter

Andrew Corston

This meeting was partially a thank you to those who have worked on the Neighbourhood Plan thus far and partially to enable group members to comment on the current Draft NP and give their own feedback.

Buffy reported that so far we have had only 13 email responses, no letters and only 3 survey responses to the Pre-Submission Consultation. So far none of the statutory consultees have responded at all.

It was felt that more comments would come through in the last few days of the consultation and as this was not until the end of September we needed to be patient.

Buffy also clarified to those present that Woods Lane would now go ahead as SCDC had decided not to continue fighting that particular legal battle.

Buffy will be attending the next meeting at Burness Parish Rooms to explain that the fact that Burness was not included in the Draft NP document was a an honest omission and will be rectified. We had all missed this but it was on no way a deliberate omission and in fact much of the community feedback has told us how important Burness is to Melton. We will include it in the history section under ‘Melton Today’ as well as in ‘Community Infrastructure.’ We should also perhaps be adding a small separate section which outlines those buildings and facilities which are important to Melton and are of Community Value.

The question was asked “Has this Draft NP achieved what we wanted it to when we started this process?” and the overall answer was yes. Each person attending then set out their own thoughts about the document.

Andrew Corston suggested there should be an ‘Executive Summary’ at the beginning which outlined the keys issues and key policies in plain and simple words so that someone could understand the overall objectives of our NP without necessarily having to read the whole document in depth. This was unanimously approved and it will be done.

Alan Porter mentioned the issue of the A12 between the Wyvale roundabout and Martlesham roundabout being single lane and that making this two lanes on both sides would help reduce traffic through Woodbridge and consequently Melton (possibly). Whilst everyone agreed this might be the case it is outside of the remit of our NP. Plus there is no evidence in consultation we have done that this would be generally approved so we would not be able to put in anything about it.

There is a table error on 2nd page of Scoping Report – header does not carry across.

John Pitchford mentioned having a more robust protection of the green gaps between Melton and Ufford. Important to define the limits of each village. We will ask our consultant about this as protecting large areas of green space is difficult in the NP. There may be a way to do this though so we will look into it.

It was suggested we should ask for a Letter of Intent from the Chris Dawson at MasterLord about the relationship between them, Riduna and the Carter and Warburg families and their commitment to developing the Carter/Warburg site in the way we have defined as part of the NP. A letter from Pitstop / Deben Community Farm indicating their own interest in being part of this development would also be helpful. Both letters would show ‘deliverability’ of the plan.

David and Elizabeth Whittingham both felt that the Draft NP was a comprehensive document and reflected the discussions we had all had at previous working groups and met their expectations. They were both concerned about the Village Hall idea and this was discussed briefly but it was explained that this had not come out of the NP process and was a being led by the Parish Council and that there would be plenty more opportunities for the public to have their say.

Geof Butterwick pointed out the following:

p.16 5.2 / 5.4 – it needs to be made clear that Woods Lane is now APPROVED.

p.38 Residential Boats: 7.27 MOST not all of these boats do not have planning permission. David Steptoe also suggested something be put in about a need for insurance due safety and this would also subject those insured to regular surveys.

p.45 Deben Mill MEL20 – check this is still in for the correct reasons.

p.48 10.17 Riduna NOT Carters.

Buffy to review this section.

p.50 11.2/ii Need to re-word. One way system not likely anymore.

Appendix: population has not changed much but housing stock has risen dramatically. No graph for this. Need to put one in. Also a graph of 2nd homes – SCDC should have this info.

Community Transport – David mentioned that this had been raised as an idea with the NP group at Woodbridge due to lack of parking spaces. MEL4. Might be a good one to say we would ‘support’ if it looked likely as we have the same parking restrictions.

How do we know that local people will get access to the affordable homes and the low cost market housing? Should we call the open market ones ‘low cost’ rather than affordable to avoid confusion also.

Thank you page at the back of the document will be inserted.

------------------------------------------