GRIMSTON - ROYDON - CONGHAM - NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN GROUP ST BOTOLPH'S CHURCH ON MONDAY 18 SEPTEMBER 2017

Present: Grimston and Pott Row: Cllr M de Whalley, Cllr P Coleman, Mrs P Sewell (Clerk),

Mrs S Coleman and Mr J Barnicoat.

Roydon: Cllr N Fletcher. **Congham:** Representative not present.

KL&WN Borough Council: Mr F Beck

Observers: Mr and Mrs Rudd, Mr and Mrs Beales, Mrs L Morton and 3 others.

Apologies: Cllr K Israel, Cllr T Tilbrook and Cllr S Fraser

1. Welcome

Cllr de Whalley welcomed everyone and thanked Cllr Coleman for making the arrangements with the Church. Cllr Coleman said that there would be a hire fee of £10.00.

2. Next Steps

Consultation period to designated Neighbourhood Plan Area

Mrs Sewell reported that formal letters of agreement had been received from both Roydon and Congham Parish Councils and the statement of intention had been submitted to the Borough Council. The Borough Council had accepted that it was appropriate for the 3 parishes to work together and had instigated the formal consultation on the proposed designated area, the consultation period was underway and would finish on 4 October. The Chairman said that there had been 2 comments so far Norfolk County Council (no objection) and Sport England (A reminder to consider the importance of an active community)

Mrs Sewell confirmed that maps of the designation had been put up on Noticeboards around Grimston, copies of the maps were given to Cllr Fletcher for Roydon. Cllr Coleman would take additional maps to Congham.

• Borough Council Officer guidance and advice

Mr Beck provided comment and advice on the draft questionnaire (Annex A). Mr Beck recommended the Herefordshire County Council website as a source of good advice. Mr Beck said that a Strategic Environmental Assessment should not be necessary and the requirement for other statements would depend on the content of the plan. Mr Beck advised caution if identifying sites for specific purposes in the plan without the agreement of the landowner.

Site Specific Survey: Mr Beck said that a review of all the sites was underway, but would not expect the final report to be out for consultation for several months at least. **Development Boundaries:** Mr Beck said that it was the Borough Council's intention to look at reinstating development boundaries for small villages and hamlets, he was asked to send details to the Parish Clerks as well as the NHP group.

Maps: Mr Beck had provided a map of the NHP boundary with the appropriate OS licence number to be used, he offered the Borough Council's services in providing additional maps as data allowed.

Funding

Mr Sewell confirmed that she had completed the pre-grant assessment and the Locality group who managed the grant had accepted the 3 Parish arrangement. Quotes would be needed for the following:

Design and Print of Questionnaire
Post Questionnaire Exhibition/Publicity

Website Consultant expertise

3. Consultation Process

Pre-Questionnaire Consultations – Report on events attended

The Chairman reported that as the priority had been the draft questionnaire, the reports on the consultation events had not yet been completed.

• To review draft Questionnaire

The Chairman thanked members of the sub-group for the time spent on putting the questionnaire together, a second draft which had been circulated by email to all members was presented. The Chairman said that he had asked a resident to complete the form to ensure that it was user friendly. Mr Beck said that the group did not need the Borough Council's approval, but felt that the questionnaire was comprehensive and he liked where easy to read definitions had been provided. Full details of suggested changes/amendments would be set out in Annexe A.

• To set timescale for Questionnaire

Cllr Coleman encouraged the NHP group not to lose momentum. It was felt that before Christmas would be too soon as costs should not be incurred until the grant had been approved, as well as detailed plans were in place for distribution and collection. Mrs Sewell would draw up a checklist of what would be required (Annexe B). The target would be the February Village link.

4. Communication

Village Link

The deadline for the next edition was 21 September.

• Website

This was not discussed as the meeting had run over time.

5. Next Meetings

The next meeting would be held in the village hall on Monday 23 October at 7.30pm, the following meeting would be Monday 13 November.

Annexe A – Questionnaire Amendments/Observations

Annexe A – Questionnaire Amendments/Observations	
Front Page	
Change contact email to the NHP Hotmail address.	
Include Website Address	
Add details of prize draw	
Inside Front cover	
Change Map to the with OS License notation	
Remove large lettering and expand Map to landscape	
Second paragraph in letter – plans are made – not approved	
Part 1	
Optimal information – change heading as we need information for prize draw.	
They can tick a box if they want to receive further information, however need to	
consider the administration requirements to keep contacting people about	
different stages. Better to say that please include contact details so team can	
clarify a point made.	
Part 2	
Introduction: Time period is 2107-2036	
2.3 Circle rather than double tick	
2.4 Need to perhaps to specify what type of development	
2.5 Questions could be considered too prescriptive	
2.6 What it the value of this question or rather the answers	
2.9 Guard against the impression that the NHP will provide services – it can only	
encourage	
Part 3	
Important to note that household size is decreasing	
3.1 Infilling or reuse within existing is not Infilling – rephrase	
Mr Beck to send through better definition of brownfield sites	
3.2 Perhaps split the question. Also to note that bungalows also need to be	
defined by bedroom number	
3.4 Replace "in our villages" with NHP area – perhaps split into villages	
3.5 Individual homes – does this mean self build or Single dwellings.	
3.7 NHP can only provide a supportive policy – not actually provide childcare	
services	
Part 4	
4.2 Include cycle lanes, Footpaths	
4.3 Include social infrastructure (might need definition)	
Part 5	
5.3 Provide examples – caravan parks, glamping sites, hotels as question too	
wide in scope	
Part 6	
6.2 Train - clarify that it's the train from King's Lynn ie better links to	
6.5 NHP can only develop a policy, it cannot provide/create footpaths	
Part 7	
Create paras 7.1,7.2 and 7. 3 with small section at end of each for people to	
write in any they think wev'e missed off	
Perhaps reduce historical list to 25 sites (War Memorials)	
What about Church Hill school as an Community asset?	

Annex B - NHP Questionnaire Delivery

de Whalley
23/10 Meeting
Barnicoat
Coleman
23/10 Meeting if agreement with Village
Link reached
Parish Representatives to draw up a list
from each parish
Sewell
de Whalley
23/10 Meeting
de Whalley
de Whalley
13/11 Meeting
Sewell/de Whalley
de Whalley
(photo shoot at School if they design the
cover)