

Notes of a meeting of the Debenham Parish Council – Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group held on Monday, 30th March 2015 at 7:30 at Dove Cottage, Debenham.

Present: Cllr S Palframan, Cllr R Blackwell, Cllr S Phipps, Cllr J Baldwin, Cllr J Abbott, Mrs J Van Ek, Mr E Alcock OBE, Mr M Hammond, Mrs D Bedwell (Clerk) and no members of the public.

- 1. To receive apologies for absence:** Apologies had been received from Cllr D Hughes, Mrs J Upton, Mrs D Cash, Mrs S Feeney-Howells.
- 2. To receive declarations of interest:** None received.
- 3. To note any conflicts of interest and agree action to take :** Cllr S Palframan gave members a brief explanation as to when a conflict of interest may arise, particularly in the case of land owners, but to date none had been identified.
- 4. To receive and note notes from the meeting held 10 November 2014:** The notes had been circulated to members ahead of the meeting and were noted.
- 5. Appointment of Note Taker and Communications Officer:** The Parish Clerk, Mrs D Bedwell, was appointed note taker; Mrs D Cash/ Cllr J Abbott were noted as possible Communications Officers in their absence but this would need to be ratified at a future meeting.
- 6. Household Survey 2015:**
 - 6.1 Introduction
 - 6.2 General questions
 - 6.3 Themes 1-6
 - 6.4 Summary

Points 6.1 to 6.4 were addressed altogether: Cllr S Palframan gave members a brief report on the document draft, which had been circulated to members ahead of the meeting. Cllr S Palframan confirmed that the draft document would also be sent to Mr Peter Freer at MSDC for verification. The main items raised and recommendations put forward were as follows:

Introduction to the whole plan- A recommendation was made that it should identify the need for a plan in the first place and that its purpose was to identify what was most important for residents, because once needs were identified, available resources could be better directed. There was also a concern raised that a large proportion of residents may not be aware of what resources and services were already available to them.

It was also mentioned that the Debenham Plan would need to be in conformance with the MSDC Plan.

It was suggested that once the final draft was completed, it should be put to a test group before being submitted any further.

Questions 36, 37- Their relevance was questioned. A comparison could be established between “newcomers” and residents who had lived in the village for a longer period of time, therefore question no. 36 could be irrelevant. A recommendation was made to remove question no. 36. It was also mentioned that it would be interesting to find out why people moved to Debenham and it would be important to retain that information.

Questions 38 and 40 - Could better combine the number of children and adults and this could help identify needs.

Theme 1 (Health) - Cllr J Abbott reported that based on the feedback from residents he had spoken with, the results of the survey were based on what affected people the most at any given time. Mental health and an ageing population were also identified as concerns and emergency services response times were quite high due to location. A recommendation was made to identify the local groups referred to in no. 6a).

Theme 2 (Education) – School Head Teachers had their own mandates when it came to Education and the Neighbourhood Plan could have an adverse effect on it if it was not done properly. Parents currently liked the local High School because it was relatively small (point 8). Local children relied on public transport to attend extra-curricular activities, therefore the provision of a 6th Form should not be encouraged or discouraged until the consultation process had taken place. What about links with local schools? Schools could share their resources to allow children to develop in the areas they wished. A recommendation was made that the Education Theme Group should have another look at the questions in the survey.

It was also recommended that item 10 wording should change to “*What area of provision from the following 6 categories would you consider most important to you as a parent/carer?*” and that “*Quality of teaching*” should be included as one of the criteria, perhaps at the top of the list.

Theme 3 (Public Transport) – It was agreed that local farmers and the providers of taxis/bus services should be included in the consultation. Parking off/on road was also believed to be a major issue. Cllr D Hughes and Mr E Alcock OBE were due to meet in the following week in order to progress this section.

Theme 4 (Leisure and Recreation) – It was agreed that the adequacy of the provision already available and any barriers to accessing it should be included. Cllr J Baldwin to carry out amendments.

It was recommended that under point 19 “*Children and Young People*” should remain as two separate groups; that under item 20 there should be an additional “*barrier to participation*”, ie “*Disabilities*” and that the wording in point 20 should be changed to “*Bellow is a list of possible barriers to participation, please indicate which may have prevented you from trying an activity/club or enjoy a social/recreational space?*”.

Theme 5 (History, Heritage and Environment) – It appeared that Heritage was not being properly covered, therefore it should be dropped from the title. However, parishioners

should still be consulted on a number of items pertaining to this area, suggestions as follows:

- on what they would like to keep in the village,
- whether residents wanted new builds to reflect existing builds,
- what environmental aspects residents would like to see maintained, kept or enhanced,
- how they felt about the blight of solar panels and wind turbines,
- whether there was a possibility of expanding the Conservation Area,
- whether there was any scope to gauge what historic elements of the village were important, which could be assisted the Community Asset Register Scheme,
- the recognition that there was a need for a new housing development in the village.

Theme 6 (Planning, Housing and Development) – The scale of housing would need to be in conformance with the NP Policy and Framework. It was suggested that Mr Nick Ward could be asked to assist the PC with the Design Code, which specified the standard that houses should be built to and would need to include the Debenham Heritage. It was agreed that this option would need to be explored further.

It was finally agreed that each theme Group should come up with 2-4 questions and that answers would be needed by April 17th 2015. The final draft document was not expected to be finalised for at least another six weeks and a further meeting would need to be arranged to look at proposals.

- 7. Printing and Distribution:** It was agreed that Cllr J Abbot would seek a quote for the production of 1000 colour copies of the final questionnaire (which should reflect the one available on Survey Monkey via the website). It was also agreed that a number of focus groups should be asked to complete the draft questionnaire, including the schools.
- 8. Website update, including online submission:** There was still a considerable amount of work to be done and Cllrs J Abbott and S Palframan would be meeting in order to progress matters.
- 9. Timetable:** Most of the schedule had already been covered at different points in the meeting. The distribution of the questionnaires would be carried out by the Scouts again, with agreed collection points at the Primary School, Websters, Coopersfield and DLC. It was also suggested that collection boxes may be available from MSDC and Cllr S Palframan agreed to make enquiries.

It was also suggested that there could be a “lottery type” incentive for the return of the questionnaires, where the winning ticket would receive a prize. Group to consider this suggestion collectively.

A further suggestion was to provide drop-in sessions, where residents could be helped to complete their questionnaires.

- 10. To consider the recruitment of a Consultant and agree recommendations to full council:** Cllr S Palframan informed members that the NP Committee had agreed in principle to approach a consultant, as the next stage was crucial with regards to the drafting of the

plan prior to submission to the examiner. Mr M Hammond had kindly provided Cllr S Palframan with a list of possible names and he would be speaking with some of them in order to move the process forward.

11. To note lessons learned from Working Groups: It was expected that when the responses started coming in, the groups would need to work again and care would need to be taken not to overlap sections and the complexity and sheer scale of some areas. Members would be asked to find the time to keep the momentum going and finalise the project.

12. Any Other Business: There was no further business.

13. Date of next meeting: Approximately within one month, to be verified at a later stage.

With no further matters to be transacted, the meeting ended at 10.05pm

Signed: _____ Date: _____