

Rudby Parish Neighbourhood Plan Team Meeting

2nd June 2016

Village Hall

Attending:

Claire Baird	Vanessa Housley	Mick Payne
Carol Banks	Karen Hutchinson	Liam Percy
David Clarke	Niall Innes	Thomas Pickering
Andy Collingwood	Robert Innes	Karen Picking
Jonathan Cooper	Christopher Langford	Gordon Rose
Adrian Davey	Sandra Langford	Helen Salvage
Andrew Dyball	Mark Lewis	Keith Shorter
Chris Dyball	David Lowe	Derek Simpson
Jim Gannon	Katie Lowe	Elsie Vaughan Jones
John Gifford	Roger Mallinson	Andy Voke
David Hellowell	Tricia Mancina	Richard Wilson
Sallyann Hewitt	Graham Moore	
Natasha Housley	Allan Mortimer (Chair)	

Apologies:

Claire Devine	Kate Linker	Miranda Woods
Rosie Danjoux	Hazel Showler	
Mike Holmes	Mike Wilkins	

Background

A public meeting (attended by about 200 people) on Neighbourhood Planning was held in Hutton Rudby village hall on 23rd May 2016. At that meeting there was a call for expressions of interest from people who wanted to work on a Neighbourhood Plan, and Allan Mortimer (AM) was asked to chair the Neighbourhood Plan Team / Steering Group.

At the public meeting there was a strong message that the community wanted a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) to get better control over the development path for the Village/Parish, and that because of current development pressures wanted to see it delivered quickly.

Meeting Purpose

The target attendees for this meeting were the volunteers (The NP Team) from the earlier meeting.

The chair stated that his aims for the meeting were:

- To bring the NP Team together as a group.
- To develop a better understanding of the process.
- To start forming an organisation suitable for the task
- To progress key tasks.

The meeting format was a chair-led discussion / Q&A.

Meeting Introduction

AM welcomed the team, gave a brief personal history, and then set out his understanding of Neighbourhood Planning and how he envisaged the NP team would develop.

The Neighbourhood Plan must be a truly inclusive process, and this should inform not only how we engage with the community, and who is on the NP team, but also how we operate within the team.

Neighbourhood Planning is about asking the community about their issues, needs and problems. It is about gathering evidence and using that evidence to develop policies. We are not here to impose our personal views, or make assumptions and jump to conclusions before the evidence is gathered. As a group we need to focus on our listening skills, and develop a mind-set focused on consultation. ***This should inform how we operate within the NP Team itself.***

Neighbourhood Planning ***must*** by definition be inclusive and engage with all parts of the community. Although we have a large group of volunteers which is very pleasing, there are some “gaps” (e.g. very few parents of pre-school / primary age children) which we need to address. We do need to ensure “coverage” and proper engagement but should avoid a quota-filling mind-set.

Roles Of Hambleton District Council (HDC), Rudby Parish Council (RPC) & Save Hutton Rudby (SHR)

As our local planning authority, HDC play a significant role. They approve our application for a Neighbourhood Plan, guide us through the process, provide us with access to information we will need, help us achieve compliance with various statutory requirements, and provide some funding. A good working relationship with HDC and in particular with the planning department is essential.

RPC have a specific statutory role in Neighbourhood Planning. For example, only RPC can apply for permission to develop a Neighbourhood Plan, and RPC are ultimately responsible for making the final submission. RPC are committed to the project, have indicated an intention to provide financial support, but will delegate the project execution to a broadly based community group (i.e. us). So as with HDC a good relationship and open lines of communication with RPC are important.

SHR have actively campaigned for an NP, and as an organisation are fully behind the project. However, ***SHR has no special status within the NP team.*** SHR members who want to participate in the NP team do so as individual members of the community and not as SHR representatives.

Proposed NP Team Organisation / Structure

The following factors are the main influences on the proposed organisational model:

- There is a need for formal delegation of authority by and accountability to RPC.
- There are key relationships to manage including those with RPC and HDC.
- There is a desire to deliver quickly without compromising quality.
- There is a need to ensure involvement / engagement across the community.
- The NP team is a large group, people continue to come forward, and new members should always be welcomed at any stage of the project.
- Representativeness is difficult to achieve in small sub-groups, but small groups are more effective at making decisions and progressing assigned work than large committees.
- The NP team should internally operate in an inclusive and consultative style.
- Composition of sub-groups will primarily be determined by the need, but demographic spread/representativeness will be monitored.

The proposed structure is an attempt to balance these factors, but as volunteers on a community project we should aim to be a self-organising team rather than have an externally imposed structure.

- The basic unit is the whole NP Team, and the full team will be consulted on and participate in all major decisions.
- There is a need for a group to be charged with responsibility for the delegated authority from RPC, to act as a project board, to manage key relationships, to manage overall scope of work, to co-ordinate work of sub-groups, and to provide leadership for tasks. An appropriate size for this group is about 10 people. Around half this group should be task oriented people who can take on a significant workload to “drive” the project. This group will be known as the “Steering Group”.
- There will be subject/theme groups who will be responsible for building up the evidence base and developing policies in each of the major areas. While we cannot at this stage fully identify the groups we will need, there are some such as housing, architectural style / settlement form, and environment that are very likely to feature. These groups will need a team leader and members interested in the subject area. These are likely to suit those who can commit to a steady workload over extended periods of time. Size of teams will vary, but very small groups should be avoided to minimise the risk of a narrow view emerging.
- There will be short term task groups – for example the Village Event stall, or distribution and analysis of questionnaires. These are likely to suit those for whom short intensive bursts of activity are easier to accommodate.

Composition Of The Steering Group

There is a need to make some nominations before the next RPC meeting on 13th June so authority can be formally delegated. However, it would be prudent not to make all the appointments until we have a better understanding of the talents in the wider team and of the tasks we have to perform.

AM said he wanted the NP team to be involved in the process of appointing the Steering Group, and suggested the team consider the following as the first phase of nominations:

Name	Role	Reason For Nomination
Allan Mortimer	NP Chair	Appointed at public meeting
Jonathan Cooper	RPC Nominee	Liaison with RPC
Rosie Danjoux	RPC Nominee	Liaison with RPC
Bridget Fortune	HDC Councillor	Liaison with HDC

The next phase of nominations should look at adding task oriented people, people who can link to other important organisation, and broadening of the demographic and geographic distribution.

Feedback on this proposal and additional nominations will be discussed at the next NP meeting.

Neighbourhood Area Designation

One of the first steps in progressing a Neighbourhood Plan is a decision on the area to be covered. In parished areas, this is commonly the whole parish, but can be smaller or larger.

Our community interest in Neighbourhood Planning has grown out of concerns about development pressures on the main settlement area, and there is also precedent from the Village Design Statement of focusing on this core area. So there is some support for a limited area approach.

AM advised the meeting that he had been asked by RPC to make a recommendation on the area, and that he intended to make that recommendation based on the NP Team consensus view.

During the discussion the following observations were made:

- The Neighbourhood Plan will have a long “shelf life” so the decision should not be based purely on short term concerns about development pressures.
- There is a desire to deliver a good plan quickly, and peripheral/minor issues should not be allowed to detract from this key objective. The project management strategy should address this concern.
- Development pressures / issues are focused on the main settlement, but there may be development issues elsewhere.
- Middleton and Skutterskelfe parishes are too small to do their own Neighbourhood Plans.
- A core settlement approach would need to include some “hinterland” or it would be unable to address/control development close to the existing village.
- The narrowest realistic boundary for a core settlement approach would include parts of Hutton Rudby, Rudby and Skutterskelfe parishes. It would include around 90% of the total parish population; the major habitat/landscape types (agricultural, woodland, Leven valley); and the major land uses (residential, agricultural, recreation/leisure, local services).
- Skutterskelfe has some land use by non-agricultural businesses.
- There are only two very small areas (part of Hutton Rudby Parish West of the A19, and the East end of Skutterskelfe) that probably do not treat the village as their local service centre.
- At their annual assembly, Middleton residents expressed interest in being included in a whole parish Neighbourhood Plan.
- RPC intend to provide financial support from the precept and would prefer that these funds are used for the whole parish.
- Defining a boundary around the main settlement would have something of an “arbitrary” basis. Why include one field, but not the next? Agreeing this could take up significant time.
- The whole parish boundary is well established and matches the school catchment.
- Including the whole parish is “fairer”.
- Overall workload for the Neighbourhood Plan increases with population, with different classes of land-use, different habitat types, and the choices on which issues are taken into Neighbourhood Level and which are left to the District Level.
- If there is good scope control on issues addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan, the workload and delivery time should not be significantly greater than for a core settlement strategy.

At the end of the discussion AM asked for a show of hands supporting a recommendation for a Whole Parish designation underpinned by a project strategy that focuses on the major issues. There was near unanimous support for this recommendation.

Action AM: Prepare submission for RPC meeting

Indicative Costs & Sources Of Funding

Indicative costs for Neighbourhood Plans can be found from case studies. These range from around £5,000 for small rural parishes with few issues up to around £20,000 for larger urban parishes with more complex issues.

Factors which influence costs include size of population, number and complexity of issues addressed, and the quantity of resources and skills available from volunteers. We probably fall mid-range for population, and complexity, but are starting out well resourced. It, therefore, seems reasonable to envisage that our costs should come in the middle of the range – say £10,000 to £15,000.

Sources of funding include:

- Grant of £3,000 from HDC on approval of area designation
- Grant of up to £9,000 funded by the Department of Communities and Local Government. This needs to be used within 6 months or by the end of the financial year if earlier.
- Support from the Parish precept for preliminary work, and if necessary to top-up funding from other sources.

At this stage it would appear that grant funding should cover most of the costs of delivering our Neighbourhood Plan. Furthermore on adoption, the parish becomes eligible for enhanced Community Infrastructure Levy payments for any applicable development inside the parish boundary. Over time there should be a net cash benefit to the Parish.

Next Steps

- **Preparation For Village Event 2nd July.**

The village event is an opportunity to gather information about issues important to the community and provide information about the Neighbourhood Planning process. This will help us define our scope of work, and identify issues which we need to explore in more detail through structured questionnaires.

I need some volunteers to help with:

1. Logistics such as sourcing a gazebo, display boards etc. to use at the event.
2. Preparation of leaflets / posters and some interactive elements to help capture community input. People with education backgrounds are likely to have useful skills.
3. Manning the stall

Action All: If you can help, please contact me by email – don't wait for the next meeting.

The only name I have at the moment is Liam Percy.

- **Program Of Meetings**

RPC meet on the 2nd Monday of every month. In addition to reporting to them on progress, from time to time we will need to ask RPC to make decisions.

The optimal timing for a regular Steering Group meetings is approximately 1 week ahead of the RPC meeting. Steering Group meetings will be held in a public venue, be open to both the wider NP team, and the general public, and participation will be actively encouraged.

Subject and task group meetings will be arranged on ad-hoc basis.

- **Issues For Next Meeting (Village Hall 9th June)**

Presentation by Caroline Skelly of HDC planning / Q&A

Team Structure / SG Membership

Process Road Map / Outline Project Plan / "Strawman" project plan.

Branding / Logo etc.