

Melbourne NDP

Minutes of a Workshop held on 28 May 2015 at MARs

Facilitator Joe Dugdale, Consultant Rural Action Derbyshire

Present Jane Carroll, Mair Aitkenhead, Mike Smith, Frank Hughes, Ian Turner

Apologies Matt Rowe, Rose Minifie

Programme Joe described an outline of the aims and scope of the meeting (see attached programme) which was essentially to discover our progress with the NDP to date and then to plan further appropriate evidence gathering. All further tasks for each policy group were then placed in the context of a timeline. The overall aim of the meeting was to produce draft policies and a draft NDP. Due to time constraints, it did not prove possible to complete the agenda but much ground was covered and in particular Joe clarified many matters for the group .

Clarifying the goals of Melbourne NDP

Mair gave a preliminary summary of objectives of the Melbourne NDP which have been put forward so far.

1. To maintain a socially and economically active community and to enhance the quality of life for residents
2. To preserve and protect the unique character and heritage of our village
3. To prevent coalescence of the settlements of King's Newton and Melbourne
4. To improve traffic management, public transport and parking facilities
- 5 To protect and enhance our green open spaces.

Joe described the typical content of an NDP, and summarised the steps involved in completing such a plan together with a time frame.

He stated that there should be a chapter for each policy group. The chapter should contain a proposal and policies to support that proposal. There needed to be a body of evidence gathered to support each policy.

Once the draft plan is complete, it will be submitted to SDDC who then put it out to consultation with a long list of statutory bodies.

We then proceeded to scrutinise each policy group in turn with a view to describing the progress to date and discussing the next steps forward for each group.

Housing

Ian summarised by saying that approximately 150 to 200 people had attended the public meeting held in January 2015, and that their numerous comments had been recorded and collated. Essentially, the conclusion was that the community wanted housing development to be slow and well integrated. They were anxious that infrastructure concerns as a consequence of new development were addressed and such services seen to keep pace.

There was support for smaller sized housing, housing suitable for first time buyers and for the elderly.

Mapping/land-based surveys

The group had identified some suitable areas but confessed to facing some difficulties because of the large number of new developments currently being proposed in Melbourne and confusion as to whether these would count towards our required numbers in Part 2 of the Local Plan.

Joe advised that all of these should be ignored, that they would not count towards our Part 2 allocation, and that we should concentrate on identifying infill sites suitable for small developments which will contribute to our share of the 404 dwellings to be provided by the key service villages in Part 2 of the Local Plan. He emphasised that the group are able to suggest development advice to potential developers. Wording such as 'we would welcome application from developers able to provide development of this sort' would be appropriate. A map of land owned by SDDC in the Parish has been requested (this arrived 5 days after the meeting).

Ian will meet with SDDC Strategic Housing Manager in the near future to discuss their contribution to affordable housing. He has also requested to be informed of the waiting list for social housing specifically for Melbourne.

It was suggested we also request a map of all the brownfield sites in the Parish.

Joe's concluding advice was as follows:

- a) Continue mapping suitable sites
- b) Work up lots of options for the buildings: first time buyer homes, flats, sheltered housing, etc.
- c) Better scoping of potential sites, fill in the map
- d) Mair asked about a survey of estate agents and letting agencies to identify specific demand. This was thought advisable.

Timeline

Complete by October 2015.

Business, Retail, Employment, Tourism

Mike showed Joe the questionnaire he proposes delivering to the 150 identified businesses. Joe thought it should be simplified and shortened to encourage a high percentage response. These questionnaires will be hand-delivered.

Concerning tourism, it was noted that currently Melbourne is a popular place to visit and that there was potential for numbers and activity to increase in the coming years. The growing reputation of the Melbourne Festival, the numerous routes for walking groups in Melbourne's environs and the increasing use of the town as a cycling hub were all contributory factors. The group thought that better toilet and parking facilities and better public transport links will be necessary to ensure that an increase in tourist interest and numbers can be sustained.

It was suggested that more evidence is gathered by manning an NDP booth at the Festival Trail weekend in September and collecting the opinions and experiences of visitors.

Timeline

End of October.

Community and Leisure

Mair and Frank had collected and collated comments from the Public Meeting held in January. Many stated that current facilities were tired, dated, too scattered geographically and needing amalgamation. Facilities for young people and those for the elderly were thought to be inadequate, and whilst there was support for the Sporting Partnership and the project at Cockshut Lane, the provision for indoor sport was thought to be woefully inadequate.

They explained that the 'face-to-face' consultations that had been undertaken with key groups so far were with Community Care, Senior Citizens' Centre, Scouts and Guides, MARs and the Sporting Partnership. Schoolchildren and non-sport playing residents still needed to be targeted for their opinions.

A specimen questionnaire for a long list of social societies active in the village had also been prepared.

Joe suggested identifying the gaps in provision and constructing a 'shopping list' and options for what would be desirable. He also recommended meeting some of the social groups. Ideally, this 'wish list' should be ready by September /October in time for another Public Meeting. Results and decisions from the Public Meeting should then be included in a questionnaire to households.

Timeline

October.

Education/Health

Face-to-face meetings have been held with the Surgery Practice Manager and with Secondary School leaders. No scope statement has been produced as yet. Joe recommended consulting with the Local Clinical Commissioning Group, the Southern Derbyshire Health Board and the health groups of SDDC. He was also in favour of information gathering from the local Dental Practice concerning adequacy of provision, number of NHS patients and whether they would be prepared to expand facilities. He also stated that the group is at liberty to give opinions on the use of the Melbourne School land.

Overall, he recommended that attention should be paid to all issues in this policy group, but that no formal chapter should appear in the NDP. However, we should state that obviously the provision of health and education facilities needs to keep pace with the growth in the population.

Infrastructure

No member of this policy group was present and there was very little time remaining. Joe suggested getting a plan of the sewers from Seven Trent and also obtaining as much information as possible from SDDC concerning traffic, transport, water and sewerage matters.

Environment/Heritage/Conservation

Evidence collected from the Public Meeting in January had been collated and Barry Thomas had constructed a Scoping document. It was recognised that all the Policies necessary for this group have already been constructed and that there are various lists of Community Assets, Listed buildings, etc., etc. Acknowledgement of the detailed and comprehensive work of the Civic and Historical Research societies was given which meant that most of the policy evidence for this group is already available.

Jane said she thought the Cemetery Building should be listed as a heritage asset and that she would check this fact.

Joe was of the opinion that this group, with the availability of this evidence, is ready to write these particular policies.

This concluded all our discussions. Joe then went on to describe Gant charts (graph of tasks against a calendar of dates) and to suggest a template for the planning of the Plan.

Outline Planning time schedule for Melbourne NDP

Complete initial evidence-gathering

September/October

Options/proposals for all policies

November

Public event to consult on options

Late November

Questionnaire to all households as a result of
Public event (short and punchy). Analyse .

December

Pre-submission draft

Attach appendices containing all the evidence

First finished draft to SDDC

SDDC Six week consultation, duty to consult with
numerous parties

Early 2016 (?Spring)

Submit to Inspector

All present thought this timescale a little optimistic but resolved to make progress as quickly as possible. Joe was thanked for his comprehensive contribution to furthering our understanding of many aspects of the NDP .

Date and time next meeting

Thursday June 25 2pm MARS

Melbourne NDP Workshop November 25th 2015

Facilitator Joe Dugdale (Rural Action Derbyshire)

Present Joe Dugdale (RAD), Jane Carroll, Mair Aitkenhead, Mike Smith, Frank Hughes, Steve Spear, Graham Truscott, Wendy Earp, Margaret Gildea

The aim of the workshop was:

To "health check" the current position of the Melbourne NDP,

To make decisions on what should be our next steps .

To decide in which order to take those steps.

"Heath Check"

Evaluate current position

Prior to the meeting Mair had sent Joe all the survey evidence gathered so far, a summary of how we think we are complying with the basic conditions for an NDP, and a list of evidence documents that our group think might be pertinent.

Most present thought that in order to progress the individual groups, having collected evidence on their topic, should then share that information with the whole team and come up with options in each section with which to consult the public.

Joe then reminded us that the NDP is predominantly concerned with utilisation of land and outlined which of our topic groups had implications for planning decisions. These were Housing, Conservation and Heritage and Business and Retail. These must be the core of the NDP. All recommendations from other groups i.e. Community and Leisure, Education and Health, Traffic and Transport etc can only be defined as aspirations of the NDP. The Inspector will firstly look at conformity issues (that is compliance with the NPPF and the guidance around this, and compliance with the specific core strategic policies of the Local Plan) and only then consider other aspirations.

The NDP must have a view over 15years, and have due regard to what the Local Plan says about development in the area as it will eventually be adopted as part of the Local Plan

Topic groups

Housing

After discussion the following information was accepted.

The NDP cannot have any influence when planning permission has already been granted.

The NDP can draw up plans concerning sustainability issues for those developments with outline planning permission.

Joe cleared up some queries on strategic allocations and windfall sites.

He emphasised that we must work with SDDC Planners

The NDP is primarily able to influence where new housing is situated, its design (not too onerous a specification) and then what needs to happen as a consequence of those houses being there, thus helping to fulfil other aspirations in the NDP. The completed plan attracts a higher percentage of CIL and a stronger voice in these negotiations in order to assist with achieving aspirations .

Joe was of the opinion that what we are missing is a clear idea of the possible number of houses from the Local Plan Part 2 allocation of 600 for key service villages that could be accommodated and accepted in Melbourne in the NDP. This information should be sought from the public. Questions could be framed around the size of groups of houses, whether they should be situated on brown or greenfield sites, what type of housing (e.g. flats, starter homes, homes for the elderly), and people should be asked to indicate on a map acceptable positions for the development of this new housing.

As far as ownership of land was concerned Joe stated that SDDC should have a list of all land , landowners and landlords in the Parish, and also that this information should be available on www.mycommunityrights.com

All proposals put forward should have been tested in the Community.

Heritage etc

Jane outlined the progress in this topic area to which the Civic Society had made a big contribution.

Joe recommended obtaining printed copies of maps of the Conservation Areas and all the associated documents concerning the three Conservation Areas.

He recommended a separate group consider "Green open spaces" and suggested liaison with the responsible person at SDDC, and a separate meeting with the public on this topic. The meeting might use illustrative maps and photographs, to gather ideas. Non SHLAA sites should also be considered. Evidence, with descriptions of the reasons the designated spaces are an asset to the community will be needed in order to protect them.

Infrastructure

This was an aspiration topic.

Up to date information should be sought from SDDC on our streetscape, pedestrian access, traffic flow, sewerage disposal etc. He suggested looking at cycling routes (Sustrans) and footpaths (local footpaths group) for more information on what is currently provided.

Consultation

It was clear to Joe that not enough consultation with the public had occurred since the January open meeting. More work was needed in this area, not to gather basics but to consult in order to produce options and then proposals. There was also a need to collate all evidence gathered so far.

Consultation needs to investigate the Vision that the Community has for the future. In order to have a view the Community needs to be better informed of what we have found so far.

A tentative date for a Public Meeting has been set for February 20th 2016. This should seek responses to our ideas and hopefully generate some new volunteers.

Actions

- Collate and summarise all documents (Margaret end January)
- Detailed examination of plots of land
 - green open spaces/ (Barry Thomas)
 - ownership/previous usage (?)
- Produce Consultation Plan (Consultation group)
 - individual meetings on different "themes"
- Data analysis
 - decide methodology (categorising opinions consult Ian Hey)

- Residents Questionnaire (examples from Joe by June)

Joe then outlined expected progress following the completion of a Draft Plan.

The Plan would be submitted to the Examiner having been amended from the Draft.

At this stage it will also contain:

- All minutes
- All supporting evidence
- Consultation Document
- Basic conditions compliance statement
- Data conditions statement

The meeting ended with all expressing their thanks to Joe Dugdale for the expertise and knowledge shown in answering our multiplicity of questions, and for his patience in dealing with our deliberations.

Melbourne NDP

Workshop November 25th

MARs 12.30pm to 15.30pm

Facilitator Joe Dugdale RAD

Evaluate progress with

Evidence base

Consultations

Community engagement

Vision

Identify tasks still "to do"

Plan the next six months with a view to producing a Draft NDP