

# **BETLEY, BALTERLEY & WRINEHILL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP**

## **Minutes of the meeting of 15th September 2016**

### 35. PRESENT:

P Ainsworth, John Bailey, Robert Bettley-Smith, Mandy Davenport, Tricia Gee, Richard Head, Mark Morris, Mick Padmore.  
Gwyn Griffiths.

### 36. APOLOGIES

Robert Beddis, Joe Berman, Mike Covell, Seb Daly, Bill Rogers.

### 37. MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of 25<sup>th</sup> August were approved as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

### 38. MATTERS ARISING

38/1 GG apologised that he had not yet drawn up the requested mailing lists.

38/2 RH reported on the Whitmore NP. The response to the Questionnaire had been poor, with a return rate of 25% with 5 days to go. RB-S suggested that anything over 30% (if unskewed) would be considered statistically valid. The importance of a variety of effective ways to return the questionnaire was clear.

38/3 RH hoped to meet with Graham Bibby re Keele's experience by the end of the month. The current situation was:

Designation was pending;

A grant had been secured from the Community Rights Programme;

A consultant had been engaged re a Housing Needs Survey;

They held a database of c.60 residents who had expressed interest.

38/4 RH reported that preparations were in place for a Roadshow at East Lawns on Saturday.

38/5 JBa had circulated a first draft of the Evidence Base document. Options for online surveying were discussed and it was agreed that Smart Survey UK seemed a reasonable option.

#### **ACTION POINT: JBa to follow up at a cost of £25pm to be included in budget.**

38/6 GG outlined the position re grant funding. There were several constraints which made the grant funding less than straightforward:

1. Funding was not available for administrative staff costs (but was available to engage specialist consultants);
2. Funding could not be retrospective;
3. Any grant had to be spent within 6 months of granting, or by the end of the financial year (whichever was sooner);
4. Grant applications normally took a month to process;
5. Funding could be provided across two financial years, but this would require two separate applications, and unspent money could not be rolled over.

#### **ACTION POINT: ALL to consider what expenditure was likely to be incurred in 2016-17 and 2017-18 - to be forwarded to GG.**

**ACTION POINT: GG to prepare a bid application based on estimates provided.**

38/7 It was felt that a new Finance Sub-Group was needed.

**ACTION POINT: RB-S, MD, MM & GG to form a Finance Sub-Group to follow up the work identified in 38/6.**

39/7 There was discussion of how a Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) could be prepared and whether the NP area was too small for an effective HNA.

**40. PROGRESS AGAINST PLAN**

40/1 MP now had access to Census statistics for 2001 and 2011. GG had also accessed SOA (Super Output Area) data which was aligned to the NP area.

41/1 It was agreed that the document setting out progress could be featured on the website.

**41. FEEDBACK**

41/1 MP had explored some of the issues relating to local affordable/ social/ low-cost housing. Although the intent was clear - to maintain a community which was mixed, sustainable and where locals could access housing - the means to achieve this were complex.

41/1/1 Social housing was difficult, especially for small schemes and to feature in the NP would require an evidence base which included existing provision, turnover rates, level of demand and local housing policies (including the Local Authority and the local Registered Social Landlords).

41/1/2 Low-cost housing was attractive but very, very difficult to secure and then to sustain. Land ownership was key but even if sites could be obtained protection by covenant would be needed and allocation would need to be supported by a robust housing need. One option would be to use Community Right to Build involving a private landowner and the Parish Council.

41/1/3 There was support for a policy requiring development to include a significant element of smaller (and therefore relatively cheaper) housing but the mechanism for securing this was not obvious.

**42. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

32/1 RH would co-ordinate a Roadshow at East Lawns on Saturday, 11am to 2pm.

**43. DATE OF NEXT MEETING(S)**

Steering Group - **Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> October 7.30pm.**