

SECOND NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP MEETING

Held at St. Oswald's Church Meeting Room, 21 July 2016, 7.30pm

Present:

Tony Hill (Team Leader)
John McCurdie (Secretary)
Nigel Davies (Community Monitor)
Jannice Wilkinson
Claire Gillham
Claire Ellwood
Alan Thompson
Chris Granger
Jenny Harrison
Sue Clothier
Patrick Willink
Keith Hurst-Jones (SLDC Councillor)
Sue Cook
Mark Cropper
Laura Miller
Romola Acland
Stan Collins (Cumbria County Council – part)

Introduction:

Tony Hill welcomed everyone to the meeting and said that this meeting was another step in preparing the Neighbourhood Plan, which he hoped would be in early draft stage by December.

He hoped that the meeting would cover:

- Feedback
- Discussion of Chapter D of Nigel's report (Development and Infrastructure)
- Next week's Round Table discussion with Nigel

The Steering Group would have two tasks from the meetings tonight and next week (26th):

1. In preparation for public consultation, develop the thoughts and progress from those meetings. There would not necessarily be only one Neighbourhood Plan, so this could be the first of many. However, the plans must be based on objectives. Tony suggested the SMART mnemonic – Smart, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-based. Patrick had mentioned the R-W-W (or Schrello) method of:
 - Realistic funding, doing, manpower
 - Win implement ideas or policies
 - Worth is it worth it? e.g. cost / benefit / risk of impeding other things.

2. The Steering Group should be left with a realistic structure to inspire and provoke the community. It should explain what it is trying to do and how, not only to the community but also partners, stakeholders, South Lakeland District Council and Lake District National Park Authority.

Tony said that Nigel's thought was that 4 small working teams should be set up to go through ideas under the chapters:

- A – Environment and Design
- B – Community Facilities and Services
- C – Traffic and Transport
- D – Development and Infrastructure.

However, this was only a thought, and the Neighbourhood Planning Team should think about the structure over the weekend, as well as their role in a team and possibly leading.

Tony suggested that Sue Cook should be his deputy and this was agreed by all present.

Sue addressed everyone and said that it was important to look at suggestions made and define some of the vague terms, such as "nice developments" and "integrate mill and village". She said that Chapter D Development and Infrastructure was the core or heart of the Neighbourhood Plan and would draw in ideas from other areas.

There were comments and questions from the group:

Mark – can the Neighbourhood Plan influence the design of housing? Tony replied "Yes".

Keith – there is a need to attract small businesses. Tony mentioned that the Council could nominate Community Assets, and the shop had been registered recently as one. This means that, if it is put up for sale, there is a moratorium of 8 months while the Council looks for opportunities to buy it a valuer's rate.

Chris – consultation will tell us why some suggestions have not happened already, e.g. a café and the integration of mill and village.

Patrick – we should not close doors to any idea, e.g. integration of mill and village.

Jenny – who are the people being talked about as stakeholders? She suggested current and future residents, visitors, and workers.

Nigel – why did we not gather ideas from the village, rather than put ideas to the village?

Jannice – ideas were gathered for the Parish Plan of 2004, but the suggestions were very low level, e.g. more litter bins. Nothing was sparkling, unlike the Partnership's Vision document.

Patrick – we need to go out and talk to the community, probably informally.

Chapter D: Development and Infrastructure

Sue led the discussion, and said that Mark had suggested a simplification of the structure into 4 topics:

1. Housing
2. Commercial
3. Public facilities, e.g. hall, surgery, playground
4. Spaces, e.g. squares, parks, parking.

1. Housing

There are two areas of land allocation for 92 houses: 72 in Hall Park and 20 in Willink Fields. The Neighbourhood Plan can have input to the development plans but not the right to stop them.

Comments from the group were:

Tony – should any other developments be on green or brown land?

Keith – it is important to integrate developments

Patrick – where else can we put housing?

Mark – one of the most powerful actions of a Neighbourhood Plan is to identify land for housing.

Patrick – we must be careful that our plans do not look too much like the Vision document, since there was hostility to that.

Mark – does the village need more housing?

Jannice – surveys have said that it should be for locals only

Stan – "locals only" rules apply for 10 years then the property can be sold to anyone for anything.

Patrick – how many houses do we think that the village needs?

Tony – up to 300 new dwellings, and that would lead to more services.

Patrick – if that "primes the pump" and gets money, does everyone agree that 300 is the target?

Stan – all new houses do not have to be added at once. When Hall Park was developed it was almost a separate town, since too many were added at once.

Mark – more starter homes are needed.

Claire E – there are no accessible houses at present.

Sue Clothier – we want accessible and mixed housing but no sprawl. There should be no huge estates, and housing should have links into the village by footpaths and cycle tracks.

Tony – those aspects are covered by the development briefs and we can control those in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Nigel – we need a "critical mass". If 92 houses are not enough, then we need to settle on a number.

2. Commercial

Laura – several people have mentioned a café, but how to make it happen?

Tony – how do we grab a slice of the action?, e.g. there are 15 million people passing annually on the A591.

Stan – electrification of the Oxenholme-Windermere railway line makes Preston and Manchester commutable. We could have a small number of rentable offices for workers who mix commuting and working "at home".

Stan – other possibilities are a hairdresser, visiting chiropodist, etc.

Laura – satellite education.

The meeting ended at 2130.

John McCurdie
Secretary, Burneside Neighbourhood Plan Team

THIRD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP MEETING

Held at St. Oswald's Church Meeting Room, 26 July 2016, 7.30pm

Present:

Nigel McGurk
Tony Hill (Team Leader)
Sue Cook (Deputy)
John McCurdie (Secretary)
Alan Thompson (Community Monitor)
David Ginsberg
Jannice Wilkinson
Chris Granger
Jenny Harrison
Sue Clothier
Emma Butterworth
Romola Acland
Nigel McGurk

Introduction:

Tony said that there were common themes in all 4 chapters of the proposed Neighbourhood Plan:

- A core to the village;
- A "Festival Square";
- Shops;
- Walkways;
- Connectivity.

There would be up to 300 new dwellings and that we should start by looking at two key areas: development and infrastructure. From that start, we could develop the vision of the village, the parish, and beyond. He believed that development of the plan may not be as difficult as we think.

Tony said that everyone would have a role to play in the development of the plan, so people should approach him or Sue Cook to say what they wanted to do or lead in a particular area. As a group, we will write most of the plan, and that a skeleton will be created soon.

Nigel continued by stating that our starting point was ahead of most other Neighbourhood Plans, but we are now making a big leap to set out the look and feel of the Neighbourhood Plan. We must discuss housing, but also group and prioritise other issues into must do / nice to have / do not matter.

He suggested that we start on Chapter D (Development and Infrastructure), and assess the priorities for the core of the village.

Discussion:

Sue Cook – are we leaving aside land ownership and restrictions?

Nigel – reiterated that progress on the Neighbourhood Plan is advanced because the Parish Council has done a lot of work on land ownership. The key point with the plan is that the policy must be deliverable, and it is a very good idea to bear in mind the wishes of the landowner. He felt that Burneside could benefit from better integration.

Alan – about 10 years ago, we looked at the reallocation of sports facilities, and South Lakeland District Council (SLDC) said that the only development that would be allowed on the western side of the railway would be for community use.

Nigel – we can work together with SLDC but the Neighbourhood Plan can allocate any site.

Chris – last week's meeting was very useful in mentioning a figure of 300 houses, and that did not seem to bother most people.

Nigel – national policy is that we can not suggest fewer houses than SLDC want without going through a lot of difficulty. For more houses, we do not have to carry out demographic surveys, etc. He thought that any houses built would be sold easily. He mentioned that excessive demands, e.g. 10,000 houses and a nuclear power station, would be questioned, but as a general response it would be satisfactory to suggest up to 300 new homes.

David – wanted to concentrate on the essentials:

- Draw the community into the centre;
- How and where for the centre;
- Pub, shop, café, and a place by the river;
- School and children's needs.

He suggested that the centre could be by the old engine sheds.

Tony – asked how to set up the core of the village.

Nigel – the approach could be general, e.g. to protect the character of the selected area and the type of development allowed, through to a mini-master plan with a lot of detail. He thought that we would be more inclined towards the latter. He said that there could be a list of village assets that could be categorised as:

- Remain in place;
- Replaced at their current location;
- Replaced at a different location but better than before.

Sue Cook – thought it would be lovely to have the heart of the village around the river.

Jenny – wanted clarity about who were the people for whom the village was being developed.

Nigel – the only people with a vote are the residents.

Chris – economic growth is vital.

Emma – the village must appeal to incomers.

Chris – asked if we had to make the plans time-based, since people may be deterred from coming if there was knocking down buildings while there was building of new houses.

Nigel – we must state the time that the Neighbourhood Plan covers. As an example of potential problems, we might identify 8 (say) sites for housing, and a developer picks a Greenfield site on the outskirts for development while the centre remains unchanged. Therefore, development should be phased.

Sue Cook – people in the village will have to vote the Neighbourhood Plan into acceptance, so what is in it for them? She agreed that we did not want houses first with no facilities.

Tony – we are not building the houses.

Sue Cook – agreed, but we must ensure that there is something for the existing residents.

Jannice – a Burneside survey in 2014 showed that 94% of people wanted development on brownfield sites.

Nigel – a relevant point, but he reiterated his earlier point in that a plan must be deliverable. He added that the 2014 survey could not form part of the consultation because of its age.

Nigel – several Neighbourhood Plans have fallen foul of other deals being made, e.g. between a farmer and a developer, where lawyers for the latter squeeze down the benefits. He said that there was an opportunity here to work with the landowner and specify that, say, 50 houses can be built only if there are facilities or a contribution to cover them. We should take full advantage of a major landowner being on the Steering Group.

What's in it for me?

David – a better environment, with shops as Staveley has. He said that he visited Staveley in preference to Burneside, and would see people he knows from Burneside when having a coffee in Staveley.

Emma – agreed with having a better environment. She said that when the business was booming, it was hard to get into the Burneside shop.

Nigel – a vibrant shop is local. He asked if, because of uncertainties with the owner's plans, it would become a blank unknown or will it be part of the plan? Should the Neighbourhood Plan provide an alternative elsewhere?

Emma – there is a lack of belief in the village.

Tony – we can create a shop and café ourselves. This could be done in the Neighbourhood Plan but it would have no legality and must be deliverable, so plans would be needed. However, he felt that first we had to identify where the core of the village would be.

Sue Clothier – the core must be safe, so we need to stop lorries going where we do not want them to go.

Jenny – can the Neighbourhood Plan influence traffic?

Nigel – the Neighbourhood Plan can not influence a bypass. It can promote a safe route. The national framework is keen on footpaths, cycleways, and other framework.

Jannice – we have tried to get a footpath on Hollins Lane without success.

Nigel – we can not influence highways, but we can create new rights of way.

Tony – wanted to keep the focus on the location of the centre.

Emma – what about the risk of flooding?

Tony – use "blue sky" thinking. Say where we want the centre and then we look to solve the issues.

Chris – beside the river is possible but he believed that the school site is better.

Tony – we need a compelling reason to relocate the school.

Jannice – it would be difficult to change the use of Millennium Green.

Nigel – in deciding on the core of the village, think integration and connection.

John – in considering any site, it is possible to put into the Neighbourhood Plan that roads can be closed off, and demolishing buildings and structures can be suggested. For example, the area by the river between the shop and Croppers could have the road behind the church closed, and the bridge for connecting to Hall Park Estate could be downstream.

Sue Cook – agreed that we should let go of thoughts about why something could not happen.

Nigel – the constraints are financial. For example, schools can be demolished. The Education Department is keen on new schools, but it all depends on finance.

David – do not forget that the catchment area for the school could increase through developments at High Sparrowmire and elsewhere.

Tony – we will convene the first proper meeting of the Steering Group but we want to take a concrete proposal to it.

David – we seem committed to a riverside attraction.

Nigel – we should look at opportunities along the river.

Tony – we must try to capture more passing trade. If there were brown road signs showing a place of interest, what would it say?

Sue Cook – "Heritage Centre". To some people, the pull of Windermere is Lakeland's big store. Our pull should be the mill.

Tony – a lot of regeneration has been based on heritage.

Summary:

Nigel – two very important aspects:

- People's interests in any areas;
- Consultation. Ensure that the message is that we will listen to anything. He suggested the end of September for consultation, and for ideas to make it an event.

Interests:

Romola – open spaces, habitat, environment, biodiversity;

Sue Clothier – environment and design;

Emma – anything involving younger generation, talking to people;

Alan – desire to remain as a Critical Friend;

John – traffic including footpaths and cycleways;

Jenny – traffic and movement thereof;

Jannice – flexible, so any area;

David – provision of community facilities, flood relief;

Chris – architecture, environment, enthusiasm for change;

Sue Cook – change management, communication.

Further work:

Tony wanted the following to happen:

- Read again Nigel's summary;
- Read these minutes;
- Look at the different styles of Neighbourhood Plans;
- Steering Group to meet, ideally in early August;
- Start to arrange consultations for the end of September

- Develop a skeleton plan.

Final point:

David mentioned that, as chairman of Burnside Parish Council, he had met the new leader of SLDC, Giles Archibald. David said that Giles was very much in favour of what we were doing, and that we have a direct line to him.

The meeting ended at 2125.

John McCurdie
Secretary, Burnside Neighbourhood Plan Team