

Heslington Neighbourhood Plan

Minutes of the Working Group meeting held on 5th December 2016 At the Heslington Village Meeting room

Present: - David Blacketer [DB], Bill McClean [BM], Richard Frost [RF], Niall McTurk [NM], Nick Allen [NA], John Lawton [JL], Ifan Williams [IW].

In attendance – Richard Bramley [RB], Jeffrey Stern [JS].

Apologies were received from Tony Loffill

1. DB welcomed all attendees.
2. **The minutes** of the Working Group [WG] meeting held on 6th July 2016 were approved.
3. **University of York.** JL reported on the meeting which JL, DB and Dave Chetwyn [DC] had held with David Duncan at which the aims and purpose of NPs was explained and the need for the University to consult with the 5000 students and staff on campus. The University had agreed to help with the process and mutual help was agreed.
4. **The application.** BM reported that CYC had approved the application from the PC to develop a Neighbourhood Plan [NP] for the entire parish. There would not be a 6 week general consultation period and the WG could simply get on with it. CYC will be informing local businesses this week. Agreed that the BM would identify businesses not covered by the CYC list and seek to ensure that all interested parties eg: landowners and residents and workers were consulted.
5. **University of York contact.** JL agreed to be the main contact with the University. He would inform them that the Parish Council would be consulting all village and other non-university residents. The UofY to form a sub-working group with a separate form of survey. JL to contact the UofY and be a part of their group. They could nominate somebody to be part of this WG.
6. **Template for the NP.** DC had supplied a draft template for the Heslington NP. This would be useful going forward but agreed that the immediate task was developing the evidence base. Important to get people to respond to the questionnaire and we would need to show how the evidence was obtained. Agreed that a substantial part of the Village Design Statement might be carried through to the NP.
7. **Appointments:**
 - Survey editor – RJF
 - Managing editor – RJF with help from JS and JL
 - University sub-team leader – JL
8. **The survey questionnaire.** RF had revised the survey document following advice from DC. All leading questions had been removed and only strictly planning issues were addressed and the form was simpler but still came to 4 sides of paper. Some questions opened the opportunity for respondents to comment on non-planning issues. There was discussion on possible extra questions and a need to make it look more important so that we might get more responses. Circulation initially would be by hand with a copy per person for each dwelling. Use of twitter and facebook could be considered at a later stage. Completed

forms to a box at Sinclair properties. The questionnaire to be printed in colour. JL would be happy to organise the collating of responses. The responses from the University survey would be collated separately from the resident's survey. RF planned to get this survey document ready for the next PC meeting. An open meeting would be required at some stage in the process.

8. **Other stakeholders to consult.** DB, WM and JL to liaise regarding the other stakeholders to be consulted. BM to find out what information is being sent out by CYC as standard practice. Is there a time limit for responses?
9. **Policy mapping workshop.** Agreed that this is needed after survey results are in. Also important to find out what issues the PC, the Village Trust and the Heslington Church and similar bodies wish to be included. CYC may help with policies.
10. **Consultant involvement.** Agreed that DC should be involved in the meeting with UofY and in policy making session
11. **CYC help available.** Agreed that DB and BM would meet with Rebecca Harrison at CYC to discuss this and to include possible use of the electoral roll. Thought that Martin Grainger would be too busy.
12. **Duration of the Plan.** 15 years is thought to be a normal duration for these plans and the WG supported that. There needs to be structured statement for review periods. Thought that reviews should be undertaken by the PC every 5 years or at such shorter period as is triggered by a major event or change in planning laws as directed by the PC.
13. **Date of next meeting.** BM to circulate members to fix a date in January or early February.