

Eaton Neighbourhood Plan

Meeting Minutes



Date:	Tues 13 th September 2016 – 20:15
Location:	Plough Inn – Eaton village
Attendees:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Tamsin MaCormack (TM) ➤ John Bradburn (JB) ➤ Andy Mitchell (AM) ➤ John Goodwin (JG) ➤ Neil Thorpe (NT)
Apologies:	➤ Steve Waltho (SW)
Invited guest(s)	➤ Tom Evans (TE) – Cheshire East Neighbourhood Planning Manager
Minutes completed by:	Neil Thorpe

Agenda item	Points discussed
Welcome	The group welcomed Tom to the meeting and thanked him for his time and commitment to our Plan. Briefly introductions were made by all group members.
Feedback from Tom Evans	<p>TE provided a good background to the whole procedure including that the Neighbourhood Plan process is the best mechanism for supporting the overall planning process on a local level, and that it supports the Local Plan from Cheshire East. TE advised that he could either be 'hands-on' in terms of being an active participant within the Eaton plan or that he could purely act as a support role. He will attend a minimum of 6 core meetings and will help us to set objectives and policies for our Plan. TE advised that there is a regular Wednesday 'drop-in' event where he can further support us, as well as through remote communication channels, particularly at: tom.evans@cheshireeast.gov.uk</p> <p>National funding is a priority for all Planning groups and there is potentially up to £9000 from central Government, as well as potentially some from Cheshire East.</p> <p>ACTION: Tom to send the link for relevant pages on the DCLG website so that all Eaton Plan members can then research this further.</p> <p>TE further advised that there are 3 main considerations we need to understand and plan around:</p>

1. Housing Needs Advice – this will notify of recent demographic development and ultimately suggest an intended housing requirement for our Plan area. This could help going forward, although our Plan is certainly not a guarantee that all development will be stopped.
2. Spatial mapping – we need to understand the local area especially on open spaces and its usage. This is important as we may be able to evidence areas within the Plan where considerations need to be documented.
3. Our Timeframe for our Plan – we were advised to progress as swiftly as is practical so that we can action against any potential local development and strategic site allocations that may be impending. We need to understand that until we reach stage 14 (Draft Plan submission) then we have no formal say or stance within any formal planning application that may arise within our Plan area.

ACTION: Tom to forward recommended organisations that could provide a consultancy landscaping service, particularly focussing on the School Lane and its adjoining spaces.

JB showcased TE our current Project Planning tool and fed back that this was a positive and professional mechanism to provide structure to our work.

TE suggested the next steps should be:

- Issue a questionnaire to the residents and collate feedback
- Hold an initial engagement event with such residents
- Promote the whole process through regular advertising, either using resources or through our website
- Think of maybe 'special interest' groups that could provide an interesting perspective on the area – such groups as children or agricultural workers have been used by others and this can be effective
- Keep communication relevant and timely to all stakeholders – people need to know and understand to be fully engaged
- Hold a subsequent event around 6 months later to update the residents and again re-engage with them.

It was clarified at this point that a 'stakeholder' within this context is someone that contributes to the Plan area (i.e. a resident or a worker). It was also identified that only adults on the electoral register will ultimately have a vote within any formal system within the Plan process. Both these points were previously unclear.

Tom further offered to attend at a subsequent meeting before Xmas where he suggested that we should have a structure to include:

- Any environment concerns

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strength of the community • Areas within the Plan that are potential for development <p>We would also need to consider putting these points into a 'Vision' for the future and then set objectives on how to achieve this vision, including potential policies to support this.</p> <p>This was then agreed for Tom to kindly attend on Tuesday October 11th as Tom was on annual leave for our next planned meeting on September 27th.</p> <p>Tom advised that the counties of Hereford and Wiltshire have similar profiles to ours and it may be beneficial to gain an understanding of village applications and Plans in these areas to identify best practice.</p> <p>ACTION: <i>all Eaton Plan members to research this further.</i></p> <p>Tom informed the group that as part of the Cheshire East overall Plan there are around 1250 households to be allocated in rural locations across the area. Each village is then proportionally divided.</p> <p>ACTION: <i>Tom to confirm how this is calculated proportionally and feedback so that we have a clearer picture.</i></p>
<p>The new Congleton Ring Road/ Havannah & Buglawton</p>	<p>Various discussions were made throughout the meeting regarding the impending Congleton ring road, as it will probably bisect our area to the south if the current proposals materialise. TE advised that we could use this as a positive as we could promote the need to retain the green space between the Eaton village and the prospective new road, thus using the road as a 'boundary' or 'barrier' to keep the 2 areas separate.</p> <p>There was a lengthy discussion around whether or not the recent housing developments in Havannah and Buglawton would be treated as being part of the boundary of Eaton (as it strictly is within the parish of Eaton) or whether it would be considered to be a development within Congleton itself. This is a point of focus for the group and both the group and Tom debated this for a while. Tom suggested that it may come under the remit of Congleton however the group informed Tom that this was not their understanding of this from previous relevant correspondence.</p> <p>ACTION: <i>Tom to confirm how Cheshire East would consider this point and for Tamsin to liaise with the Parish Council and local Ward councillor to gain feedback and clarification.</i></p>
<p>Data for the Plan and Questionnaire</p>	<p>TE advised that any data regarding any aspect of our Plan such as gender/ethnicity/etc. is accessible online and should not be a major challenge to assemble, and that he is happy to provide support and</p>

	<p>guidance on how this is obtained. This can be sourced using 'neighbourhood statistics' as a search mechanism on the internet. TE commented it would be interesting to compare the 2001 data with the more recent 2011 information for our area, and for this to be a feature within our Plan.</p> <p>In terms of collating direct responses through the questionnaire TE fed back that historically he finds that personal door-to-door communication and issuing of a hard copy questionnaire is the most successful. He pointed out that a subsequent collection service is also beneficial to guarantee responses as opposed to waiting for residents to reply without a prompt. There are templates for such a questionnaire available on the Cheshire East website.</p> <p>ACTION: <i>Tom to send an exemplar so that we can gain an understanding of format and content.</i></p> <p>TE informed the group that there is no general minimum % response rate required for the Pan to succeed – however did stress that it did require around 50% of the responses to be positive in order for the Plan to be considered a viable opinion of the stakeholders as a whole.</p>
Areas of 'non-development'	<p>TE asked us to consider the parts of the Eaton area where potentially we could evidence that development needed to be avoided at all costs, such as any public footpaths and also public vantage points. These are very useful and persuasive within a Plan to highlight areas of natural beauty and interest that could not be developed. He also asked us to consider any heritage sites within our area.</p> <p>The topic of the existing Tarmac owned sand quarry was discussed and TE suggested that we definitely should make this a feature of the Plan, highlighting any suggestions of potential usage and recommendations. He stated that we could have a large say in how this site is vacated when the time arises.</p> <p>We then thanked Tom for his valuable time before we reconvened the meeting.</p>
Advertising	<p>It was agreed that we need to promote the Plan more forcefully and therefore Tamsin will write a short update for the local Parish magazine that will ultimately be delivered to all homes within the area.</p> <p>ACTION: <i>Tamsin to write a short text and send across for inclusion in the next edition of the Parish magazine.</i></p> <p>It was further agreed that we needed to amend the previous version of the flyer before we thought about sending it to all Parish residents so that it</p>

	<p>more fairly reflected the parish as a whole. We have now sourced some appropriate images via local resident Liz Mitchell.</p> <p>It was agreed that there is still an ongoing issue with the hosting rights of the Eaton website. If no resolution can be found very soon then it was decided that John Goodwin would kindly set-up a new site where we can have full control and accessibility, both for the Eaton Plan but also for the Parish Council and other relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>ACTION: <i>John Goodwin to research and to implement a new site once confirmation has been agreed at next meeting.</i></p>
Date of next meeting	Tuesday 27 th September 2016 – 8:15pm at the Plough, Eaton.