**Chidham Hambrook Nutbourne East**

**Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group**

**7th March 2022 via Zoom Videoconferencing**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Philip MacDougall (Chair), Stephen Johnson, Keith Dimon, Jane Towers, Andrew Sargent, Sue Bramwell-Smith, Jon Keynes, Bruce Garrett.

**Honorary Secretary**: Lisa Wilcock.

*Meeting commenced at 1930hrs*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 288/22 | **Apologies**None. |  |
| 289/22 | **Declarations of Interest**None |  |
| 290/22 | **Approval of minutes of the meeting held on 7th February 2022.**Approved. Noted that the letter to CDC which was approved by Troy Planning was sent from the Clerk of the Parish Council rather than this group.  |  |
| 291/22 | **Matters from mins that are not on the agenda**Nothing to report.  |  |
| 292/22 | **Opening remarks by Chair**It is with deep sadness that the Chair announced the loss of Andy Collins in the past few days. The Chair spoke about his immense support not only within this group but the Parish Council and the Parish as a whole including residents’ groups and of course as District Councillor at CDC. The Group’s thoughts are with his family. |  |
| 293/22 | **Matters not on the agenda that the Chair considers need to be added at short notice.**Nothing to report. |  |
| 294/22 | **Housing Numbers**Matt Hancock MP put a question to Michael Gove MP indicated that the housing numbers are not fixed in stone. As follows taken on 7th March 2021:*[Matt Hancock](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4070)**[(West Suffolk) (Con)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4070)**Will the Secretary of State confirm that when it comes to local plans the idea that we need exactly the same proportion of extra housing in every part of every council area is wrong, and instead the different needs of different communities, as in my constituency in Haverhill, Brandon and Newmarket, can be treated differently, not with a one-size-fits-all approach?**[Michael Gove](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1571)**Yes, 100%, spot-on, totally correct.*The group feel that this is an opportunity to ask questions and to push back on the allocation number. Does this mean that certain criteria mean they are an exception? Does it cover all areas? Why would one area not have a set number and another would be different? The group **agreed** to write to Gillian Keegan MP and cc Michael Gove MP. The letter should come from the Parish Council. **Action** AS to send a draft letter to the Clerk of the Parish Council for its approval by the Parish Council before it is sent out. | AS/BJ |
| 295/22 | **Questionnaire Returns**All responses received and entered on to a database. Name, email and responses to questions and comments that were made have been put together. Estimated there are about 162 questionnaire returns. Noted that there were 166 back but some were blank . KD gave an overview of the questionnaire feedback. A small group will assist KD is extrapolating the comments under themes to produce analysis. All information will go back to the Clerk of the Parish Council and KD will facilitate this. There are about 1700 on the electoral register so there has been just under a 10% return. KD to speak to the Clerk of the Parish Council to check that there are not more email Reponses to go into the shared folder, JT to pass the last few questionnaires to KD. **Action** KD to speak to the Clerk of the Parish Council. | KD |
| 296/21 | **Policy Document**Update was given to the group by SJ but the document is subject to anything that may come out of the Questionnaire consultation process. Noted that once the information from the questionnaire is ready then the group need to check to make sure the policy document is correct.  |  |
| 297/10 | **AOB**KD asked if Troy Planning commented on the letter to CDC, it was confirmed that he said it was fine and the letter was sent to CDC but the group still have not received a response. **Action** Clerk of the Parish Council to follow it up.The question was asked if a site recently had planning rejected on it whether that piece of land could still be considered as part of the NP process. It was suggested that even if planning was rejected on a piece of land the NP may have a different allocation for the land that is more suitable and therefore the piece of land can still be considered. | BJ |
| 289/10 | **Date of next meeting Monday 11th April 2022 to cover the questionnaire and the comments.**  |  |

*Meeting closed 2055 hrs*