

# Diss & District Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

## MINUTES OF A MEETING

held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> December 2020

at 7.30pm online

Highlighted Dropbox links to documents referenced in these minutes can be accessed by SG representatives only.

### Present:

David Burn (Chairman), Eric Taylor (Diss), Roger Greenacre (Stuston), Alison Wakeham (Burston & Shimpling), Paul Curson, Jane Jennifer and Trevor Ault (Roydon), Rebecca Dingle (Palgrave), Roger Broughton (Brome & Oakley), Graham Moore & Dola Ward (Scole), Louise Cornell & Mark Thompson (CCP consultancy), Dave Poulter (Project Manager), Stephanie Ayden (Project Officer), Mark Heazle (Leisure Business Development Manager, South Norfolk Council).

### 1 Chairman's opening remarks and formalities

- 1.1 Welcomed the Group and opened the meeting.
- 1.2 Stephanie Ayden volunteered as note-taker.

### 2 Apologies and introductions;

- 2.1 Apologies were received and accepted from Sharon Cousins Clarke (Palgrave), Simon Olander (Diss), Ursula Halton (Brome & Oakley) and Steve Leigh (Stuston).
- 2.2 Rebecca (Bec) Dingle was introduced as the new representative for Palgrave and was welcomed to the session. It was confirmed that Neil Weston had stepped down as representative for Palgrave.

### 3 Minutes of previous meeting:

- 3.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 16-Nov-20 were agreed unanimously. **Action: DB** to pass approved PDF to Project Officer for publication to [www.ddnp.info](http://www.ddnp.info) **COMPLETED**
- 3.2 Matters Arising:
  - 3.2.1 *MINUTE 3.2.2*: LC confirmed she was satisfied with info received regarding the cycling map.  
**Action:** LC would liaise specifically with Roydon reps in due course. Regarding the Frenze SSSI, LC had not been able to see it on any national databases.  
**Action:** GM would check back with CM. Regarding the ecological network, LC confirmed all parishes had contributed to the Claylands Project.  
<https://www.norfolkwildlifetrust.org.uk/gallery/interests/a-living-landscape/claylands>
  - 3.2.2 *MINUTE 3.2.3*: Meeting with key SNC and MSDC members and officers:  
**Action:** DB/DP/LC to pick this up outside the meeting.
  - 3.2.3 *MINUTE 3.2.5*: Palgrave Parish Report: SA confirmed the Palgrave parish report on first DDNP consultation has been approved by SCC and uploaded to the [www.ddnp.info](http://www.ddnp.info) site

4 **Declaration of interest:** none declared.

5 **AOB** none requested.

### 6 Future leisure provision in Diss – Mark Heazle (Leisure Business Development Manager, SNC)

- 6.1 MH outlined the context of the leisure facilities provision by SNC, which is the only council that manages its own facilities inhouse. To date, around £9 million has been

invested in their four other leisure centres (Wymondham, Long Stratton, Ketts Park and Framingham Earl).

- 6.2 Diss Leisure Centre, formerly an outdoor lido, was expensive to run and had been subsidised by the council. Options had been explored to identify what facilities were needed in the area, and what the alternative site options were. Consultations had taken place with local partners including Diss Town Council and Norfolk Constabulary with a view to creating a Community Hub on a single site.
- 6.3 Other sites that had been considered were the Diss High School site, Shelfanger Road Sports Ground, and south of Victoria Road. No site was 100% perfect, but the High School was considered the preferred option, as the other sites were too small.
- 6.4 Given the impact of Covid-19 on the income lost due to having to close these leisure centres, the Council would take stock in the New Year. There may well be a funding gap, which would inevitably impact on the options available for leisure provision in Diss, post-Covid.
- 6.5 It was confirmed that MSDC had been contacted about this review of Diss leisure provision, but not recently. They outsourced management of their leisure facilities.
- 6.6 It was possible that a solution involving more than a single site could be found, but to date no other possible sites have been identified.
- 6.7 With regards to the timetable to explore options for the area, it was confirmed by MH that whilst it wasn't yet possible to ascertain the losses incurred by the closure of their leisure centres, and the subsequent impact on funding available, Diss was 'next on the list' for a review.
- 6.8 It was agreed that, given the DDNP has currently got the green light for development from the AECOM site assessment report, and the need to know how realistic the plans to allocate housing on the Leisure Centre site in the DDNP are (in terms of its availability), that MH would work with CCP to draft a suitable section for the DDNP.  
**Action:** LC to update the current Plan's text regarding this issue and send it to MH.
- 6.9 After DB thanked him for his interesting and comprehensive report MH then left the meeting.

## 7 Amending the draft Plan: verbal update (LC)

- 7.1 LC confirmed that there were four key strategic elements to the Plan:
  - Growth
  - Infrastructure
  - Regeneration
  - Protective Policies
- 7.2 There was now a need to review the fundamentals and to consider how these four elements 'hang together' as a coherent Plan.
- 7.3 A timetable for this steering group-led review had been broken down into sections and circulated to the group prior to the meeting. **Dropbox document link.**
- 7.4 With regard to deciding the final list of assets, it was now time to pin down evidence that would be scrutinised by the examiner. What is each asset's justification for inclusion, particularly the Local Green Spaces?
- 7.5 RD queried about assessing Palgrave's assets.  
**Action:** SA to send her the templates used to justify views/LGS/NDHAs.

## 8 AECOM report update

- 8.1 ET updated the steering group on the latest version of the site assessment report. In light of GNLP emerging policies it was noted that sites that had been previously rated as suitable were now unsuitable, or vice versa.

## 9 Project Management Team update

- 9.1 DP confirmed a report had been forwarded to DB for later circulation. The project was on programme, and the SEA Screening Assessment had been completed and sent to SNC. The first draft of the Plan had been written.
- 9.2 Work on applying for further Locality grant funding was in hand, and the end-of-grant report for the second grant (received mid-2020) had been signed off and submitted. The Plan is eligible, as things currently stand, for £28k funding, and so far just under £16k has been spent. It was anticipated that a further £3,500 would be required to take the project to the Reg 14 consultation stage anticipated for next year.
- 9.3 The option to apply a tax-base pro-rata approach to generating a further £5,000 contribution by each parish for work that cannot be paid for from the Locality grant was outlined as an equitable solution to raising further funds. To achieve this total the following amounts had been calculated, based on each parish's proportion of the NP area's overall tax base:

• Diss	£2,800
• Roydon	£ 900
• Scole	£ 500
• Palgrave	£ 400
• Burston & Shimpling	£ 200
• Brome & Oakley	<u>£ 200</u>
	<b>£5,000</b>

Whilst it was acknowledged that some parishes have already contributed, it was agreed, for the sake of simplicity, to disregard this as we move forward to the next stage of works. It was therefore proposed that each parish should be asked to contribute an amount, as above. This was unanimously agreed all reps present, subject to parish council approval.

**Action:** All reps to notify the clerks that the parish councils should consider this at their imminent precept-setting discussions.

- 9.4 **Frontier site allocation:** This will now be an allocation in the GNLP rather than the DDNP. Initially the GNLP wanted 200 dwelling units on the site, which was considerably in excess of the number planned in the DDNP. In discussion with DTC the GNLP officers have now agreed to reduce the number to 150. This was seen a good outcome in light of the GNLP's starting figure. The site will remain a GNLP allocation, however, which means that the Diss-with-Roydon housing requirement for the neighbourhood plan is reduced to a minimum of 250 units

## 10 Project officer update

- 10.1 The results report of the second consultation had been drafted. **Dropbox document link**. A total of 531 responses had been received.

**Action:** SA will circulate it to the reps after the meeting for their input prior to being published online and shared with parish councils.

- 10.2 Dropbox would be trialled as a way of circulating links to documents for reps to download and edit sections of the Plan.

- 10.3 The need for protocols for collecting/collating/actioning amendments to the Plan and its supporting documents was discussed.

**10.4 Action:** SA to circulate guidance on how to ensure this process is managed. **[completed], [Dropbox document link](#)**

## 11 Publicity and Communication:

**11.1** The need to ramp up awareness of the DDNP by hooking it into local issues and interests was now of particular importance. Whilst Facebook advertising had boosted visits to the site and the second survey link, there was a need to 'start the conversation' at local levels. It was suggested that local issues that are addressed in the Plan can be highlighted, along with information on the Claylands project and the Ecological Network corridors. **Action:** All SG reps should consider this and share any ideas with SA.

## 12 Steering Group reps section

### 12.1 Diss [DP/ED]

Should the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) be completed by AECOM? This was agreed as a decision to be taken outside the meeting, and would have an impact on the timeframes already specified. ([click here to view the timeline PDF on Dropbox](#))

**Action:** DP/ET to discuss

### 12.2 Scale [GM/DW]

There were challenges to engaging the local community, and what people cared about was out of scope of the plan. A letter illustrating this point that had been received from a resident would be forwarded to the Project Management Group (LC/MT/SA/DP/DB) for information.

### 12.3 Roydon [PC/JJ/TA]

The reps had been boosting their efforts to engage with the local community but there were still misunderstandings and apathy. Guidance was requested with regards to understanding what it means in material terms to owners of NDHAs if their properties are included. It was clarified that the Plan would include policies to protect the settings of NDHAs but there would be no requirement for the owners [of such assets] to do anything.

### 12.4 Burston & Shimpling [AW]

It was confirmed that the parish conservation area has been defined, but no appraisal report is available as yet.

### 12.5 Palgrave [BD]

BD acknowledged the complexities inherent in developing the Plan, but is keen to raise awareness and support in the parish.

### 12.6 Stuston [RG]

No comments to add.

### 12.7 Brome & Oakley [RB]

The next parish council meeting will be on 11<sup>th</sup> January; an extension of the deadline to give feedback would be needed in light of this

## 13 Correspondence (DB)

**13.1** No correspondence requiring discussion at the meeting had been received.

**The next meeting was confirmed as 18<sup>th</sup> January 2021.**

**The meeting ended at 9.35pm.**



18 January 2021