

## Minutes of Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan Community Theme Group 23rd July 2013

Attendees: Jackie Grant, Ruth Heelan, John Southgate, Clare Stent, Alice Smith.

Apologies: Robert Hayes.

1. The **state of the parish report** this is being done, the timetable was that it was to be presented to SG on July 8<sup>th</sup> so this has obviously slipped. Is it with Robert now? We understand the approval mechanism set in place for Parish Council approval but assume the report will be presented to the SG on Aug 5<sup>th</sup>.
2. The **Schools** were discussed. John has met with the heads of all 3 schools and it is clear that with 350 houses we can expect at least 100 more children in the parish – quite possibly a lot more. All schools are at capacity already. We await the CDC paper on community infrastructure levy, but assume that we will need to ask for developer funds to assist each of the schools in building extra classrooms. We do not know what the catchment areas are for each of the schools, and whether we currently take kid from outside of catchment or only from within catchment, but it is clear that due to the popularity of all the schools, that in some cases children come from some distance to attend the schools. John has agreed with the Bourne that the N/plan will be covered by the students. Alice has mentioned this to the junior's head who is agreeable to the children covering this as a project. Alice will ask Communications group for suitable material to pass onto the school. The schools discussed the option to change to academies but at present all wish to remain as mainstream schools, this means that WSCC has to plan for any expansion required. WSCC may negotiate infrastructure levies with developers.
3. **Permanent display at Southbourne Club** – we had thought that the boards were going to stay up on permanent display at Southbourne club but they are in the back room at Age Concern.
4. **Neighbourhood Plan Document** the group discussed this – will Neil Homer write it? Can we write it? Are we happy with how this is being prepared? How much control will we have over editing it (i.e. does the time frame allow time for revisions and input by/from the SG and the focus groups)? We can ask at the SG meeting on August 5<sup>th</sup>.
5. **Developers** were discussed – why do they need to be involved in the production of the neighbourhood plan? We need to ensure we keep them at arm's length at all times. It may be that some of the developers may have already commissions some studies that may provide useful facts however we are not confident that such data may not have been manipulated in order to make each developer's site the most attractive so is not as good as independent reports/studies. We can ask at the SG meeting on August 5<sup>th</sup>.
6. **The Housing Matrix** was discussed – this is being created by the Housing group – we would like to see this and add relevant information to it, and imagine that useful information re each site can be added by the other groups, Transport, Environment, Heritage and so on. We can ask for this at the SG meeting on August 5<sup>th</sup>.
7. **The Timetable** was discussed – we need to keep on top of all dates but are concerned that AiRS/rCOH are not delivering things at the agreed times.
8. **The Housing Matrix** was discussed – this is being created by the Housing group – we would like to see this and add relevant information to it, and imagine that useful information re each site can be added by the other groups, Transport, Environment, Heritage and so on. We can ask for this at the SG meeting on August 5<sup>th</sup>.
9. **Recreational space** was discussed – this is seen by this group as the second most important item requiring infrastructure levy funds, and needs to be included in any requests for funding. Depending on where development is planned, we can assess what and where recreational space should be sited.
10. **Figures** we are concerned that rCOH insist on referring to capacity figures that actually represent nothing – i.e. the SHLAA total figures do not represent a possible development figure and should not be used in any communication. We are concerned that Neil keeps going back to these figures. The figure set by CDC is 350 and that is the figure we should be writing a Neighbourhood Plan for, however it is clear that any development is dependent on the necessary infrastructure being in place PRIOR to any approval or building.
11. John fed back from the last **Steering Group meeting**, minutes are available [here](#)
12. A **50 word statement** was discussed and a final version was agreed. **ACTION John**, to finalise statement and send to communication group.
13. The **website** was discussed, please can this team keep an eye on [our page](#) (link) and advise if there are things you would like added.
14. The **next meeting** is yet to be set.