

Title of Meeting: Ivinghoe Neighbourhood Development Plan Subgroup meeting to review and agree proposals by Jenny Lampert Associates and to consider comments submitted from steering group	
Date:	01/04/2015
Time:	7.30pm
Location:	Crabtree Farmhouse, Ivinghoe Aston
Attendees:	Andrew Kinsey (AK), Pat Roach (PR), Sheena Bexson (SB), Bob Corn (BC), Stephen Booth (SJB)
Apologies:	None
Distribution:	Ivinghoe Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group
Next Meeting:	Steering Group Meeting 20 ^h April 2015, 7.30pm Location: The Hub, Ivinghoe

Ref		Actions
1.1	This meeting was arranged following a presentation to the Steering group on 28 th March 2015 at Ivinghoe Aston Village Hall by Jenny Lampert, at which it was agreed feedback would be provided by email to a subgroup who would meet to consider the feedback and review the proposals to develop a recommendation on the way forward.	
1.2	The meeting opened by reviewing comments received by email on the proposal made by Steering Group members. Comments on the proposal reviewed were received from Christabel Boersma, Malcolm Stubbs and Stephen Booth. In summary all who commented and those who attended the subgroup meeting were generally in favour of the proposals in using consultants to help guide the process and the stepped approach to proposed support.	
1.3	Available grants were briefly discussed. It was previously agreed at the meeting on 28 th March that Sue Jobbins (associate of Jenny Lampert) would attend the Steering Group meeting on 20 th April to review and support a grant application. It is understood that to be successful it may be preferable to apply in 2 tranches rather than a total figure of around £8k. However further advice from Sue Jobbins would be sought during the meeting on 20 th April.	
1.4	The proposal document was then reviewed and discussed in detail. A copy of this document and the outline grant application summary example from Sue Jobbins was posted on the Dropbox for reference (Jenny Lampert EOI subfolder) A summary of the discussion is provided below together with additional questions to be posed to Sue Jobbins during the next Steering Group Meeting on 20 th April. Although the proposal was well received, clearly it had been written without full knowledge of our current progress. This is not intended as a criticism of the proposal, however included in the discussions summarised below were suggestions for how the proposal should be amended to reflect this.	

Ref		Actions
1.5	<p>Item A – Project Management</p> <p>Generally it was felt most of these services would be required. However the fee (£2,800) would likely cover more than a year. Since the scope of the grant application will only cover 1 year this needs to be apportioned somewhat.</p> <p>In terms of the specific items noted,</p> <p>Liasion with LPA will be carried out by the steering group members (with an initial meeting already planned for 21st April), so this would not be needed.</p> <p>The inception meeting with the Parish Council was deemed not to be required, as the plan area is already approved and the steering group have commenced work.</p> <p>Remote support as a retained advisor on policy and compliance issues was considered important and required.</p> <p>The single day workshop to review the project plan to date was felt to be slightly excessive. Instead it was proposed we should provide our current plan for remote review/comment followed up with attendance at a steering group meeting to complete follow up.</p> <p>In total in terms of budget for Year 1, it was suggested the above should amount to £1k</p>	
1.6	<p>Item B – Consultation and Engagement Support</p> <p>The outline fees for this amounted to £3,800. Again, some items could be amended, and the costs considered for year 1 activities only.</p> <p>The steering group have already done some work. It was agreed we would write up notes from our visioning workshop which could then be provided for their review which may avoid the need for consultation workshop.</p> <p>It was agreed that guidance and agreement with Sue Jobbins was needed with regard to reducing some of these fees, by avoiding the need to do some of the work or rescoping of aspects of the proposals.</p> <p>The writing of a consultation statement was agreed as an essential activity.</p> <p>Consultation events and a draft questionnaire have already been planned. Instead of designing these items, instead it was suggested it would be better for them to review and comment and make suggestions on our work to date to refine them, rather than start from scratch.</p> <p>In total in terms of budget for Year 1, it was suggested the above could therefore be cut to £2,800</p>	

Ref		Actions
1.7	<p>Item C – Establishing the Baseline Evidence & Policy Review</p> <p>It was felt the proposed activities for establishing baseline evidence require further explanation to determine extent and scope of support needed.</p> <p>It was agreed the policy review was needed and recommended this is undertaken as soon as possible. A question for Jenny Lampert is can this activity be done now?</p> <p>In terms of budget for Year 1, therefore the fee for the policy review of £800 should be included.</p>	
1.8	<p>Item D – Identification of Objectives and Options</p> <p>The potential for the group to do some or all of this ourselves was discussed and there were different views as to whether this was possible/desireable.</p> <p>If the group could do some or all of this work, then this could be re-scoped to a review.</p> <p>I was suggested that this item could be deferred until a later point, and potentially included in a later grant application (post year 1).</p> <p>Therefore in terms of budget for Year 1, it was recommended no allowance is made at present.</p>	
1.9	<p>Item E – Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>It was uncertain whether this would be needed or not, and as a specialist item a fee was not included in the quote.</p> <p>The requirement for this will be explored/considered further at the meeting with David Broadley (AVDC) on 21st April to be attended by Sheena Bexson and Andrew Kinsey.</p>	SB, AK
1.10	<p>Item F – Plan/Policy Drafting</p> <p>Whilst it was recognised this activity would be needed. It was also agreed it was not likely to be an activity for year 1. Potentially this could be initiated by SB and other steering group members with review / comments from Jenny Lampert Associates.</p> <p>Therefore in terms of budget for year 1, it was recommended no allowance is made at present.</p>	
1.11	<p>Additional items</p> <p>In addition to the above items it was also suggested additional budget would be required and should be included in a grant application to cover admin issues such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Printing (the budget cost for black and white printing at 15p/sheet was considered on the high side, and as an alternative we may suggest materials are provided electronically for local printing) • Room / Hall Hire (approx. £16 per evening event), and a number of day long events for consultations. • Procurement of display boards (one off), training, refreshments etc <p>A budget figure of £2,000</p>	

Ref		Actions
1.12	<p data-bbox="256 248 675 280">Summary – Grant Application</p> <p data-bbox="256 320 1257 418">In total the grant application was considered should cover £4,600 in fees for the identified tasks for Jenny Lampert Associates Ltd, and £2,000 for admin items identified, and in addition expenses of Jenny Lampert Associates.</p> <p data-bbox="256 454 1289 521">In addition to the above it was recommended a contingency of £1,400 is added for unforeseen additional support requirements to a total of £8,000</p> <p data-bbox="256 557 1273 656">The above will be discussed with Sue Jobbins with a view to developing and applying for the grant funding and formally approved by the Steering Group at the next meeting.</p> <p data-bbox="256 692 1257 759">VAT was also briefly discussed. This would be payable on some elements of the proposals, however may be reclaimed by the Parish Council.</p>	