

## **MODBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN MEETING**

### **Minutes of the Meeting held on**

**Wednesday, April 6<sup>th</sup> 2016 8.15 pm at the Exeter Inn**

**Present:** Ann Turner (AT, chair), John Sullivan, Chris Barnes, Lynne Barnes, Barry White, Charlotte Rathbone, Mark Lawrence, Phil Jolly (PJ, treasurer), Mark Trewin (minutes).

In attendance: Phil Baker (BP), SHDC NP Link Officer, and Alan Storah, SHDC.

**Apologies:** Brian Weeks, Roy Sims, Alison Wood, Dan Turner, Tim Bevan, Andy Rathbone, Burda Gage, Phil Smith.

### **1. Matters Arising**

BW to pass on additions to draft minutes of previous meeting.

JS to provide details of potential BT contact regarding broadband issues.

The issue of how costs incurred by focus groups would be met was, in the event, addressed later in meeting (see below, **2.1** and **5**).

AT was awaiting response from Mary Talbot-Rosevear regarding contact with farming community.

There was a question as to whether Bloor Homes have any statistics etc. regarding social demographics. PB responded that housing mix too dynamic to predict, but they would have good idea of local target market, e.g. very different from Salcombe.

AT had already contacted Loddiswell Parish Council, and suggested that Modbury PC also make a direct approach to Bloor.

### **2. Question session with Phil Baker, NP Link Officer, and**

This session was the principal focus of the meeting.

PB outlined his role as NP Link Officer and clarified some points in response to questions: He introduced Alan Storah who will be available to provide advice and support now that PB is required to spend most of his time working on the SHDC Locality Plan.

#### *2.1 Process, Policy and Funding:*

- The Link Officer (LO) has a statutory responsibility to respond to queries and provide guidance, in particular with policy writing;
- PB has been sent minutes etc. of Modbury NP meetings to date, and it is acceptable for the NP group to send any documentation it wishes;

- The LO faces growing demand from numerous NPs as the deadline for Local Plan submission to government January 2017 approaches; SHDC is to draft this in October 2016; whilst there is no requirement to submit NPs in advance of this, they should be in line with local planning, so on-going contact between NP group and LO is advised;
- Approaches taken by individual NPs can be very different and have very different needs, but it must be local and evidence-based, yet within the national planning framework.
- the NP project plan should outline key phases of the proposed activity to keep on track;

*Action: PB can send examples.*

- Advised that community questionnaires be done early to identify broad policy areas and tasks; timing of community engagement is crucial;
- Ideas are to be community-sourced, though sharing of information and practice with other NPs could be helpful (but note some have paid for consultancy advice);
- funding for NP activities (including any consultancy costs) is limited, e.g. by a *six-month claim period (noted below, 5)*; small “chunks” of work are recommended.

## 2.2 Housing

Regarding local concerns and sensitivities about future housing developments, PB responded:

- there is no “top-down” allocation of figures: the purpose of NPs is to justify and evidence its vision of what it can deliver;
- PB noted that NP draft plans of Ivybridge and Ugborough which had given no figures are a “missed opportunity” whilst South Milton had suggested figures “beyond expectations”;
- Questioned on what such expectations were, PB responded that there was a methodology for testing and validating the evidence provided.

## 2.3 Landscape / Environment

Regarding questioning about the type, scope and cost of survey work:

- Any proposed surveys should be at a level appropriate to the intended purpose, and within policy frameworks;
- They should be costed within budget, and not commit funds unnecessarily.

## 2.4 Roads

- These are the responsibility of the Highways Agency, not SHDC, and have a statutory duty to address issues;
- Concerns will be only be assessed on a metrics basis, but it is within our rights to make a case to DCC.

In sum, PB stressed the statutory requirement for recognition of NPs within the planning framework. AT thanked PB and AS.

*Action: send discussion points to Link Officer for feedback as arise.*

### **3. Housing Focus Group**

The forthcoming open meeting on Saturday 9<sup>th</sup> April in the Memorial Hall had so far elicited low levels of interest, and it was suggested that the event might be cancelled or postponed.

AT stressed the value of the preparatory work (focussing on initiatives, insights from Teignbridge meeting, etc.) which could be rolled over to the May Fair stall, Messenger publicity, etc. It was resolved to go ahead as planned.

### **4. Planning for May Fair**

AT reported that a stall at this event had been booked and was a great opportunity for broad exposure of NP initiatives across the focus groups, and for gathering feedback.

The availability and roles of individuals was established.

Regarding plans for sustaining and building upon this impact, AT identified the Post Office, Modbury Court, and the Parish Office as possible locations for further publicity and activity.

### **5. Treasurer's Report**

PJ reported that the current balance was £740.28, of which £500 had been granted by Modbury Parish Council. There had been no expenditure since April 1<sup>st</sup>.

In view of discussions earlier in this meeting (1, 2.1), PJ urged for requests and claims for spending to observe the six-month limit.

### **6. AOB**

A request from MARS had been made to be represented at the NP May Fair stand regarding pedestrian access, etc. This was agreed in principle, subject to the focus and brief envisaged for this event.

AT asked for anything to be forwarded to the Link Officer to be sent to her.

### **7. Date of next meeting: Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> May, 2016. 8.15 pm.**