

MODBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP (MNPG)

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 28th September 2016 8 pm in the meeting room at the Memorial Hall.

Present:

Ann Turner (AT) Chair

Charlotte Kendrick (CK) Questionnaire logistics of distribution

Sue Rogers (SR) Questionnaire logistics of distribution

Charlotte Rathbone (CR) Housing and Landscape Groups,

Andy Rathbone (AR) Environment/ Landscape Group and Sustainability group,

Burda Gage (BG) Housing and Transport groups,

Phil Jolly (PJ) Treasurer,

Jon Sullivan (JS) Housing and Planning Group and Employment and Business group,

Phil Smith (PS) Housing and Planning Sub group (co-opted)

Mark Trewin (MT) Heritage,

Lynne Barnes (LB) Environment and Sustainability Group / Questionnaire Design,

Chris Barnes (CB) Parish Councillor/ Transport Group

Alison Wood (AW) Minutes/ Community Services and Facilities

Nicky Crawford (NC), attendee

Tom Hendy (TH), attendee

Martin Buttery (MB), attendee

Lucy Brown (LBr) vice chair of Parish Council,

Lindsay Ward (District Councillor)

Apologies: Brian Weeks (BWe), Barry White (BWh), Mark Lawrence (ML).

INTRODUCTIONS AT asked all present to go round the table with brief introductions.

TH declared his interest as a landowner, as did MB as the husband of a landowner.

1. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING:

- The draft minutes of the last meeting had been distributed both before the meeting (via e-mail) and at the meeting. There was a request for any amendments.
- AT referred item regarding seeking quotes for printing the business questionnaire and asked for an amendment to be made, as she was not seeking quotes for printing the questionnaire it was Chris Barnes that was doing this. CB confirmed that this was the case.

ACTION: AW will forward amended minutes to Sacha Hagar (Parish Clerk) for the information of the Parish Council.

1b MATTERS ARISING:

- LW raised that in the terms of reference of a Neighbourhood Plan Group (NPG) it was important that the Core Group were identified as these were the members who would vote on any decisions of the meeting and with that in mind needed to make a declaration of interest in any decisions.
- AT advised that in the development of the NPG over the past two years, it had evolved through open meetings in which people had volunteered into roles and task groups as their interest / expertise/ ability to commit time, dictated.
AT circulated a blank piece of paper and suggested as an initial step, that people at the meeting wrote down their names and present roles within the Neighbourhood Plan Group. *(These roles are listed with the names of those present, at the beginning of the minutes).*
- CB declared an interest in extended potential site West of Palm Cross Green/ behind Long Park, which had been identified in the draft Joint Local Plan (JLP). He stated that he and LB were both a residents of Long Park and a friend of the landowner.
- AR raised the fact that both he and CR were landscape architects and had been involved in some of the original landscaping of RA1 site, but this was not taken forward into final plans.
- CR said in doing site assessments in Modbury for the NPG, they were objective and professional and had no financial or personal gain in doing these assessments.
- LW affirmed that any voluntary work undertaken for the NPG was appropriate and legitimate if there was no financial gain or advertising advantage in doing the work for the group.

2. QUESTIONNAIRE

- AT spoke regarding the timescale of the questionnaire and advised that the next Parish Council meeting which was on Monday 10th October. The Parish Council needed to read and ratify the questionnaire before it could be distributed.
- MB asked how Neighbourhood Plan fitted in with Joint Local Plan.
- AT explained that JLP was due to be completed to go to inspectors in January 2017 and evidence from the Neighbourhood Plan could be submitted up to that date.
- LW said that one of her reasons for attending the meeting this evening was to inform the NPG that the timescale for the JLP was being adjusted and this was to be announced within the next few days and she would e-mail AT, as chair with this information.
- LB had circulated a first and second draft of the questionnaire and enquired if the questionnaire could be piloted before it is ratified by the Parish Council and how many people needed to complete the pilot.
- In discussion it was considered that at least 20 people would be needed to pilot the questionnaire *.AW and BG volunteered to help with the pilot.*
- There was further discussion about how the introduction should be worded and whether there was a need to simplify this, perhaps putting some of the more detailed information in an appendix.
- *CK offered to look at simplifying the introduction.*
- There was discussion regarding the need to offer help to anyone who had difficulty completing the paper questionnaire e.g. because of sight deficits
- BG suggested that the people delivering and collecting could be point of contact for such help.

- LB asked whether the format (as in Parish Plan Questionnaire of 2006) should enable different members of a household to complete the questionnaire.
- This was considered by the group to better reflect the range of opinions of Modbury residents as a whole.
- NC asked about how the questionnaire would be analysed and whether this would be independent.
- LB said she would be able to input the data.
- AT said that Neil Turner has offered to assist with further revision of the questionnaire in Lynne's absence and would also be prepared to do some of the analysis. Mark Lawrence was not at the meeting but AT said that she would ask him to help with this as he has previous experience with the Parish Plan. The NPG would then need to pay for a consultant to write an independent report of analysis in professional planning terms.
- PJ advised regarding the need to get three quotes for a consultant to put to the Parish Council for agreement.
- MB suggested that offering to help people fill in the forms could influence their responses. The questionnaire being more like a "straw poll".
- AT said after several public consultations, it was now time to be rigorous and objective as possible with the questionnaire. The help offered to people who requested it would be of a practical nature e.g. reading out the questions to someone with poor sight.
- The people attending the meeting began to look through copies of the Questionnaire, commenting on the validity and detail of various questions.
- TH asked about the question identifying smaller sites A, B, C, D, E, F and asking for thoughts on the suitability of these sites. (Question 8 in the draft). He explained that he was a landowner, whose offered site was not included in this question.
- CR showed the meeting a map of Modbury, which it was intended would be included in the questionnaire. The map identified the alternative sites that had been offered by landowners to SHDC for potential development. From previous NPG consultations and the recent response to the publication of the draft JLP with a large potential site, the dominant opinion of residents in Modbury seems to be not have a big site but for several smaller developments to retain the character and community of Modbury in the future.
- CR said members of the housing group had done a desk top study of the sites which had been offered by landowners..... CR described how she and others had used their skills as landscape architects, architects and housing consultants; and no one had personal interest in any of the sites.
- CR went on to explain that with the timescale of the JLP, it was important to have alternative potential sites available as soon as possible, to put forward to SHDC.
- MB asked, how do these sites then get enshrined by the JLP?
- CR suggested that they have to be deliverable and have the agreement of the landowner and developer.
- MT raised the point that the map was just of Modbury town, whereas the Neighbourhood Plan Area included the whole of the Parish including Brownston and rural areas.
- AT said that this was because the JLP had only identified potential sites in the town. Villages and rural areas were left to make their own decisions regarding future developments.
- LW added that Modbury was classed as a "Local Centre" because of the services it already had e.g. school, health centre, and as such was a focus for development.
- AT thanked CR for all the work she had put in in assessing sites and would not want her to feel under attack by questioning.
- CR affirmed that her role was as a "technician" helping to gather evidence.
- TH explained that he had just been intrigued about how the sites had been scored.

- CK asked if houses that were under construction at the moment, on individual sites, would be deducted from the overall number of 100 houses required by SHDC.
- LW explained that such houses were seen as “windfalls” which were considered as an addition and not part of housing need numbers and therefore would not be deducted.
- SR asked whether there was a dispute regarding the number of bus stops in Modbury.
- CB was able to answer that in his capacity as Parish Councillor he could confirm that it was official that Modbury had 2 bus stop.
- LBr enquired regarding questions about services, whether residents were in a position to know whether the school or health centre could cope with an increased population. She considered these were specialist questions for Devon county council or NHS to answer.
- MB said he felt people would have opinion about whether they thought services could cope.
- BG added Neighbourhood Plan was about the vision a community had for the future and this would include their view of services
- TH asked whether the impact on flooding and sewerage had been considered.
- AT advised that unfortunately there was not time during the meeting to comment on all the questions.
- *ACTION: LB explained that she would be away for a week from Monday (3rd October), but if members of the group wanted to send her reviewed/ updated questions by the evening of Saturday (1st October), she would be prepared to spend Sunday redrafting the questionnaire.*

3. FEEDBACK FROM MEETING WITH SHDC STRATEGIC PLANNER, TOM JONES, (Place Making Lead SHDC and Lead for the Joint Local Plan for South Hams and West Devon).

- AT had circulated, (via e-mail), notes from Extraordinary Meeting held on 09.09.16 and subsequent meeting with Strategic planner on 15.09.16 and a few copies were available at the meeting.
- Strategic Planner, Tom Jones had been helpful. He had not been aware that potential site to West Of Palm Green, an extension of RA1 site could take many more than the 80 houses identified that Modbury needed, in addition to site for 20 dwellings at RA2.
- AR spoke of ways to challenge planning proposals. Design Review Panels (a multidisciplinary team of professionals (e.g. architects, engineers, ecologists) are paid for by the developer and are site specific. The opinions of a Design Review Panel are not enforceable but influence planning decisions and are seen as good practice
Also “Planning for Real” www.planningforreal.org.uk, processes which are a good way to engage community in planning processes.
- LW talked about the letter from WYG, on behalf of Bloor Homes, to the JLP consultation. She said it was normal practice of developers to put forward their aspirations during a consultation process. However she said it was important to be vigilant, especially in vulnerable time before JLP is adopted. NPGs can keep district councillors and SHDC officers updated of their developing evidence which can be used to amend JLP until the time it goes for inspection.
- LW said it would be important to have a watertight case, and to do this it would be important to challenge arguing points in planning terms.
- Discussion re highways / relief road. Tom Jones considered a relief road would cost about 5 million pounds and a substantial development of 500+ houses would be needed to warrant it. Devon County Council (DCC) would also need to contribute and it is unlikely they would have the fund to allocate to such a project.
- Further discussion would be needed with DCC, Highways Dept...

- AT thanked Lindsay for arranging the meeting with Tom Jones.

3. NEXT STEPS.

- BG expressed that it is clear that the Neighbourhood Plan Group function is gathering of evidence and the views of the community but it is not a protest group. However she felt that local residents needed to be able to voice their opinions about Bloor Home's proposals in their letter to the JLP consultation. BG considered that other organisations within the town might be willing to be that voice for example via arranging a petition.
- There was discussion that perhaps an independent planner was needed sooner rather than later, to provide a professional opinion and response to Bloor's proposals. This would be in addition to the consultant needed to interpret and report on the results of the NP questionnaire.
- PJ added that the Parish Council would need to consider if this was appropriate and how an independent planner might be financed.
- Names of possible consultants who could be approached were discussed.
- CB said he would ask for an item to put on the agenda of the next Parish Council Meeting on 10th October, regarding the possibility of employing the services of an independent planner.
- PS provided feedback from an appointment he had attended with George Rosevear (Parish Councillor) and Brian Weeks (Neighbourhood Plan Group Member) with Sarah Holmes, a solicitor at Bond Dickinson in Plymouth, who specialises in planning law. Her advice included:
 1. Judicial Review. This she advised was something that should be the last "port of call". It could only be contemplated if a local authority made decisions which they did not have the power to make, or did not follow due process of planning policy and planning law.
 2. A Neighbourhood Plan once adopted is part of planning law. The cost of a Judicial Review could be anything from £ 10,000 to £40,000. Therefore the advice was to spend money on producing a robust Neighbourhood Plan.
 3. Her advice was that Neighbourhood Plans should consult with all stakeholders including developers. There should also be a detailed response to any developer's proposals.

4. TREASURER'S REPORT:

- PJ circulated copies of his report (attached to minutes) which included quotes for printing the questionnaire.

5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS:

- AT asked that as it was getting late, unless there was urgent other business for it to be brought forward to the next meeting.
- There being no urgent other business. The meeting closed at 11pm.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

Wednesday 12th October at 8pm

Memorial Hall Meeting Room.

MODBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP
FINANCIAL INFORMATION
for the period 1st April 2016 to 28th September 2016

	Parish Fund		'Locality' Restricted Fund	
	£p	£p	£p	£p
TOTAL FUNDS b/fwd as at 1st April 2016		£ 240.28		
INCOME 1st April 2016 to 31st March 2017				
Grant from Modbury Parish Council		500.00		
For the period 1st April 2016 to 31st March 2017				
Grant from 'Locality'			4,270.00	
for the period 1st July to 31st December 2016				
		£ 740.28		
EXPENDITURE 1st April 2016 to 31st March 2017				
Paper & ink - NPG secretary	(18.00)			
Meeting room hire for Housing Group (MH)	(16.00)			
May Fair - printing (ML)	(1.50)			
May Fair - printing (Jon Hardy)	(42.00)			
May Fair - printing (Barnes CS)	(40.05)			
May Fair - OTM banners (ex VAT £13.80))	(69.00)			
		(186.55)		
Room hire - NPG meetings			(20.00)	
Daniel Turner - website maintenance			(240.00)	
			(260.00)	
FUNDS AVAILABLE AS AT 28th September 2016		£ 553.73		£ 4,010.00

NOTES :

- All funds are held and accounted for by the Modbury Parish Council.
This schedule is for the information of the NPG only.
- The Locality grant is restricted as it can only be spent on the items specified in the application.
Any unspent funds have to be returned at the end of the grant period and a new application made.
- Locality budget summary

	Budget	Spent to date	Balance remaining
Website maintenance & management	1,440.00	(240.00)	1,200.00
Questionnaire - printing, input & analysis	1,800.00	-	1,800.00
Venue hire & refreshments	260.00	(20.00)	240.00
Travel expenses	200.00	-	200.00
Exhibition design, graphics & photos	370.00	-	370.00
Stationery, sundries	200.00	-	200.00
	£ 4,270.00	£ (260.00)	£ 4,010.00

4 Agreed to Parish records 27th September 2016

PMJ
27th September 2016

**MODBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP
FINANCIAL INFORMATION**

QUESTIONNAIRE PRINTING QUOTES - SEPTEMBER 2016

850 copies A4 portrait	12 page black	12 page colour	8 page black	8 page colour
KINGFISHER	£ 238.00	£ 346.00	£ 164.00	£ 240.00
SHDC DESIGN	£ 245.00	£ 391.00	£ 165.00	£ 269.00
NICK WALKER	£ 414.00	£ 614.00		

Note:

1. All prices are ex VAT as the Parish can reclaim any VAT.
 2. Both Kingfisher and SHDC are using 120g paper, Nick Walker quoted for 90g.
 3. Kingfisher have also quoted for a print run of 1,000 which would only add £6 to the 12 page colour quote.
 4. Jon Hardy was asked to quote for black & white but hasn't replied to date.
 5. Recommendation - is that we use Kingfisher (who currently print the Messenger)
- If we go for an 8 page questionnaire we do not require MPC approval as it is less than £250; a 12 page print run would need MPC approval at the October meeting.

PMJ/27th September 2016

Budget	Spent to date	Balance
1,440.00	(240.00)	1,200.00
1,500.00	-	1,500.00
100.00	(20.00)	80.00
300.00	-	300.00
370.00	-	370.00
300.00	-	300.00
4,270.00	£ (580.00)	£ 3,690.00