

MODBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP (MNPG)

Final and amended minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 16th November 2016 at 8 pm in the meeting room at the Memorial Hall.

Present: Core group members: Ann Turner (AT) Chair, Charlotte Rathbone (CR), Andy Rathbone (AR), Burda Gage (BG), Jon Sullivan (JS), Barry White (BWh), Mark Lawrence (ML) Parish Councillor, Alison Wood (AW) Minutes.

Co-opted members: Sue Rogers (SR), Phil Smith (PS) Phil Jolly (PJ)

Attendees: Lindsay Ward (LW) District Councillor, Nicky Crawford (NC)

Apologies: Charlotte Kendrick, Chris Barnes, Lynne Barnes, Roy Sims

Before the meeting formally started AT asked on behalf of AW (minute's sec) if everyone was happy for the meeting to be recorded to help in the process of providing accurate minutes. No one present at the meeting objected to this.

1 .DECLARATION OF INTERESTS:

PS declared he lived next to a potential site

JS declared he lived opposite a potential site.

BWh declared that he lived adjacent to a potential site.

BG said that she was in contact with a landowner of one of the potential sites, but it was noted by the meeting that this involved no pecuniary advantage for BG.

2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

- I. AW said she had received amendments to last meetings regarding declared interests from Lynne Barnes, Brian Weeks and BWh and had updated the minutes accordingly.
- II. PS queried re point (2 C) "Site selection" , clarifying that although he had put forward the form of words for the proposal , as a co-opted member of the core group, he did not think he was able to propose motions. CR said she was happy to be named as the proposer and it was agreed that the minutes would be amended to reflect this.
- III. PS also raised that it needed to be recorded that one of the original sites had now been viewed as being divided into 2 sites (this was because of the topography and separate access), so rather than 8 sites there were now 9 alternative potential sites plus one which was discounted because of its distance from the town.
- IV. AT spoke regarding point 2A/B VI, where BG had suggested that extracting and analysing responses to housing questions first might be useful. AT said this was raised at the meeting with Tom Jones, Strategic Planner and the advice had been that this would not be necessary. LW concurred with this view.
- V. AT Timescale of the NP. PS had kindly put forward a Draft Gant Chart of key stages in the NP process and prospective timescale, this had been viewed by Lee Bray prospective independent planner who considered that the timescale might be a little overoptimistic.
- VI. LW informed that the date for the Draft Joint local Plan (JLP) to be published was March 2017 not January as had been previous date.
- VII. LW also said she had spoken today to Tom Jones (TJ), South Hams District Council (SHDC) Strategic Planner and he had been clear that he did not have any more time to allocate to looking at alternative potential sites in Modbury. However there was a consultation deadline of December 21st for part of the JLP and Tom Jones advised that a submission response would to be considered at that date.
- VIII. AT said if everyone was agreeable it would seem appropriate to bring forward item 8 on the agenda regarding feedback from the meeting with the Strategic Planner.

3. FEEDBACK FROM MEETING WITH STRATEGIC PLANNER.

- I. LW said that she had spoken with TJ today, and he had clarified that yesterday's meeting, which she arranged and attended with members of NPG and Bernard Taylor (chairman of the Parish Council) had not provided sites to take forward but had demonstrated a robust process. However LW advised that the consultation period did provide the opportunity to offer sites. She reinforced that it is the SHDC officers who make recommendations but it is the councillors who make the decisions.
- II. AT suggested that perhaps it would be helpful to inform the group exactly what had been taken to the meeting and asked CR if she could elaborate.
- III. CR explained that they had presented to TJ the list of alternative potential sites that had already been appraised by housing sub group and were to be put to the community in the questionnaire. SHDC had added further criteria such as economic importance and pollution hazard. These additional criteria/ filters had been applied to the list of alternative potential sites before the meeting, with a "traffic light" type ranking of which sites would be most suitable. The SHDC/JLP large potential site, an extension of the current RA1 site west of Palm Cross Green, was clearly deliverable. However it was also clear, from the public meeting arranged by the Parish Council, responses submitted to the JLP consultation and NPG consultations, that the residents of Modbury did not consider that such a large site was appropriate to sustain the character, community and environment of the town and there was evidence that residents has expressed the wish was for a number smaller developments in the town to meet the housing need.
- IV. AT Explained that although not wanting to pre-empt the outcome of the questionnaire, they had also taken to the meeting, information that BG had worked hard to gather from one landowner and a developer as an example of what might be possible. She had also provided the information that PS was making contact with housing associations regarding affordable housing options.
- V. There were questions from the group about why what was presented to the strategic planner was not seen as something that he could take forward to his team
- VI. LW expressed her opinion that going with 9 sites in the questionnaire would not give a clear picture and would leave Modbury vulnerable to the clearly deliverable large site being adopted.
- VII. LW emphasised the need to put a response to the consultation and to also give the information to her so she can put it to the two Lead Councillors on the JLP committee. She outlined what was needed:
 - a. The response needed to be strategically aligned to National Planning Policy and that of the JLP.
 - b. The response needed to be realistically deliverable and it would be helpful to have a developer on board.
 - c. There needed to be policy linkage which both LW and independent planner (Lee Bray) could assist with.
 - d. There needed to be technical evidence. (LW indicated that what the group had already gathered was robust)
 - e. There needed to be clear argument as to why this response was being put forward.
 - f. There needed to be resolution with the Parish Council.
- VIII. AT said that the NPG needed to be transparent, therefore to put forward a preferred site before the results of the questionnaire there was the risk that this could be viewed as not following the laid out NP process in being equitable and fair. The planned exhibition to go alongside the questionnaire would provide residents the opportunity to see in more detail the assessments of sites and their location and that way support them in making their choice.
- IX. BG stated that she had taken it upon herself to contact the landowner and developer that the Modbury Society had made links with during the development of the Village Design Statement (2003). She spoke as secretary of the Modbury Society, that the Modbury Society's aim was to support the NPG but there was concern about the lack of speed of the NP process and she felt it was crucial to have something for the meeting on Dec 21st and a letter had already been sent to TJ regarding alternative potential sites.
- X. AT pointed out that the sites in this letter were the same as those included in the NP questionnaire.

XI. ML informed that the consultation deadline for 21st December was a consultation about employment land and technical points about housing distribution throughout the JLP area, however any submission put in by that deadline had to be considered. March 2017 was the date being mentioned by SHDC as the deadline for the formal JLP consultation. He also ascertained from LW, that there was not a case for the MNPG being able to allocate the 80 houses through the neighbourhood plan as villages were able to do.

XII. There followed discussion about the seemingly conflicting pressures on the NPG to put forward a “package” of sites with landowner and developer on board, as a response to JLP with a deadline of 21st December as opposed to await further evidence from consultation with the community via questionnaire. Some members found it hard to accept that despite the responses SHDC had received so far via NPG consultations, the public meeting organised by the Parish Council in August and individual responses to the JLP consultation that that there was the risk that SHDC could adopt the large potential site offered in the JLP.

XIII. LW said it was her opinion that from previous evidence gathering the NPG did have a mandate to put forward alternative smaller potential sites to the one large site offered in the JLP.

XIV. PS suggested a compromise route, whereby the NPG put forward a report of progress so far and recommendation to the Parish Council in time for their next meeting 12th December, with details of alternative preferred sites but with the added proviso that these sites are subject to consultation. This report following the requirements outlined by LW i.e.

- a. The response needed to be strategically aligned to National Planning Policy and that of the JLP.
- b. The response needed to be realistically deliverable and it would be helpful to have a developer on board.
- c. There needed to be policy linkage which both LW and independent planner (Lee Bray) could assist with.
- d. There needed to be technical evidence. (LW indicated that what the group had already gathered was robust)
- e. There needed to be clear argument as to why this response was being put forward.
- f. There needed to be resolution with the Parish Council.

If authorised by the Parish Council this report could then be forwarded to LW (District Councillor) and TJ (Strategic Planner) and submitted as a response to the consultation by the deadline of 21st December.

XVI. AT asked if a member of the core group was willing to propose the action suggested by PS

XVII. *BG proposed that the NPG proceed with the route of providing a report to the Parish Council as presented by PS “the NPG put forward a report of progress so far and recommendation to the Parish Council in time for the Parish Council’s next meeting on 12th December, with details of alternative preferred sites but with the added proviso that these sites are subject to consultation. This report following the requirements*

- a. *The response needed to be strategically aligned to National Planning Policy and that of the JLP.*
- b. *The response needed to be realistically deliverable and it would be helpful to have a developer on board.*
- c. *There needed to be policy linkage which both LW and independent planner (Lee Bray) could assist with.*
- d. *There needed to be technical evidence.*
- e. *There needed to be clear argument as to why this response was being put forward.*
- f. *There needed to be resolution with the Parish Council.*

If authorised by the Parish Council this report could then be forwarded to LW (District Councillor) and TJ (Strategic Planner) and submitted as a response to the consultation by the deadline of 21st December.”

AR seconded the proposal.

The vote to accept this way forward was accepted unanimously by all members of the core NPG eligible to vote.

4. APPOINTMENT OF PLANNING CONSULTANT:

- I. AT: informed that as the group were aware, there had been tenders made for an independent planning consultant to support the work of the NPG. She reported that through e-mail replies from the members it appeared that Lee Bray (LBr) was the planner that the group would choose. Lee Bray offered a flexible arrangement itemising the tasks and costs
- II. PJ, Treasurer added that if appointed LBr has agreed to bill the NPG monthly, which would support the NPG in keeping on track with its financial commitments. The total cost of his services would depend on the number and nature of the tasks he was requested to do, and would be between £6,000 - £8,000. If the NPG received the funding it was expecting this would leave a shortfall of between £2,000-3,000. The NPG would have to approach the Parish Council regarding the cost of this shortfall.
- III. *ML proposed that NPG accept and appoint Lee Bray as independent planning consultant for the group, subject to funding being agreed.
This proposal was seconded by CR*

The vote to appoint Lee Bray as Independent Planning Consultant for Modbury Neighbourhood Plan Group was unanimous of all those eligible to vote

5. TENDER FOR THE DATA INPUT FOR THE QUESTIONNAIRE:

ML: Provided information about the tender for data input for the group, he said had been working on this, and will aim to put something in Modbury Messenger and was in contact with companies that provide data input services. The cost of data input having already been budgeted for.

6. QUESTIONNAIRE:

- I. AT said that she and Neil Turner had looked at all the comments received from the group on the draft questionnaire and made some amendments accordingly. The questionnaire had gone to the Parish Council Meeting this week and had been approved. It was anticipated that the questionnaire would be piloted and go to the printers at the end of this week or beginning of the next.
- II. LW Raised the amendment she had advised i.e. that the SHDC sites were described as "potential sites for allocation" not "draft sites" as this the word draft had a different meaning in legal terms.
- III. AT confirmed that this amendment would be made.
- IV. SR confirmed that the organisation for distribution was in place.
- V. PJ Asked about details which would affect final cost of the printing and distribution of the questionnaire i.e. regarding the number of pages, colour versus black and white printing and weight for stamp costs.
- VI. AT said she considered that colour print was more user friendly, and looking through other NP questionnaires this seems to be norm.
- VII. *AT agreed she would confirm details to PJ so the cost could be accounted for accurately.*

7. TREASURER'S REPORT (see itemised report attached to minutes)

- I. PJ reported that website domain rental and hosting fee had been paid through to October 2017. There were ongoing fees for website management and the cost of room rental for meetings.
- II. PJ went on explain that as discussed earlier in the meeting, looking to future expenditure, this would include the fees of an independent planner. He explained that the Locality Grant is a restricted, in that it can only be spent on items specified in the application. So after costs of questionnaire have be paid for, ML is looking to close and send back unspent funds. These funds would be recouped, when an application is made for a further Locality Grant which will include itemising the costs for an independent planner.
- III. PJ requested that any expense claims be put in promptly, otherwise when the Locality Grant is closed there will be a delay in payment until the new grant has been applied for and agreed. He also reminded everyone that any invoices should to be made out to "Modbury Parish Council" , which would enable the VAT to be reclaimed and thus save money

8. PUBLIC EXHIBITION TO SUPPORT QUESTIONNAIRE:

- I. AT said that the NPG had been offered the Tourist Information Centre (TIC) as a location for an exhibition. The idea being that the exhibition could focus on showing the alternative smaller potential sites, their location and assessments.
- II. BG said from her involvement with the TIC, she thought it might be possible to leave the exhibition open without having it manned all the time. George Rosevear is the chairman and AT asked if BG could confirm whether leaving the TIC opened and unmanned was an option.
- III. AT asked if there were volunteers who could help co-ordinate setting up the exhibition BG and AW offered to do this.
- IV. LW also offered that she could hold one of her District Councillor JLP surgery's at the exhibition
- V. AT said that Bernard Taylor, chairman of the Parish Council had also offered his support.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- I. SR asked if the questionnaire included one regarding the use of the bank which was under threat of closure. It was confirmed that there was a question regarding access to banking services.
- II. JS asked about the progress of the business questionnaire. AT said there were only a few amendments before it would be ready.
- III. ML spoke about the need to contact the landowners, possibly via a standard letter.
- IV. AW said that if the meeting were agreeable, she would write to local services, school, health centre, police and fire service to update them of the progress of the NPG, and to ask for any comments they might want to put forward in the NP about the impact (positive or negative) of the JLP proposals on the services they provide .
- V. AT There being no other business the time and date of next meeting was arranged and the meeting closed at 10pm.

Date of next Meeting: Wednesday 7th December 2016 at 8pm. in the Meeting Room of the Memorial Hall.

AW 11.16

TREASURER'S REPORT:

**MODBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP
FINANCIAL INFORMATION**

for the period 1st April 2016 to 16th November 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				
		<u>£ 740.28</u>		
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)	(40.00)			
May Fair - OTM banners (ex VAT £13.80))	<u>(69.00)</u>			
		(186.50)		
Room hire - NPG meetings			(140.00)	
Daniel Turner - website maintenance			(360.00)	
Website domain rental & hosting fee 2016/17		(137.30)		
Questionnaire labels & envelopes			<u>(50.23)</u>	
				(550.23)
FUNDS AVAILABLE AS AT 16th November 2016		<u>£ 416.48</u>		<u>£ 3,719.77</u>

NOTES :

- 1 All funds are held and accounted for by the Modbury Parish Council.
This schedule is for the information of the NPG only.
- 2 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.
- 3 Locality budget summary

	Budget	Spent to date	Balance remaining
Website maintenance & management	1,440.00	(360.00)	1,080.00
* Questionnaire - printing, input & analysis	1,800.00	(50.23)	1,749.77
Venue hire & refreshments	260.00	(140.00)	120.00
Travel expenses	200.00	-	200.00
Exhibition design, graphics & photos	370.00	-	370.00
Stationery, sundries	200.00	-	200.00
	<u>£ 4,270.00</u>	<u>£ (550.23)</u>	<u>£ 3,719.77</u>

- 4 * printing quote of £346 from Kingfisher accepted by the Parish Council 10th October 2016
- 5 Agreed to Parish records 27th September 2016

PMJ
7th November 2016