

MODBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP (MNPG)

Draft Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 11th January 2017 at 20.00 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), Mark Lawrence (ML) Parish Councillor, Mark Trewin (MT), Alison Wood (AW) Minutes.

Co-opted members: Sue Rogers (SR),

Apologies: Phil Smith, Chris Barnes, Lynne Barnes, Barry White, Charlotte Kendrick, Roy Sims, Jon Sullivan, Nicky Crawford, Phil Jolly

Before the meeting AW (minute's sec) asked 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:

There were no declarations of interest at this meeting.

2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING:

- a) The draft minutes of the last meeting were circulated and agreed as a true record without further amendments. AW will forward the final minutes to the Parish Clerk for the information of the Parish Council.
- b) AW agreed that she would write up a summary regarding the exhibition to support the questionnaire to provide a record of this event.
- c) AT spoke about the item regarding feedback from Thame Neighbourhood Plan Presentation which had been organised by Lindsay Ward (District Councillor). AT explained that she had some difficulty in opening link to the presentation that had been forwarded by Lindsay and would check this again.

3. FEEDBACK FROM PARISH COUNCIL RE: SITE OPTION DRAFT DOCUMENT

- a) AT informed the meeting that the Parish Council passed/ agreed the document regarding "Site Options" with the amendment/ inclusion of one word "fully". The Parish Council has sent the document to Joint Local Plan (JLP) consultation.
- b) ML confirmed that there had been no response back, but added that a response would not be expected at this stage in the process.
- c) BG said she felt it was a credit to the NPG that the report had been prepared and forwarded to the consultation.

4. QUESTIONNAIRE PROGRESS:

- a) AT said that thanks needed to be expressed to all the volunteers who delivered and collected the questionnaires, with special mention to those people who were not directly involved in the NPG.
- b) ML thanked SR and CK for their work in the logistics of distribution and then gave a brief resume of progress:
440 questionnaires have been returned (about 6 of these were blank), this was out of 816 distributed
There were approximately 8% unoccupied properties which equates to about 3% properties in process or being sold/ rented out and 5% second homes.
Therefore the overall return was in the region of 58% of all households.
- c) AT said thanks needed to be given to people doing data input of numerical content of the questionnaires
Mark Lawrence , Phil Smith, Phil Jolly, Neil Turner, Tim Beavon and Ron Wood.
- d) ML spoke of Neil needing special mention because of all he had done organising the process and spread sheet etc.
- e) AT said once the numerical data input had been completed, she would then be able to forward the written/ qualitative comments for typing.

4. QUESTIONNAIRE PROGRESS: CTD.

- f) ML it would be hoped that the numerical data input would be completed by the end of next week i.e. 21st /22nd January.
- g) ML spoke of the need to feedback results to the community, in an exhibition so further understanding and sharing of information can take place and residents remain engaged with the development of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- h) There was agreement that with some of the more complicated sites, such as RA2/E, it would be useful to look at ways to help people visualise how these might be developed.

5. LOCAL GREEN SPACE DESIGNATION:

- a) AT had circulated via e-mail SHDC information regarding Local Green Space (LGS) designation, which can be incorporated into Neighbourhood Plans. LGS status provides special protection against the development for green areas of particular importance to local communities
- b) CR said several LGS had been included in the questionnaire, and queried whether there was a limit on the number that could be identified, and said she would try to contact Rob Sekular (SHDC officer with responsibility for green spaces) who could advise further. Most of the sites would meet the extra criteria. These details could be examined by the Landscape subgroup.
- c) BG asked if the green areas in front of Cromwell Park and Long Park had been included.
- d) CR confirmed that these areas were in the questionnaire.
- e) ML suggested that the Environment/ Landscape sub group could look at this in more detail, but raised a note of caution, if for example a LGS designation could then prevent a relief road being developed in the future.
- f) MT noted that Palm Cross Green was not included in questionnaire and was important because of historical importance of such a site. This omission was noted.

6. ROAD TRANSPORT AND TRAFFIC.

- a) AT asked to add this item to the agenda explaining that Barry White (road and transport subgroup), had compiled questions for Devon County Council Highways. AT forwarded these to County Councillor, Richard Hosking on behalf of MNPG
- b) AT wanted to note thanks to Councillor Hosking for his prompt reply to these questions, which she had circulated to the group via e-mail.
- c) It was felt that the Road Transport Subgroup would need to look at Councillor Hosking's replies in more detail.
- d) AR raised the point regarding air pollution. He said had been aware that this had been monitored in Church Street in recent times but on looking at the link provided by Councillor Hosking, he had not been able to find any specific results for Modbury. AR said he would happy to try and follow this up further with environmental health.

7. REVIEW TIMESCALE AND FUTURE PLANNING:

- a) AW circulated copies of the Gantt chart, with thanks to Phil Smith for drawing it up (Appendix A Attached to minutes),

The items in green are tasks that have been completed, those that are orange are in process and those in red are yet to be started.

7. REVIEW TIMESCALE AND FUTURE PLANNING: CTD.

- b) AT spoke of the need to be realistic and not overoptimistic in the timescale of what can be achieved by when.
- c) After discussion it was agreed **Data input (5.5 On Gantt chart)** should be able to be completed by the end of the first week in February this would include the entering of both the numerical data (by the end of January) and qualitative data from written comments on the questionnaires which was to be typed up.
- d) **Data analysis (5.6 On Gantt chart)** can started using the numerical data before all qualitative data is written up i.e. from end of January to the end of February.
- e) ML pointed out that the data analysis will be elastic, as different threads/ questions can be asked of the data as the report is prepared.
- f) ML also enquired if there was anyone who had or knew of anyone who had knowledge of and access to the software, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) to facilitate this more in depth analysis.
- g) MT asked if there would be funding for the person completing such analysis.
- h) ML said that this had not been included in the budget for funding.
- i) There was discussion about the need to provide the community feedback of the results of the questionnaire, to get further responses, as plan is prepared. It was considered that this might be added as an additional item on the Gantt chart under **Community Consultation i.e. 5.9 Feedback of questionnaire results looking to an exhibition in April.**
- j) In considering **section 6 on Gantt chart Development of Neighbourhood Plan.** There was discussion about at what stage Lee Bray (independent planner) should asked to begin his input in helping develop the policies based on all the evidence collected.
- k) **AT agreed that she would contact Lee to update him of the NPG's progress to date and ask his advice and opinion about at which stage it would be useful for him to input his services.**(
- l) In discussion the group felt some guidance from Lee would help the subgroups in the way they draw their evidence together, not wanting to waste time and effort on work that might not be needed.
- m) BG and others also spoke of the importance of **6.2 on Gantt Chart Developing a Vision.**
- n) AT described how this would develop from the interpretation of the questionnaire results. ML had provided previous vision statement of the Parish Council which could be a foundation depending on emerging themes, but concurred regarding the importance of the vision and objectives in developing the Neighbourhood Plan.
- o) ML spoke about a point that Brian Weeks had raised at the last Parish Council meeting regarding whether there would be a second homes policy as had been included in other Neighbourhood Plans (e.g. St. Ives, Cornwall)
- p) AT said policies would depend on the evidence that had been gathered, but it is certainly something the housing sub group should consider.
- q) AT spoke of looking to the future planning now that the data from the questionnaire had been gathered. The sub groups had worked on the themes from previous consultations to shape the questions in the questionnaire, **it was now important for the sub task groups to reform to look at the themes that were emerging from the questionnaire results. The Working Subgroups being:**
 - Communication**
 - Employment and Business**
 - Environment-Landscape**
 - Environment- sustainability**
 - History and Heritage**
 - Housing and Development**
 - Road Safety and Transport**
 - Community Services and Facilities**

7. REVIEW TIMESCALE AND FUTURE PLANNING: CTD.

- r) AT said she would also e-mail Nikki secretary of Modbury Association of Recreation and Sport (MARS), regarding forwarding to MARS the data from the sports section of the questionnaire. The analysis of these questions would form part of the Open Spaces Sports and Recreation, (OSSR) project. Also if the intention OSSR project is to be part of the Neighbourhood Plan, it should perhaps be included on the Gantt chart.
- s) CR clarified that the landscape group would be looking at the OSSR areas not related directly to sport, including play areas
- t) There was discussion of the need to encourage more people with specific knowledge and interest to join the subgroups, recruiting via Modbury Messenger, personal face to face contacts and events/ exhibitions. As an example ML advised that parking, transport and traffic were major issues coming from the questionnaire therefore indicating that the transport group would need more support.
- u) AW suggested that an item on the agenda of the next meeting to be an update of current status of each subgroup.
- v) AT spoke of wanting to arrange a half-day review meeting with sandwich lunch for the NPG, to provide an opportunity to look in detail at the data from the questionnaire and the next steps. There was discussion as to whether it would be helpful to ask Lee Bray (independent planner) if he could attend such an event, also it might be an occasion for new interested "task group" volunteers to come and find out more. Looking towards a date in early March, possibly Saturday 11th
- w) AW to make provisional enquiries about booking MARS pavilion for that date.

8. TREASURER'S REPORT.

- a) AW circulated copies of the Treasurer's Reports, which was in two parts, "Financial information 1st April 2016 to 31st December 2016" and "Budget for 1st January 2017 to 31st July 2017" with thanks to Phil Jolly Treasurer (Attached to minutes, appendix B)
- b) ML informed that the Parish Council has agreed to provide £2,000 which was the shortfall identified in the budget after the receipt of the expected Locality Fund.
- c) ML said that there was a need to be prudent on the demands on budget. He explained that he was in the process of applying for new grant, but the Locality Grant can be applied for apply 6 month period or end of the financial year which is sooner, so at the moment the grant can only be applied for until the end of March. Therefore in itemising the budget he would need to know of any costs related to independent planner, Lee Bray's work in that period. Although it was agreed that most of Lee's work would come after the end of March, ML said he would like to include some of the costs to log Lee's involvement in the process.
- d) AT thanked ML for his hard work in completing the applications for funding.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS:

- a) ML, informed the meeting that Martin Ranwell had attended the last Parish Council meeting, Mr. Ranwell's letter (Appendix C) has been circulated to both PC and NPG in which he had raised questions regarding the vision of the NPG and what was going to be done about parking problems. Both these issues are currently being worked on by MNPG and ML extended an invitation to Mr Ranwell to attend any MNPG meeting, which are open meetings.
- b) There was also discussion that in the community events, it would be important to include achievements from previous "Plans". This would also form part of the context/ background to the development of the current NP.

10. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING: 8pm on 15th February 2017 in Memorial Hall Meeting Room.

AW 24.01.2017

APENDIX B (i) Treasurer's report

MODBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP
FINANCIAL INFORMATION
for the period 1st April 2016 to 31st December 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)	(40.00)			
May Fair - OTM banners (ex VAT £13.80))	(69.00)			
Website domain rental & hosting fee 2016/17	(137.30)			
		(323.80)		
Room hire - NPG meetings			(140.00)	
Daniel Turner - website maintenance (13Jul - 13Dec)			(600.00)	
			(50.23)	
Questionnaire labels & envelopes			(872.80)	
Questionnaire - printing & postage (ex VAT £106.40)			(393.90)	
Questionnaire - consultancy			(30.00)	
Exhibition - printing (ex VAT £6)				
			(2,086.93)	
		£ 416.48	£ 2,183.07	
Unused Locality funds returned at end of grant period		-	(2,183.07)	
TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE AS AT 31st DECEMBER 2016		£ 416.48	£ -	

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.

3 Locality budget summary

	Budget	Spent to date	Balance remaining
Website maintenance & management	1,440.00	(600.00)	840.00
Questionnaire - printing, input & analysis	1,800.00	(1,316.93)	483.07
Venue hire & refreshments	260.00	(140.00)	120.00
Travel expenses	200.00	-	200.00
Exhibition design, graphics & photos	370.00	(30.00)	340.00
Stationery, sundries	200.00	-	200.00
	£ 4,270.00	£ (2,086.93)	£ 2,183.07

4 Agreed to Parish records as at 31st December 2016

5 The Locality grant has been closed and a new grant applied for per the budget for 2017

PMJ
31st December 2016

APPENDIX B (ii) Treasurer's report

**MODBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP
FINANCIAL INFORMATION
BUDGET for the period 1st January 2017 to 31st July 2017**

	Note	Parish Funds £p	2017 'Locality' Grant £p	TOTAL BUDGET £p
Professional Fees				
Lee Bray Consultancy	1	1,280.00	6,020.00	7,300.00
Dan Turner website maintenance & development	2	120.00	720.00	840.00
Questionnaire				
Data input	3	400.00		400.00
Draft Plan				
Printing & distribution		625.00		625.00
Administration costs				
Room hire	4	-	160.00	160.00
Exhibition costs		150.00		150.00
Refreshments for public meetings		50.00		50.00
Admin - printing, paper etc		200.00		200.00
TOTAL LOCALITY GRANT APPLICATION	5		£ 6,900.00	
TOTAL PARISH BUDGET		2,825.00		
less Parish Funds b/fwd as at 1st January 2017		(416.48)		
TOTAL PARISH FUNDING REQUIRED		£ 2,408.52		
TOTAL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN BUDGET TO 31st JULY 2017				£ 9,725.00

NOTES :

- 1 Lee Bray consultancy per quote less paid to date
- 2 Dan Turner contract to 13th July 2017 at £120 pm; January payment from Parish funds
- 3 Data input budget reduced from £750 to reflect contributions by volunteers
- 4 Room hire: 8 x £20 per Phil Smith programme
- 5 Locality grant maximum is £9,000 less spent to 31Dec16 £2,086.93 = £6,913.07 (say, £6,900)

PMJ
8th January 2017

APPENDIX C:

Letter from Martin Ranwell

Dear Parish Councillor

I write further to the recent survey in connection with the Neighbourhood Plan.

It is suggested that the time has come for the Parish Council to urgently debate and agree a vision for the future of our town, and for this vision to be shared and endorsed, or otherwise, by the residents of Modbury.

As things stand at present, I can only see a future in which our historic Georgian market town, with its narrow streets and inherent lack of parking, is progressively clogged with ever increasing volumes of traffic, both parked and trying to pass through the bottleneck that is the A379. This is the reality of the situation. We are all only too well aware that Broad Street / Church Street, Brownston Street, and Galpin Street are nightmares to be negotiated only with considerable trepidation, patience and care. Reversing is often the name of the game.

A vehicle count yesterday in Brownston Street revealed a total of no less than 67 parked vehicles, one of which was parked illegally, and 2 further cars were parked inconsiderately. Galpin Street had 32 vehicles, of which 7 were on double yellow lines or on the pavement. Why is this abuse allowed to continue ? Any further development, including the soon to be completed 92 unit Palm Cross Green development (RA1), will only exacerbate these problems.

Surely the time has come to recognise that this scenario is a fundamental obstacle to our future, and that until the parking and traffic flow problems are addressed, and somehow overcome, there should be absolutely no further housing developments in Modbury whatsoever. The bottom line is that our small market town was designed and built in an age before the development of the internal combustion engine, and that it cannot readily be adapted to the 21st century, where most households have two cars, and the volume of commercial and commuter traffic passing along the A379 between Kingsbridge and Plymouth increases in direct proportion to the overall increase in the population of the South Hams.

As our friends across the Atlantic would say, we need to “wake up and smell the coffee”.

Yours sincerely

MARTIN RANWELL

1 Tuckers Brook, Modbury PL21 0UT