

MODBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP (MNPG)

Final Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 15th February 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), Chris Barnes (Parish Councillor), Mark Lawrence (ML) Parish Councillor, Mark Trewin (MT), Barry White (BWH), Jon Sullivan (JS), Alison Wood (AW) Minutes.

Co-opted members: Nicky Crawford (NC), Phil Smith (PS)

Attendee: Mike Hurican, (Land Acquisition Manger, Devon and Cornwall Housing) Bernard Taylor (Chair of the Parish Council),

Apologies: Lynne Barnes, Charlotte Kendrick, Sue Rogers, Roy Sims, 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:

PS declared he lived close to a potential site.

JS declared he lived close to a potential site

BWh declared that he lived adjacent to a potential site

CB declared he lived adjacent to a potential site and was a close friend of a landowner.

2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING:

- a) The draft minutes of the last meeting were circulated by AW via e-mail and paper copies.
- b) *Item 7t-v Timescale.* BG spoke of the issues she had already raised with AW regarding the reporting of the need to recruit more volunteers, BG felt the minutes had not reflected this adequately.
AT clarified that there may have been confusion, as in the last meeting there were two initiatives firstly to review data from questionnaire and the secondly to recruit members to the groups. The review would inform what work the subgroups would be asking new volunteers to do, but clearly interested volunteers were welcome to attend the review.
BG said that since the last meeting she had made approaches to people that might be interested in volunteering.
AT asked if the names and contacts could be passed onto her and AW, with a note as to whether they were going to be able to attend review meeting.
- c) *Item 4. Questionnaire progress:* AT reported that the numerical data has been analysed and the written data was "almost there".
- d) *Item 5 Local Green Space Designation;* CR said she had not yet consulted Rob Sekula (South Hams District Council) officer but would do so, to enquire whether there was a limit to the number of Designated Local Green Spaces(DLGS) a NP area could identify.
- e) *Item 7r Timescale* PS asked if the Open Spaces, Recreation and Sports (OSSR) survey was to be part of the Neighbourhood Plan. If it was he would include in the Gantt chart Programme. AT said she had e-mailed Nikki Mitchell, Modbury Association of Recreation and Sport, (MARS), but has not yet had a reply.
- f) **ACTION/VOTE:** ML proposed that the minutes be accepted as an accurate record of the meeting, this was seconded by CR, which was agreed by a unanimous vote.
AW to forward the Final Minutes to Sacha Hagar, Parish Clerk and Daniel Turner for up loading onto the website.

3. INTRODUCTION TO DEVON AND CORNWALL HOUSING (DCH) REPRESENTATIVE, MIKE HURICAN.

- a) AT welcomed Mike to the meeting and asked if he could give a brief introduction to DCH and his role and then field questions from the group.
- b) MH explained that he was a Business Manager within DCH involved in land acquisition and negotiating with developers.

He said DCH had merged with Torr Homes. In Modbury in the past they had purchased land from Stevens's garage where the Co-op and Burns Court houses now stand. More recently they have bought land from Bloor homes in the RA1 development, currently being built at Palm Cross Green.

- I. DCH have 24,000 properties over the Devon and Cornwall area, with about 400 in the South Hams.
- II. Building about 1,000 properties per year, 200 of those being on the open market to cross subsidise their other projects.
- III. The 80% of houses not on the open market break down into:
 - Social Rent 10%
 - Affordable 50%
 - Housing Association 20%
 - Social Rent = approx.60% of market rent
- IV. Market is rent determined by a valuer, however if market rent exceeds housing allowance, DCH would charge less.
- V. Mike explained that grants available and other initiatives changed quite often with different government administrations.
- VI. With shared ownership, people could "staircase" i.e. gradually own a greater part of their property but if sold the property would be re-purchased by the housing association, in order that it was not "lost" to the open market.
- VII. In response to questions Mike explained that DCH had bought the land from Bloor not the landowner, DCH have control over specification and the quality of the houses, which DCH consider is more important than for example the distribution of their houses within a site.
 - The houses are open to "right to buy"
- VIII. BT asked about those on benefits or the low wages of many local people.
 - BG asked whether allocation of properties is via means testing
- IX. MH explained the allocation via Devon Home Choice was based on level of need, and people were able to bid for vacant properties.
- X. CR spoke of the difficulty of a community sustaining housing which could be for local people in perpetuity, and asked whether DCH are ever involved in Community Land Trusts (CLTs).
- XI. MH said that whilst the principle of CLTs was one DCH would endorse, there problems of synergy and the time needed for CLTs that made them less feasible for DCH.
- XII. BG asked if DCH would be interested if an altruistic landowner were to sell land to them directly to provide "key" housing.
- XIII. MH said DCH have been involved in such projects.
- XIV. CR asked about projects where current DCH housing might be demolished in order to re-develop an area to better provide for the needs of a community.
- XV. MH spoke of DCH having an appetite for such projects, for example looking at the provision of housing for older residents.
- XVI. PS gave the reassurance that from his experience working with housing associations, that they are skilled in dealing sensitively and appropriately with residents in such re-development projects.
- XVII. MI spoke about people moving into DCH housing not necessarily being local.
 - There was discussion about the fact that people may have local links and there is also a need to bring people into the town to maintain a balanced community.
- XVIII. AR asked about the proportion of DCH property in Modbury.
 - ML thought it was between 5-10% but the exact figure would be needed for the NP.

3. (CTD) DEVON AND CORNWALL HOUSING (DCH) REPRESENTATIVE, MIKE H

- XIX. ML also spoke of the need to publicise locally e.g. via the Messenger regarding the availability of DCH housing in the RA1 development.
- XX. AT asked if people at the meeting wanted to give MH feedback about the local feeling about the new development at RA1
People at the meeting described the disappointment felt by residents when the 80 house allocation was extended to 93 .Also the concerns regarding people living in the new development not feeling integrated into the community both because of the topography “away” from the town and the proportionally large number of houses on one site.
- XXI. MH described the struggles of SHDC being under-resourced and their need to have a 5 year land supply.
- XXII. BG spoke of her time as a parent governor at Ivybridge Community College and the apparent correlation between children who had some challenges at school and the size of the rooms in their homes.
MH reassured that good spatial specifications were important in the houses built by DCH.

AT thanked Mike for his time and useful discussion, which could be considered in the development of Modbury’s Neighbourhood Plan.

4. FEEDBACK FROM MEETING WITH SOUTH HAMS DISTRICT COUNCIL (SHDC) STRATEGIC PLANNER:

- a) AT reported that she along with Lee Bray (independent Planner) CR and BT had had a meeting with Tom Jones (TJ) Strategic Planning officer at SHDC at Follaton House.
- b) BT said he had been disappointed to learn that TJ had not read the consultation report endorsed by the Parish Council, which he had delivered by hand to the SHDC offices, before Christmas, when a deadline date of 21st December had been given.
- However the meeting enabled a further hard copy of the consultation document to be given to TJ, who gave the assurance that he would review it with his colleague Graham Swift.
- c) CR said she had also been able to update TJ with the statistics from the questionnaire and provide the maps
- d) AT had also been able to raise the fact DCH had expressed interest in working with NPG.
- e) BT described that TJ appeared to be protective of SHDC dealings regarding Bloor housing.
- f) PS spoke about there being some confusion with dates, there being dates in the past now on the SHDC website which had not been previously publicised.
- g) ML spoke of the need for the Housing subgroup to have a meeting after the Draft Joint Local Plan is published (Monday 20th Feb)
- h) CR said that a positive outcome of the meeting was that the group had met David Parkes (Asset Manager) , who had been one of the co-authors of the Frome Neighbourhood plan.

David was involved in projects using government grants called Community Housing Funds, which were to be used in areas which had a number of second homes. David had appeared enthusiastic about considering a pilot project in Modbury.

- i) BT said he had been in e-mail contact with David since the meeting and would continue to forge this link.

5. PROGRESS ON CONSULTATION/ QUESTIONNAIRE INFORMATION

- a) ML said the numerical data had been completed but needed some sorting, in order to be clear for the review meeting.
- b) AT said that the written and qualitative data should be ready by the end of the month and she plans to be able to format the data and analysis so far, in a power point presentation for the review meeting on March 4th.

6. PLANNED REVIEW MARCH 4th

- a) AT outlined that the main purpose of the meeting was to review data from questionnaire and to start working with Lee Bray in developing the policies for the plan. New volunteers who had an interest in doing some of the work in areas covered by subgroups, would be more than welcome
- b) AW asked to clarify the practical arrangements, as she would be away on March 4th and therefore not able to be there to co-ordinate setting up etc.
- c) AR offered to be up the hall at 09.30
- d) CB informed that Pauline R. (Memorial Hall) would set up IT equipment, i.e. Projector and screen ready to be linked up to lap top.
- e) BG offered to help with refreshments
- f) AT said there would be programme for the day for new members.
- g) BG important for keen new people to have introduction to the group, perhaps using name labels.

7. BRIEF FEEDBACK FROM SUBGROUPS.

a) Housing Group:

JS. Queried whether he should withdraw from housing group because of declared interest

CR. Suggested JS was important and valued member of the group because of his experience and input as an architect.

b) Business and Employment:

AT: Said Business Questionnaire was ready but that she would not have time to send it out and analyse the data.

JS: offered that he would be happy to co-ordinate the business questionnaire.

c) Sustainability /landscape group (see appendix A):

CR: spoke of the work Brian W had done for the group in identifying important landscape features

AR: Suggested that at the review meeting Lee Bray would offer guidance regarding what each group might need to do next. It

7. (CTD) BRIEF FEEDBACK FROM SUBGROUPS

d) Road safety and Transport:

AT: advised that there had been lots of comments in questionnaire regarding parking and road safety.

BWH: Advised there were no negative statistics i.e. nobody has died! Pollution evidence shows no significant air pollution. Therefore he considered there was unlikely to be any evidence for Devon County Council to review traffic measures in Modbury. He said he had reviewed some other completed Neighbourhood Plans and had found there Road Safety / Transport Policies were written in broad generalised terms,

AT: Asked if BWH could pull together information that had been gathered so far from including that provided by Councillor Hosking (Devon County).

e) History and heritage:

MT: Nicky, Mark and Rosemary Parker are members of the group

MT : said that they had thought “ Historic Environment “ might be better name for the group , sounding more relevant and reflecting the cross-over with other groups. The group felt ready to respond pulling evidence together.

f) Community services and facilities:

AW AT moment only members Alison Wood and Ann Turner (chair NPG) but potential to work with members of the many organisations in Modbury, depending work needing to be done following questionnaire results.

What has been done so far:

- Meeting with children and staff at the school.
- Producing child friendly information leaflet for the school
- This leaflet helped to facilitate the children with the support of their teachers sending in their many ideas and concerns about the future of Modbury, in words and pictures.
- School gate consultation to try and engage parents.
- Meeting with Health Centre, Practice Manager.
- Pop up consultation Stall in the Health Centre foyer for a week to inform consult with patients and staff at surgery
- February 2016: Meeting inviting cross section of voluntary organisations and public services to share their views. Those who attended were from Modbury Association of Recreation and Sport (MARS), Modbury Society, Parish Council, Modbury Health Centre, Modbury WI, Modbury Tiddlers & Modbury Beavers, Ist Modbury Cub Scouts, Chair Of Governors, Modbury Primary School, Lunch Club
- Others who were invited: Modbury Caring, Rock Shop, Modbury Preschool, Modbury Society, St. Georges Church, Kingsbridge Neighbourhood Policing , Modbury Fire Service
- Meeting with representatives of Modbury Association of Recreation and Sport (MARS), to discuss Open Spaces and Recreation Sport (OSSR) plan and its relationship with Neighbourhood Plan
- February 2017 Letters written to School, Health Centre, Fire and Police service to update about the South Hams District Joint Local Plan an invite for their further comments to then be taken into consideration in the development of Modbury Neighbourhood Plan

8. TIMESCALE.

Copies of Modbury Neighbourhood plan programme, Gantt chart, as compiled by PS (see Appendix B), were circulated:

PS talked through Chart.

- a) Section 1 **Joint Local Plan timetable** to provide context

Draft JLP plan to be approved by 6th March

- b) Section 2 **Neighbourhood Plan Group Meetings**

- c) Section 3 **Grant application process.** Locality Fund grant has been approved until end of March

- d) Section 4 **Planning Consultant.** Lee Bray has been appointed as Independent Planner (See Appendix C for the “Position Statement for Neighbourhood Plan Group” drawn up by Lee and previously circulated via e-mail).

- e) Section 5 **Community Consultation**

Data Input by the end of last week

Data analysis by the end of February

5.7 Write Report which includes review meeting (March 4th)

Agree report in next meeting

Public consultation for April 8th

- f) Section 6 **Development of Neighbourhood Plan**

6.3 Developing vision is an important issue. AT said the responses from questionnaire will inform vision

6.4 Develop plan policies. Lee Bray putting information into policies – with input from others.

A 5 week period from mid-March to the end of April.

6.5 Draft first version of NP by the end of April

6.6 NP meeting at the beginning of May to agree the draft

6.7 Draft version to be put to Parish Council meeting 8th May

6.8 Followed by 6 week consultation with SHDC i.e. mid-June

BT queried how this consultation with SHDC will take place. Will it be an “around the table consultation”.

- g) Section 7 **Public Consultation**

Draft MNP published in July followed by 6 week public consultation with the community,

- h) Discussion.

ML outlined the SHDC JLP timescale which will involve a public consultation which will be in Modbury on 23rd March. This would be followed, most probably at a later date, by a further public meeting to provide a response to the JLP consultation before end of April. There was discussion of the vulnerability of the time when the JLP might be adopted and the Neighbourhood Plan will still be at the consultation stage. PS spoke of the need to actively manage time to plug this gap. AT added that what the Group did have in its control was the process and evidence they were gathering.

9. TREASURER'S REPORT: (Appendix D)

- a) AW circulated the report kindly forwarded by the Treasurer , Phil Jolly
- b) ML confirmed that the Locality Fund Grant had been approved to end of March and that the application for the next grant should be just be a bureaucratic process.
- c) BT asked if Lee Bray costs were accounted for and ML confirmed that they had
- d) ACTION/VOTE BG proposed Treasurer's report was agreed. ML seconded the proposal and there was a unanimous vote agreeing Treasure's report.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS;

- a) AW spoke about the Public Consultation event to feedback the results of the questionnaire. This event was planned for April 8th at the MARS Pavilions. The pavilions had been booked for a half a day but did group want to revise that and book the Pavilions for a whole day to reach more people?
- b) BG wondered whether many people would go up to the Pavilions to view the feedback and whether it should be more central in the town.
- c) ML asked whether the White Hart assembly rooms would be a possibility.
- d) AT said the problem for the White Hart was that being upstairs, not everyone could access the exhibition.
- e) ML said the date of April 8th would allow some broad opinions to be fed into Parish Council Meeting on 10th April
- f) AT suggested that if it was felt not enough people had been able to see the exhibition, an additional date could be set up at an alternative location.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

March 4th 10.30-13.30 Review Meeting with Lee Bray Independent Planner/

Next NPG Meeting: To be confirmed, because Wednesday 22nd March several members (CR, AR, AW and BG) Are unable to make that date.

AW March 2017

Appendix A:

Neighbourhood Plan Environment & Sustainability Group (ESG) report summary

15.02.17

thoughts in red

members

Lynne Barnes
Chris Barnes
Andy Rathbone
Charlotte Rathbone
Jeff Booth
Dan Turner (abroad)

landscape & environment

- held this first subgroup meeting a year ago.
- x3 meetings since.
- finding our feet and unclear as to scope necessary....this has grown/contracted/changed.
- much overlap between groups.

sustainability

- **main event:** Mayfair 2016.
- listed possibilities.
- garnered views at stall with one to one discussions & box-ticking (potential wish-list)
- data sheets of interest/contacts (AT).
- hypothetical field...an invitation to list/design community uses (bar chart of ideas).

- SW Regen x2 drop-ins @ Modbury (photovoltaics).
- AR attended LI NP conference @ Bath 2015.
- AR attended CSE Bristol seminar @ Yealmpton (NP & energy sustainability) 2015.
- AR attended Sustainable Energy Fair @ Watermark 2016.
- LB attended Woodfuel Hub workshop (Devon Hedge Group) @ Slapton 2016.
- AR/DT/AT attended 'how to' workshop @ South Brent.

- A379 pollution (well below threshold demanding action).

landscape

- AR/BW/CR commenced to list/map some significant landscape features (we have photos on file)....*incomplete (question value now, too huge a task).*
- **main event:** Mayfair 2016.
- garnered views at stall with one to one discussions & box-ticking (potential wish-list).
- Walkabout folk id. important elements, photographing/recording these where possible or enthused to do so (we have photos on file).
- Hedges & Edges landscape character preferences (responses & other feedback listed).
- CR attended Orchard Link lectures @ DRA 2017.

current status...

- *renewed interest in orchards.*
- *enthusiasm within the team for community woodland (plan).*
- *light pollution?*
- *need fresh blood?*
- *need to know what is essential (rather than desirable).*

MODBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

POSITION STATEMENT FOR NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN GROUP

mid January 2017



ELEMENT OF WORK	COMMENTARY
First principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The plan (and its process) should be clear, succinct and user-friendly ◦ The basic conditions must be met (4 tests: conform with NPPF, fit with local strategy, deliver sustainable development, meet EU and Human Rights obligations)
Website and work to date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The website is well organised, easy to navigate and appears to include all key material gathered to date ◦ It's important to keep the site as simple as possible, particularly in its layout, and up to date ◦ Some working groups appear further advanced – this may reflect the priority of each topic locally ◦ Consultation has been good and will be a key part of the evidence base which must underpin the plan ◦ Analysis of the latest questionnaire exercise is awaited in order to begin drafting the plan in earnest
Draw things together into a coherent draft plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ A possible plan structure is shown below, with a list of supporting documents which are required or advisable ◦ Consultations have given rise to a wide range of aspirations and objectives, not all land use based ◦ The neighbourhood plan must be a land use document ◦ Non land use aspirations and actions can form a separate accompanying (non-statutory) local action plan
Draft plan consultation (and timetable)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Publish the draft NP before the draft JLP consultation closes – probably late March / early April this year ◦ The plan must be published for 6 weeks consultation and responses should guide any amendments ◦ The draft plan and responses can form the basis for Modbury's response to the JLP
Final plan submission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The final plan should be submitted to SHDC who will arrange for its examination and a referendum ◦ Assuming these hurdles are passed the plan is "made" and becomes part of the statutory plan for the area

A POSSIBLE PLAN STRUCTURE

Foreword (by the Chair of the steering group)

1. Introduction

Why do we need a plan / what area does it cover / how has it been prepared / how will it be used / what period does it cover?

2. Modbury in context

3. Vision and objectives

4. Policies and Proposals

History & heritage	Services & facilities
Housing & Development	Communication
Road Safety & Transport	Environment & sustainability
Employment & business	

5. Delivering the plan

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

- A. Basic Conditions Statement
- B. Statement of Consultation
- C. Bibliography and evidence base
- D. Monitoring Framework
- E. Sustainability Appraisal (and SEA?)

Appendix D:

**MODBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP
FINANCIAL INFORMATION**
for the period 1st April 2016 to 13th February 2017

	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)			
Daniel Turner - website main (13Dec - 13Jan)	(120.00)			
		(443.80)		
Room hire - NPG meetings			(140.00)	
Daniel Turner - website maintenance (13Jul - 13Dec)			(600.00)	
Questionnaire labels & envelopes			(50.23)	
Questionnaire - printing & postage (ex VAT £106.40)			(372.80)	
Questionnaire - consultancy			(393.90)	
Exhibition - printing (ex VAT £6)			(30.00)	
			(2,086.93)	
	£ 296.48		£ 2,183.07	
Unused Locality funds returned at 31st December 2016		-		(2,183.07)
TOTAL FUNDS as at 13th FEBRUARY 2017		296.48		-
Outstanding Items as at 13th February 2017				
Locality Grant 14th February to 31st March 2017				3,270.00
Invoices awaiting payment on receipt of grant				
Lee Bray - fees for January 2017			(883.10)	
Daniel Turner - website maintenance 13Jan - 12Feb17			(120.00)	
			(1,003.10)	
ANTICIPATED TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE		£ 296.48		£ 2,266.90

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.
Applications can only be made for 6 month periods or up to the end of the financial year whichever is shorter.
- 3 Locality budget summary (14Feb - 31Mar17)

	Budget	Pending expenditure	Balance remaining
Professional fees (Lee Bray)	2,500.00	(883.10)	1,616.90
Website maintenance	240.00	(120.00)	120.00
Questionnaire textual data input	400.00		400.00
Room hire	80.00		80.00
Stationery, sundries	50.00		50.00
	£ 3,270.00	£ (1,003.10)	£ 2,266.90

- 4 The new Locality grant has been approved but not yet received (as at 13th February 2017)

PMJ

13th February 2017

