

MODBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP (MNPG)

Final Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 4th April 2017 at 20.00 in the meeting room at the Memorial Hall.

Present: Core group members: Ann Turner (AT) Chair, Chris Barnes (Parish Councillor), Mark Lawrence (ML) Parish Councillor, Mark Trewin (MT), Barry White (BWH), Alison Wood (AW) Minutes.

Co-opted members: Nicky Crawford (NC), Rosemary Parker (RP), Charlotte Kendrick (CK), Jeff Booth (JB)

Attendees: Bernard Taylor (BT) Chair of the Parish Council, Nicky Shepley (NS) Parish Councillor, George Rosevear (GR) Parish Councillor

Apologies: Burda Gage, Jon Sullivan, Phil Smith, Lynne Barnes, Charlotte Rathbone, Andy Rathbone, 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:

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) AW raised that in the draft minutes she had highlighted a point regarding shared ownership and wanted to seek clarification whether this was accurate i.e. Item 3 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."
- c) ML confirmed that this was an adequate description of the process.
- d) There being no further amendments the minutes of the meeting 15.02.17 were agreed.
- e) AW will forward the minutes to Sacha Hagar, Parish Clerk for the information of the Parish Council
- f) AT advised that matters arising would be covered by the agenda of the current meeting

3. DEVELOPMENT OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICIES:

AT suggested that as the deadline for the response JLP was imminent that this item of the agenda be brought forward and development of Neighbourhood Plan Policies although a priority be discussed later. Those attending the meeting were in agreement with this.

4. RESPONSE TO JLP (JOINT LOCAL PLAN)

(CB left the meeting at this point, because of his declared interest)

- a) AT welcomed Bernard Taylor (chair of the Parish Council), Nicky Shepley and George Rosevear Parish Councillors to the meeting to contribute to the discussion.
- b) AT hoped that everyone had had a chance to read the draft local plan and knew about the Open Public Meeting arranged by Parish Council and to be chaired by Gary Streeter MP, on Friday 7th April at 7pm in the Memorial Hall,
- c) AT suggested Neighbourhood Plan Group should make its own response to JLP in addition to that of the Parish Council. Individual residents and other organisations for example the Modbury Society would be making their own responses.
- d) AT PS and ML had preliminary meeting to discuss the responses. Two main issues (i) Numbers of household allocated and (ii) the location of the sites,
- e) AT asked if ML could summarise the evidence regarding the numbers

4. RESPONSE TO JLP (JOINT LOCAL PLAN) (CONTINUED)

f) ML explained that any response to JLP should be regarding whether it is sound that is based on evidence. He outlined, that following the first draft and consultation in summer 2016, Devon County Council (DCC) had produced a new forecast of housing need based on a 10 year rather than 5 year timescale. In his research of the draft JLP and background documents, he had found, three points where soundness of the JLP could be questioned.

(i) In the forecast of housing need, the numbers had gone down for South Hams but up for West Devon. However South Hams have a greater land supply but this does not seem a sound justification to allocate South Hams disproportionately more housing, (900 more than housing need)

(ii) In the forecasts, 15% has been allocated as vacant homes (which includes second home) the usual vacancy rate is 3%. Inland towns such as Modbury do not have such a high rate of second homes, which brings into question whether the vacant home percentage is justified. (300 more in the South Hams than seems reasonable)

(iii) He also explained “market uplift” the concept that an oversupply of houses brings down the overall cost of houses making them more affordable. South Hams has added 25% market uplift its allocations but it questionable where extra people would come from and where they would work. (Adding about 800 to housing nos.).

ML considered that taking these factors into account rather than 4,500 allocated housing for South Hams 2,700 seems a more reasonable figure.

So in terms of Modbury in response to the JLP it would be reasonable to request a reduction from 80 to 40, in addition to 93 now being built at Palm Cross Green.

g) ML advised it would be hoped that SHDC members would take these amendments on board before the Draft Plan went to the planning inspectors.

h) JB asked why these discrepancies had not been unearthed by SHDC.

i) GR recounted that at recent meeting of Council for Protection of Rural England (CPRE) a South Hams Strategic Planner was open about the fact that he did not have a full understanding of how the forecast figures were arrived at.

j) ML explained the forecasts were used by officers in County Council with a particular expertise in this area, so there were understandable reasons why SHDC officers and members might not be aware of how exactly the figures were determined.

k) AT asked for a proposal regarding the number of houses in the response to the Joint Local Plan

ACTION/VOTE

ML proposed that in response to the consultation, the housing allocation for Modbury in the Draft Joint Local Plan be halved from an allocation of 80 houses to 40 houses which would seem more appropriate and reasonable based on evidence gathered.

MT seconded the proposal.

There was a unanimous vote for the proposal from those at the meeting eligible to vote.

l) GR advised that he was also a member of Bigbury Parish Council and the Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan had introduced the St Ives judgement regarding second homes, which is something Modbury might want to consider.

m) AT asked if at the public meeting in addition to as housing numbers and sites, types/models of housing such as community land trust should be put forward.

n) BT felt the main function of the meeting was to get feedback from the community.

4. RESPONSE TO JLP (JOINT LOCAL PLAN) (CONTINUED)

- o) AT moved the meeting on to discuss sites. From consultations, questionnaire results it was clear residents wanted small sites, within the town, to sustain an integrated community that had accessibility to facilities and maintained historic character of the town. The revised draft joint local plan had provided smaller sites than the original draft but these sites remained on the west of the town, where current development of 93 houses was in progress.
- RA2/site E was not now included in JLP but this did not mean that it could not be taken up by NP.
 - From questionnaire sites F and G to west of town were favoured.
 - Site D Scalders Lane and RA2/ Site E Poundwell Meadow were the least preferred.
 - From the questionnaire the other sites were fairly evenly distributed in the way people voted for them.
 - Site E /RA2 Poundwell meadow was least preferred because many people thought its development would reduce car parking, however accommodation for older people with level access to town was a priority.
 - Site C east of Ayleston Park there were concerns about risk of flooding.
- With views of the residents and other information gathered for example regarding flood amelioration, the retention of car parking, the NPG needed to formulate policies and outcomes.
- p) There was some discussion about car parking and future solutions. Lower Poundwell meadow car park often not full. Car parking charges can be reviewed by Parish Council but the revenue has to remain the same.
- q) ML. For the public meeting with request for reduction of housing allocation from 80 to 40, with regard to sites there was a need to choose 2 sites with about 20 houses on each.
- r) NS spoke of how historically up to now, there had been an evolution of small sites around the cross roads at the heart of the town, the extension to the west was tipping the town away from this centre.
- s) AW spoke of the importance of being able to walk to the shops, JLP wanting to sustain healthy communities. Poor accessibility to west of the town would encourage people to use their car either to come into town increasing congestion or to shop elsewhere.
- t) MT said JLP comments regarding historic impact mentioned visible impact of being seen from Flete estate, less about the more immediate impact on the historic character of Modbury.
- u) NC spoke about it being important to value and not refute the responses to the questionnaire.
- v) BT agreed emphasising that it has to be clear to people that the process is adding to the results of the questionnaire.
- w) JB raised the point that site F would be ideal for employment land. There was some discussion as to whether this land was available at the moment but if it were it would be a natural extension of current industrial estate with good access to A 379.
- x) AT asked for a proposal regarding sites.
- ACTION/ VOTE ML Proposed that from evidence gathered by NPG, sites C, part of site H and site B to be discussed at Public Meeting on Friday 7th and for Parish Council to choose 2 from these 3 sites. AW seconded this proposal.***
- Of those eligible to vote 3 voted for the proposal and 1 against***
- y) There was discussion regarding the reservations about the part of site H, which is within the potentially larger site on the west of the town. There was a fear that this could leave it open to even more development in the future.
- z) RP asked about how site B might be accessed, it was agreed access from Dartmouth Road would not be easy. Another point raised was that access routes for flood amelioration work, already agreed might open up alternative routes.
- aa) There was also discussion about the NP identifying a development/ settlement boundary which Lee Bray (independent planner) had suggested is something the NP might want to include

3. DEVELOPMENT OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICIES:

AT recommended that because the response to JLP item had taken up a large part of the meeting, That the agenda item regarding the development of policies, which was a priority and required time and focus, Be deferred to the next meeting.

5. TIMESCALE;

- a) AT. From the Modbury development Plan Programme / Gantt chart, produced by Phil Smith for the group, to date the programme was on track. However, 6.6 of the programme: Draft first version of Plan by end of April and to be agreed by the Parish Council in the first meeting in May will slip, but the time taken in preparing the response to JLP had to be acknowledged as the reason for this “slippage”.

6. TREASURER’S REPORT (see Appendix A)

- a) AT thanked Phil Jolly for producing the report
- b) ML confirmed that as seen in the report, the Locality Grant Fund had been closed and he was now in the process of applying the new grant for the next 6 months.
- c) AT said she had been told by SHDC that there was not a requirement for many hard copies of the draft Neighbourhood Plan which would keep printing costs down.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- a) BT asked who would be representing the NPG at Friday’s public meeting. It was confirmed that AT, ML and PS would attend.
- b) AT spoke regarding May Fair, she confirmed she had booked a table at the Fair on May 6th for NPG and thought as the theme for the week was “Its easy being Green” , that the MNPG table should highlight environmental, sustainability and green space issues. She asked for volunteers to be at the stall
- c) JB said he would be happy provide some support on the day but did not want to do it on his own and hoped Charlotte and Andy R would be available.
- d) CK spoke about feedback she had had from delivering the questionnaire that there was a risk of people getting “consultation fatigue”
- e) AT confirmed that the NPG was passed consultation phase, the job was to now put consultation information into actions. The May Fair stall would show what was possible.
- f) RP asked for example what requirements were there for developers to have green standards.
- g) AT these are issues which can be brought into the NP and community actions plans

Meeting closed 22.00 hrs.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

TUESDAY 25th APRIL 7PM MEETING ROOM MEMORIAL HALL.

AW 04.17

APPENDIX A:

TREASURER'S REPORT 31.03.17

**MODBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP
FINANCIAL INFORMATION
for the period 1st April 2016 to 31st March 2017**

	Parish Fund		'Locality' Restricted Fund	
	£p	£p	£p	£p
TOTAL FUNDS b/twd as at 1st April 2016		£ 240.28		-
INCOME 1st April 2016 to 31st March 2017				
Grant from Modbury Parish Council 1Apr16 - 31Mar17		500.00		
Grant from 'Locality' 1Jul - 31Dec 2016				4,270.00
		<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))	(69.00)			
Website domain rental & hosting fee 2016/17	(137.30)			
Daniel Turner - website main Inv 6	<u>(120.00)</u>			
		(443.80)		
Room hire - NPG meetings			(140.00)	
Daniel Turner - website maintenance Inv 1 - 5			(600.00)	
Questionnaire labels & envelopes			(50.23)	
Questionnaire - printing & postage (ex VAT £106.40)			(872.80)	
Questionnaire - Lee Bray consultancy Nov 16			(393.90)	
Exhibition - printing (ex VAT £6)			<u>(30.00)</u>	
				(2,086.93)
	<u>£ 296.48</u>			<u>£ 2,183.07</u>
Unused Locality funds returned at 31st December 2016		-		<u>(2,183.07)</u>
TOTAL FUNDS as at 16th FEBRUARY 2017		<u>296.48</u>		-
Grant from 'Locality' 17Feb to 31Mar 2017				3,270.00
Lee Bray - fees for Jan/Feb/Mar 2017			(2,671.80)	
Daniel Turner - website maintenance Inv 7/8/9			(360.00)	
Debbie Clyburn - textual input			(320.00)	
Room hire - NPG meetings			(95.00)	
Admin expenses - exhibition & workshop			<u>(118.16)</u>	
				(3,564.96)
	<u>£ 296.48</u>			<u>£ (294.96)</u>
Transfer of funds to meet Locality Grant shortfall		<u>£ (294.96)</u>		<u>£ 294.96</u>
TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE AT 31st March 2017		<u>£ 1.52</u>		<u>£ -</u>

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.
Applications can only be made for 6 month periods or up to the end of the financial year whichever is shorter.
- Locality budget summary (17Feb - 31Mar17)

	Budget	Expenditure	Balance remaining
Professional fees (Lee Bray)	2,500.00	(2,671.80)	(171.80)
Website maintenance (Dan Turner)	240.00	(360.00)	(120.00)
Questionnaire textual data input (Debbie Clyburn)	400.00	(320.00)	80.00
Room hire (Modbury Memorial Hall)	80.00	(95.00)	(15.00)
Stationery, sundries	50.00	(118.16)	(68.16)
	<u>£ 3,270.00</u>	<u>£ (3,564.96)</u>	<u>£ (294.96)</u>

PMJ
31st March 2017