

## **MODBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP (MNPG)**

**Final Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> April 2017 at 7 pm in the meeting room at the Memorial Hall.**

**Present: Core group members:** Ann Turner (AT) Chair, Barry White (BWh), Mark Lawrence (ML) Parish Councillor, Jon Sullivan (JS), Alison Wood (AW) Minutes, Burda Gage (BG joined meeting at item 4)

**Co-opted members:** Phil Smith (PS), Nicky Crawford (NC), Rosemary Parker (RP), Jeff Booth (JB)

**Attendees:** Nicky Shepley (NS) Parish Councillor, Barry Lee (BL)

**Apologies:** Chris Barnes, Lynne Barnes, Charlotte Kendrick, Mark Trewin, Charlotte Rathbone, Andy Rathbone, Burda Gage, 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.

### **2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING:**

- a) Regarding response Joint Local Plan (JLP). Thanks was given to members of the Parish Council and the MNPG who had reported the difficulty residents were having accessing the online "portal" to put their responses to the JLP consultation. This issue had been taken up by BBC Spotlight News and the item was broadcast on this evening's news.
- b) AT raised a further point regarding response to JLP. She had received an e-mail from Mark Trewin (historic environment lead for NPG). Mark was unable to attend tonight's meeting because he was unwell. However, he had written a response to JLP from historic environment perspective (see Appendix A). Mark had asked if this could be submitted as a NPG response. AT asked those at the meeting if they were in agreement that Mark could submit this response under the auspices NPG. All at the meeting were in agreement that Mark should go ahead putting the response as coming from NPG historic environment group. AT said she would contact Mark after the meeting to inform him of this and wanted thanks to Mark for his contribution to be noted in the minutes.
- c) AT also wanted thanks to be given to ML and PS for the work they had done in giving their presentation at the Open Public Meeting about the JLP arranged by the Parish Council. Also for their work in drafting the response to the JLP consultation on behalf of NPG.
- d) PS raised that for clear audit trail , it should be noted in the minutes that following the last NPG meeting (04.04.17) when it was voted to recommend that the Parish Council choose 2 out of 3 sites i.e. C, B and part of H. At the Parish Council meeting sites C&B east of Ayleston Park were chosen.  
Also the Parish Council and NPG have both submitted separate responses to the JLP consultation.
- e) AT pointed out that, the item Development of Neighbourhood Plan policies, which had been deferred at the last meeting because of the time taken on response to JLP, would be discussed later in this meeting.
- f) The minutes of the last meeting were agreed as an accurate record. AW will forward them to the Parish Clerk and Daniel Turner, NPG website manager.

### 3. POTENTIAL COMMUNITY PROJECT.

- a) AT informed the meeting that David Parkes South Hams District Council (SHDC) had met with members of NPG, Parish Councillors and landowners, to look at the possibility of funding a community project in Modbury. There is money available for such projects and this is separate from the JLP. AT explained that David Parkes had shown interest and was arranging some preliminary surveys. AT will keep the group updated  
AT will keep NPG updated with progress

### 4. DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN: *(BG joined the meeting during this item).*

- a) AT had circulated to the group the initial draft version NP drawn up by Lee Bray (independent planning consultant for MNPG). At this stage it is an outline and guidance for the group to put forward the detail for Lee to develop into policies. AT asked for first impressions and comments.
- b) From discussion one of the general views was that the document spoke a lot of policies referring to new development not to the ongoing issues for the residents and the impact of new development.
- c) Going through the document it was clear that the Vision and objectives needed to be "firmed up".
- d) *ACTION: PS offered to facilitate a workshop, something which he was used to doing in his work, to "brainstorm" and hammer out a fuller vision statement and objectives. His offer was welcome and taken up by the group. Time and venue to be confirmed.*
- e) BWh regarding Road Safety and Transport, he considered the paragraphs 4.18 -4.20 were light on references to the concerns raised in the consultations (congestion, pedestrian safety, traffic speed).
- f) BL said as a long term resident of Modbury he was well aware of current and ongoing issues regarding road safety and would be willing to help with the work of the Road Safety subgroup.
- g) AT welcomed BL's offer of support.
- h) AT spoke of the transport subgroup providing Lee with the detailed information.
- i) *ACTIONS: BWh: to e-mail Lee Bray with transport groups information and summary. Also to contact Devon County Council for further input from the Highways dept. AW said she had some contact from Kingsbridge Police under the remit of the community services and facilities subgroup and would be happy to contact them to ask if they would be able to meet with members of the group to discuss road safety issues.*
- j) There was discussion regarding relief road paragraph 4.18 in the draft. BG spoke of her opinion regarding the impact of relief roads on local businesses this was based on evidence she had gathered in the past from sources including the Department of the Environment. She said businesses might see a downturn for 6 months and struggling businesses might fail, but then once people become aware they can park in calmer setting and people shop more.  
From the meeting there was agreement that all the Neighbourhood Plan could do would be to protect the route for the future, if and when funding becomes available. (From the questionnaire 49% in favour, 32% against 19% no firm opinion)
- k) AT also expressed strongly that if there were aspirations for actions in the future responsibility needed to be assigned to which organisation or person would take these actions forward.
- l) PS raised the point that in the housing and development policies needed to go beyond sites to include types of houses and tenure
- m) NS raised the point that green energy / sustainability issues seem to be missing. Paragraph 4.29 refers to green spaces and landscape but not sustainable energy.
- n) AT said the environment group having divided into two areas one looking at landscape and the other at sustainability, green energy being a very important factor looking to the future.
- o) JB asked if Neighbourhood plan could insist on sustainable standards in house building above national minimum
- p) *ACTION: AT said this would be one of the questions she would ask Lee Bray.*

#### 4. DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN: (CONTINUED)

- q) JB asked about schemes to become carbon neutral, such as the scheme in South Brent where income from wind turbine and photo voltaic was used to insulate homes. It was valuable to build and learn from what others have done including local university projects etc.
- r) BG spoke about “houses for life”, adaptability in housing design to meet changing needs including the importance of accessibility for the disabled.
- s) JS mentioned dementia friendly housing schemes
- t) AT re Employment and business paragraph 4.21. AT said there had not been a large response to the business and employment questionnaire, which she was in the process of analysing. Lee Bray had highlighted the question as to whether a work hub was to feature in the NP. From questionnaire did not seem a huge interest. (45% quite useful, 24% not especially useful, 31 % neutral)

*ACTION: JS offered to get some information and statistics regarding the use of the work hub in Totnes.*

- u) ML asked about employment land be included in the NP. JS said that there was currently a waiting list for the New Mills industrial site. BG spoke of the need to be ambitious and open to new employment initiatives for example those that might involve a science/education. It was agreed such an attitude could be reflected in the community action plan.
- v) AT re housing paragraph 4.6 in draft document Lee was asking if sites were to be included but this would not be possible until JLP approved. However rationale for spatial distribution could be included.
- w) In the draft Lee had also queried the inclusion of Town Square. There was discussion of the factors that concerned residents about Town Square e.g. loss of parking and that these conflicting factors needed to be considered hand in hand. ML explained that car parks were owned by SHDC but could be leased by the Parish Council who could then have more control of how they were used, although revenue must remain the same. He also highlighted that aspirations were not directly part of NPs.
- x) PS referred to MNP6, paragraph 4.15 in the draft regarding Principal Residence Requirement and asked whether this was the “St. Ives element” i.e. newly built houses could not be purchased as second homes.?
- y) *ACTION: AT said she would contact Lee for clarification.*
- z) *ACTION: RP offered to look at Supporting Diversity MNP14 paragraph 4.29 in the draft and was advised to liaise with Charlotte Rathbone who would have information on this section.*
- aa) JS commented that the draft was very Modbury centric with little input from the wider Parish.
- bb) AT said the consultations, household and business questionnaires had all made efforts to tap into the views of the wider parish, the lack of wider input was not for want of trying.
- cc) PS asked whether MNP2 Design and Construction (paragraph 4.5) would refer back to the Village Design Statement. AT said the Village Design statement had been referred to by Lee under MNP4 paragraph 4.10 Heritage and Conservation and was an important reference for the plan.

## **5. TIMESCALE:**

- a) Development programme was circulated as compiled by PS. AW apologised, after it became clear that version circulated was not the most recent. It was the version discussed at previous meeting, the time-goals were the same but the chart circulated did not have the areas coloured in green for the stages that had been achieved. For correct version see Appendix B
- b) AT said that there would be slippage in the date for completion of a draft NP which had been scheduled for the end of April. This delay was due to the time needed to provide a considered response to the JLP consultation which had been a more immediate and pressing deadline. It was considered that the draft plan was now more likely to be achieved by the end of May/beginning of June
- c) PS said he would update the development plan accordingly.
- d) AT thanked PS for his work on the Development programme.

## **6. MAY FAIR STALL:**

- a) AT confirmed that as May Fair theme was "It is easy to be Green" that the stall would focus on landscape and sustainability issues. The aim being rather than a consultation to provide information and in that way enable residents to keep up to date, interested and involved in the NP process.
- b) *ACTIONS: JB said he would liaise with Charlotte and Andy Rathbone regarding resources they had.*
- c) *JS said he could provide some information around "green" house construction.*
- d) *AT said she would send an e-mail round to collate a list of volunteers to be at the stall for part of the morning.*

## **7. TREASURER'S REPORT:**

- a) AT said Phil Jolly (Treasurer) had e-mailed to inform that there had been no changes in finances since the last meeting on 04.04.17
- b) ML confirmed that the Locality Fund had been applied for and should be confirmed in the next couple of weeks. He would seek clarification of whether the Parish Council's agreement to pay for the expected shortfall was going to be £2,500 or £2,500.
- c) AT thanked ML for his work on this application.

## **8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS:**

- a) AT informed the meeting that she was away for 3 weeks in May.
- b) There being no other business the meeting closed at 21.00

## **9. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING:**

**TUESDAY 6<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 7PM IN THE MEETING ROOM OF THE MEMORIAL HALL**

## Appendix A:

### Response to JLP – Historic Environment

This is intended to complement and support the response to the JLP by the Modbury Neighbourhood Plan Group, but with a focus on Historic Environment issues.

With particular reference to policies **DEV 21 (Conserving the Historic Environment)** and **DEV 22 (Development affecting the Historic Environment)**, we welcome a number of strategic priorities identified in the Plan, including:

- A recognition of the wider socio-economic value of the historic environment (as advocated and evidenced, for example, in *Heritage Counts: Heritage and the Economy*, Historic England, 2016)
- A commitment to protecting and enhancing a wide range of heritage assets, designated and non-designated, and potentially extending to portable and intangible assets.
- A proactive and creative approach to enhancing local distinctiveness, especially seeing heritage-led regeneration as the first-choice method of development.
- The value assigned to local community engagement, including their contribution of local knowledge, and cultural and aesthetic values.

With reference to the **Strategy for Smaller Towns** (policy area 5c), which includes Modbury, we wish to make the following observations:

The AONB boundary runs through the centre of the historic settlement area and Conservation Area of Modbury, not to the south of the town as implied (para. 5.134) (about 25% of the town's listed buildings lie within the AONB boundary). The AONB boundary also dissects the Landscape Character Area in which provides the rural backdrop and setting to the town as a whole (*The Devon Landscape: An Appraisal*, Devon County Council, landscape zone 27).

Whilst the AONB is of great strategic value, it alone is insufficient to protect the shape, form, integrity and coalescence of Modbury from border development affects, particularly with regard to major developments around the town's northern and western periphery.

The historic landscape area to the north of the AONB boundary, which was designated an Area of Great Landscape Value and adopted in the 1996 Modbury Plan, should justly be retained as a Strategic Landscape Area, especially as this designation is proposed in the Plymouth Policy Area owing to 'increased sensitivity due to its proximity to the protected landscape' (**ref required**).

We therefore maintain that the application of this designated status in the one case and not the other does not appear to be justified, especially since the original AGLV designation was originally made precisely for this same reason.

## Appendix A (continued)

### Response to JLP – Historic Environment

With reference to the **Draft Heritage Impact Assessment** developed as an evidence base to support the JLP, this is limited in several respects, at least as far as the appraisal of sites in Modbury is concerned.

This document (paras 2.3 and 2.4) states that it has considered the Historic Environment Record, Conservation Area Heritage Appraisals (and one should add the Parish Heritage Appraisals commissioned by the AONB) as key evidence sources in making its assessments. For Modbury at least, this is evidently not the case, as the assessment only considers the impact of development upon certain Listed Buildings, some of which are quite far from the sites, even in a different parish. There is no mention of the Modbury Conservation Area or other designated assets or areas of archaeological potential lying closer to proposed development sites around the town's settlement boundary. Its conclusions are therefore very limited in detail and scope, if not skewed by this approach because it does not adequately identify which heritage assets are affected by the development site (Step 1 of the methodology). It does not therefore conform to the requirements of Historic England (*The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans*, 2015).

Even as it stands, the outcomes of the Impact Assessment are not reflected in the JLP's site proposal statements. All those for Modbury (nos. 15-17) contain the same statement that the developments will 'conserve and enhance the heritage assets'. The Impact Assessment for these same sites, on the other hand, determine that the impact will be either of no significance, little significance, or 'nothing more than less than substantial' (*sic*). The Plan's claim that the developments may have a positive effect on historic assets is not evidenced.

Step 5 of the Impact Assessment Methodology – the determination of meeting the NPPF's test of soundness - is not carried out in the assessment, but is postponed to the point at which planning applications are brought forward, 'when there will be adequate opportunity for the potential impact on those assets to be considered in more detail'. The assessments cannot at present therefore be regarded as sound for the purposes of the NPPF.