

MODBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP (MNPG)

Final Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 5th October 2017 19:00 -22:00 held in the meeting room at the Memorial Hall.

Present: Ann Turner (AT) Chair, Charlotte Rathbone (CR), Andy Rathbone (AR), Burda Gage (BG), Jon Sullivan (JS), Chris Barnes (CB) Parish Councillor, Mark Lawrence (ML), Alison Wood (AW) Minutes.

Co-opted Members: Phil Smith (PS), Jeff Booth (JB), Nicky Shepley (NS) Parish Councillor

Attendees: Lee Bray (LB) Independent Planning Consultant and Bernard Taylor (BT) Chair of the Parish Council who joined the meeting at Item 4.

Apologies: Rosemary Parker (RP), Lynne Barnes (LB), Mark Trewin (MT), Phil Jolly (PJ) Treasurer, Nicky Crawford (NC)

Before meeting started AW asked if all present were agreeable to her recording the meeting, in the interest of providing accurate minutes.

AT opened the meeting by welcoming Lee Bray, independent planning consultant for the Modbury Neighbourhood Plan.

1. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS:

AT explained that potential development sites would be discussed during the meeting.

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

2. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING:

- a) The minutes of last meeting (15.08.17) were distributed and had been distributed via e-mail prior to the meeting. AT indicated that most actions from the last meeting would be dealt with during item 3 on the agenda the review of the draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP).
- b) Other actions
 - I. Re: 2V, AT noted thanks to RP and NC from the Historic environment subgroup for the list of historic buildings
 - II. Re:2IX, AT said MT unable to be at meeting but would be updating re: information from Historic England on registering parkland
 - III. Re 3V, AT had contacted a fellow NPG member in Bigbury and ML had contacted an Ivybridge NPG member and had gained some reassurance, that both groups had shared similar difficulties with the process.
- c) AT asked if there were any other matters arising or amendments to the minutes of the last meeting. There were none and those at the meeting agreed that the draft minutes be accepted as an accurate record.

ACTION:AW to forward the final minutes to the Parish Clerk for the information of the Parish Council.

3. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (NP): review draft

(N.B. headings and paragraph numbers from draft NP are in blue)

- a) LB had brought the latest draft of the NP in digital format for the group to review. In his introduction he considered that the group had done a lot of work and that the draft plan was nearly ready. It needed drawing together; he explained that a NP needed not to be too heavy on words and details. He understood that Modbury was an aspirational community, but by not stretching the content beyond what can be evidenced, less revision would be required after the independent examiner puts in his/her report.
- b) He spoke of the Statement of Consultation and Assessments being stand-alone documents not appendices to the NP.

- c) **RE: 1. DRAFT PLAN INTRODUCTION.** LB and others agreed that the text in blue boxes drew the reader to significant points/ summaries of the NP process
- d) PS asked re 1.10 what was meant by local development plan. LB said it had quite a specific meaning relating to the Joint Local Plan (JLP) sections relating to Modbury as well as the NP. In discussing this, it was agreed that a glossary would be useful.

ACTION: the compilation of a glossary

e) **RE: 2. MODBURY IN CONTEXT**

- I. Re 2.3 LB considered that the info re listed building, conservation areas, would sit better under the Modbury Today, heading.
- II. AT pointed out that the photos etc. would be changed. The current arrangement was mainly for the purpose of general layout. It was thought, for example, the interesting graph of population over the years might be better placed in background information.
- III. Re. 2.7 Planning context this would be updated as JLP progressed.

f) **RE: 3. VISION AND OBJECTIVES**

- I. LB considered that the Vision statement and objectives read well.
- II. PS noted that the objective regarding a community energy scheme did not have a policy linked to it. LB suggested that it might be added to community facilities “shopping list “ policy MNP1
- III. There was discussion regarding identifying a relief road and its conflict with AONB protection. LB suggested wording “identifying a relief road whilst respecting the integrity of the AONB.
- IV. CR raised:
ACTION: the need to reference the Open Space, Sport and Recreation assessment (OSSR) objectives produced by Modbury Association for Recreation and Sport (MARS).

g) **RE: 4. POLICIES AND PROPOSALS**

- I. Simple schedule with hyperlink (supporting document)
- II. P.S said that an important consideration missing in 4.2 was affordable housing for local people and BG raised whether this would include social housing. In discussion it was suggested that what was meant by affordable housing needed to be included in the glossary.
- III. **Development design and construction policy MNP1**
ACTION: Once sites are decided, settlement boundary map needs to be included.

h) **DEVELOPMENT SITES POLICY MNP3**

Discussion regarding sites followed:

- I. LB and other advice confirmed that an examiner would not pass a NP that did not conform to JLP. The sites included in the JLP being as follows:
 - West of Palm Cross, where Bloor has planning permission for 93 homes and 1,900 sq. m of employment space (this is under construction)
 - (F&G) Pennpark, a site for 40 homes (privately owned)
 - (H) West of Barracks Road, a site for 40 homes (Bloor)
- II. BT confirmed that Bloor homes were arranging a public consultation, in Memorial Hall on November 27th 3-7pm, about how H could be developed
- III. AT said NP needed to convey, the clearly evidenced wish of the community, to have small sites distributed across the town. In order to resist development all on one side of the town, a NP could put forward alternative deliverable sites.
- IV. LB explained that providing alternative sites would allow scope for development in the event that any of the JLP sites should fail to proceed, and would indicate the community preferences for small developments distributed across the town.

i) [DEVELOPMENT SITES POICY MNP3](#) (continued)

AT asked if all present and not restricted by declaration of interests, were in agreement that Site C should be proposed to be included in the MNP (for about 25 dwellings) and that the settlement boundary be drawn round sites H, F,G and C. All present who did not have a declaration of interests were in agreement.

AT said this proposal with supporting rationale, needed to be taken to the Parish Council (PC) for the Council to vote on. The PC had previously voted on site B and C both east of Ayleston Park.

BT said according to procedure, the PC are able to vote to reverse a decision within 6 months of that vote.

ACTION: AT to bring the inclusion of site C in Draft NP in addition to JLP sites, to the next PC meeting as part of NP report.

ACTION: CR in process of completing vision and character assessments of F, G and H in addition to C.

- j) AT drew the meeting back to Draft plan [DEVELOPMENT DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION POLICY MNP2](#)
- I. LB noted that there was some repetition from other parts of the draft, so if the group was happy he will revise accordingly.
 - II. P.S asked re 4.5 what a “Design Review Panel” was. It was suggested this was another term which could be added to glossary, in addition to the hyperlink provided.
 - III. JS raised the point of whether replacement buildings were included as new developments.
 - IV. There was discussion about whether a NP could require higher building regulations than the national guidelines. LB spoke of guidelines quickly becoming out of date as national planning guidance is regularly revised. Therefore if a NP includes specific regulations it risks becoming out of date during the life of the Plan and then would be of little use. In LB’s experience of working on other NPs, those that are more likely to pass examination, include wording that indicates that design standards that meet National Standards are required and those that exceed the latest government guidelines are welcomed. Such wording keeps the Plan being of use during its lifetime, whilst expressing the aspirations of the community. An accompanying document could then be drawn up with a list of what additional standards the community would welcome.
 - V. There was discussion re c, car parking clause and the general opinion was that 2 car parking was the most that could be expected at any dwelling.
 - VI. LB spoke of adding the clause he had previously included regarding developments reducing the opportunities for crime and the fear of crime. . Also clause e, regarding safeguards during construction, would be more appropriate as the last clause in the policy
 - VII. It was considered that the clause regarding thanks to South Hams District Council (SHDC) should not to be included in 4.6, since as the JLP moves on decisions will become dated. Thanks to SHDC to be included in acknowledgments.
 - VIII. Later in the meeting CR and JB pointed out that there needed to be a clause included regarding gardens, hedges, and bin stores.

k) [RE: HISTORY AND HERITAGE](#)

- I. LB asked re: 4.8 historic assets were these all present in Modbury?

ACTION: AT said historic environment subgroup members were not able to attend meeting but would be able to double check this.

- II. LB considered there should be a clause regarding energy efficiency and listed buildings
- III. LB also advised that conservation and listed buildings come under separate legislation.

I) HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT
MNP5: HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

- I. (a) Should read 3 bedrooms or less.
- II. Re: suitable housing for older residents. LB advised that if NP was going to set targets for certain types of housing, there would need to have specific evidence to support for this. It was noted that supported housing had been part of discussions with David Parkes from SHDC regarding possible Community Housing Fund projects in Modbury.
- III. There was discussion about whether local people are not accessing affordable housing currently available (e.g. Red Lion Court), and whether there is a reason for this, for example in the way it is advertised. (*?? Future community action to investigate further*)
- IV. ML asked about rural exception sites for affordable housing. LB said rural exception sites would include all sites outside settlement boundary. LB advised that although there was already a JLP policy and National Level policy regarding affordable housing on rural exception sites, it would be helpful to support this policy via the Neighbourhood Plan.

m) MNP6: PRINCIPAL RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT

- I. LB spoke of there being less evidence for this policy than in perhaps coastal areas of the South Hams. However he thought it was worth keeping it in and seeing what the examiner's opinion is.
- II. LB suggested that the clause regarding registered social landlords put back into MNP6. a, i.e. "New housing, excluding replacement dwellings **or those managed by a registered social landlord**, will only be supported where there is a restriction to ensure its occupancy as a principal residence." LB said this advice was based on the fact that this was the form of words used in St. Ives NP where the Principal Residency Requirement had been successfully adopted.

n) ROAD SAFETY AND TRANSPORT

- I. **MNP7** PS enquired whether policy (a) could be expressed more strongly. After discussion LB thought the following wording would express this in terms that would be acceptable to the examiner; "Development shall include good, safe pedestrian access and links with enhanced opportunities for walking, cycling and the use of public transport. In particular improved pedestrian links to recreational and greenspaces are required"
- II. BG spoke Re c, in her experience the term relief road was more acceptable to most people rather than a by-pass, the latter perhaps implying avoiding the town altogether.
- III. Discussion re whether a clause stating developments incorporating a Car sharing Scheme would be welcome and also those with electric car charging points.
(*?? To be added to MNP12*)

o) EMPLOYMENT AND BUSINESS:

- I. LB said it was good to include work hub but the examiner may possibly question lack of identified premises.
- II. There was discussion regarding new homes with design for home working. LB spoke of other plans having the caveat "where appropriate and viable", but also warned against making the plan too dense.
- III. To identify current employment areas i.e. New Mills Estate on Plymouth road, Poundwell and employment land on RA1 development at Palm Cross Green.
- IV. To also look again regarding including a boundary line around shopping area.

p) COMMUNICATION.

LB considered this to be a simple and effective policy. Although concerns about the health and safety of phone masts are often raised, LB stated that there are no guidelines or evidence to back up these concerns.

q) SERVICES AND FACILITIES.

- I. LB considered that these policies could be significant in doing a lot of good for the town.
- II. JS asked whether one house was considered to be a “development”. LB thought that, although it could not be a requirement for a small development, contributions towards facilities wish list might be put forward by developers to support their planning application.
- III. MNP12 “shopping list” of Town’s priorities. There is scope to add but to the list but should be carefully prioritised as funds are not unlimited.
- IV. “New development will be where appropriate and where the requirement comes directly from the development be required to contribute”. However again there may be cases where facilities and infra structure not directly affected by development may be given contributions to support planning application process. LB advised to not specify the size of development which would be expected to contribute.
- V. AR suggested community woodland for recreation habitat and biofuel be added and also discussed the use of the term Civic Space rather than Town Square , which related better to the function proposed.
- VI. Other suggestions included being more specific regarding play areas and cross referencing the OSSR document.

r) ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY

- I. LB spoke about Site of Special Scientific interest (SSSI) as this is not under threat and is covered by national policy, he advised not to include it in NP.
- II. CR pointed out that in MNPG 13 c the term landscape would be better than “landscaping” which is not really recognised by professional planners,
- III. Re: MNPG 14 AT said there was a need to double check the national sites
- IV. Re: MNPG 15 CR confirmed that she had permission from DCC to use base map and will use this to identify green spaces. Green spaces to be added included
 - Play space in Cromwell Park
 - Green space on Palm cross green development
 - Allotments
 - MARS recreation ground
 - School field
 - Green area by the A379
- V. AT asked LB about the potential conflict of a future route for a relief road being over a designated green space.
LB advised that infrastructure takes precedence AONB, however any justification for a relief road in the future would demand as much protection to the integrity of the AONB as possible.

s) DELIVERING THE PLAN

LB advised that there was a tried and tested form of words to explain the delivery of a NP.

4. JLP PUBLIC EXAMINATION

- a) PS explained that he had been asked to represent the Parish Council at the public examination and wanted to be assured that he would be presenting what the PC wanted, and would therefore welcome a member of the PC to join him.
- b) AT said that she had registered to attend on behalf of NPG, the registration deadline being 12 mid-day on 06.10(tomorrow).AT asked if anyone from the NPG wanted to go, adding that as NP work to the PC their points and issues should concur.
- c) ML said he had registered for a meeting to discuss the overall housing numbers for the JLP which would be on a different day to the discussion re. Modbury.
- d) AT spoke of the needing to be able to justify the original responses to the JLP but that the examiner would also welcome updated information.

5. TIMESCALE (see Appendix A)

Thanks to PS for updating and distributing copies of Modbury Development Programme.

- a) LB considered he would need a month to update Draft with the revisions that had been discussed at this meeting.
- b) It was confirmed that NPG pay for the printing of the draft NP but probably only a few hard copies would be required.
- c) LB advised that thought needed to be given to how the consultation would be publicised.
- d) It was concluded the consultation period would go into January next year.
- e) LB considered that, realistically, having the NP adopted by next June was very ambitious. He pointed out that timescale also depended on the time capacity of both SHDC and the examiner.

AT thanked LB for attending the meeting and taking away notes and comments for further revision of the draft Plan. Lee said he would be happy to attend other meetings, if was felt to be useful, but was also aware that the NPG needed to budget for the best use of his input.

6. TREASURER'S REPORT. (See Appendix B)

- a) AW distributed copies of Treasurer's report, with thanks to Phil Jolly.
- b) AT noted that the regulations necessitated that the Locality Fund (with timescale to the end of November) would need to be closed and reapplied for.
- c) AT also reminded members that, with this in mind, people should not delay putting in any expenses incurred.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS:

- a) As a point of information was noted that the CPRE (Council for the Preservation of Rural England) had produced a document regarding the overall calculation of housing numbers.
- b) AT thanked people for staying for what had been a long but constructive meeting.

8. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING.

AT suggested that as it had been a long meeting that the date of the next meeting would be confirmed via e-mail

Meeting closed 22.15

AW 10.17

APPENDIX B

**MODBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP
FINANCIAL INFORMATION
for the period 1st April 2017 to 31st March 2018**

	Parish Fund		'Locality' Restricted Fund	
	£p	£p	£p	£p
TOTAL FUNDS b/fwd as at 1st April 2017		£ 21.34		-
INCOME 1st April 2017 to 31st March 2018				
Grant from Modbury Parish Council 1Apr17 - 31Mar18		2,500.00		
Grant from 'Locality' 16May - 15Nov 2017				3,643.00
		<u>£ 2,521.34</u>		<u>£ 3,643.00</u>
EXPENDITURE 1st April 2017 to 31st March 2018				
Room hire - NPG meetings		(20.00)	(140.00)	
Daniel Turner - website maintenance inv 10,11 & 12			(360.00)	
Lee Bray - consultancy inv 0005, 6 & 7			(1,156.25)	
Devon Wildlife Trust survey (ex VAT £12.90)		(64.50)		
				<u>(1,656.25)</u>
TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE AT 5th October 2017		<u>£ 2,436.84</u>		<u>£ 1,986.75</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.
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 (16May17 - 15Nov17)

	Budget	Expenditure	Balance remaining
Professional fees (Lee Bray)	3,143.00	(1,156.25)	1,986.75
Website maintenance (Dan Turner)	360.00	(360.00)	-
Room hire (Modbury Memorial Hall)	140.00	(140.00)	-
	<u>£ 3,643.00</u>	<u>£ (1,656.25)</u>	<u>£ 1,986.75</u>
- 4 The above assumes that invoices sent to the Parish Clerk have been paid promptly. In fact there can be a delay of several weeks particularly in the summer months.
- 5 The above position was agreed to Parish records as at 2nd October 2017

PMJ
2nd October 2017