

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

**Final and amended minutes of the meeting held on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018 19:00 -21:00 in the meeting room at the Memorial Hall.**

**Present:** Ann Turner (AT) Chair, Charlotte Rathbone (CR), Mark Lawrence (ML), Alison Wood (AW) Minutes Secretary

Co-opted Members: Phil Smith (PS), Nicky Crawford (NC), Rosemary Parker (RP), Nicky Shepley (NS) Parish Councillor, Colin Whybrow (CW) Parish Councillor,

Attendees: Bernard Taylor (BT) Chair of the Parish Council

**Apologies:** Burda Gage (BG), Jon Sullivan (JS), Jeff Booth (JB), Andy Rathbone (AR), Dan Turner (DT), Chris Barnes (CB), Lynne Barnes (LB), Phil Jolly (PJ) Treasurer,

Before meeting started AW asked if all present agreed for to her record the meeting, in the interest of providing accurate minutes. All agreed.

### **a) DECLARATION OF INTERESTS:**

AT advised that sites would be discussed during the meeting.

There were no declarations of interest

### **b) MINUTES OF LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING:**

- a) The minutes of the last meeting (16.01.18) had been distributed by e-mail and copies were also given out at the meeting. The minutes were accepted as an accurate account without amendment. AW to forward them to Sacha Hagar, Parish Clerk for the information of the Parish Council and to Daniel Turner for them to be uploaded onto the MNPG website.

### **c) UPDATE ON PROGRESS:**

AT brought notes to the meeting of progress so far on the draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP), and plans for the consultation period following it being published and these were discussed;

- a) Regarding Schedule 1 Consultation to official organisations on which NP may have an impact. AT thanked AW for compiling the list of organisations and their contact details to be sent draft NP and asked for their comments.
- b) Lee Bray (LB), independent planning consultant has nearly completed the supporting documents. He has also advised that a map including all the proposals on one document, should be included in the draft.
- c) CW was thanked for his work on co-ordinating the consultation exhibition and drawing up an overview pamphlet summarising the main points of the NP.
- d) AW confirmed that the Memorial Hall has been booked for Saturday 3<sup>rd</sup> March 11.30 -5pm with the intention of the exhibition being open between 1pm -4pm, adding that Pauline Ryder has asked for a layout plan so she can put out chairs and tables needed.
- e) AT said she hoped members of the group would also volunteer, if available, to be in the Parish Office on a Saturday morning alongside the Parish Councillors, who are there on a regular basis. The role of the volunteers would be to answer specific queries about the Draft Neighbourhood Plan during the consultation period and take note of any comments to be added to response to the consultation. AT also intends to put an information stand in the Health Centre and a comments box in the Post Office.  
Hard copies of the draft NP would be available in the Parish Office and Post Office
- f) AT said that it was hoped copies of the overview Pamphlet could be delivered by hand to outlying households.

### **3. UPDATE ON PROGRESS (CONTINUED):**

4. AT had brought a digital copy of the latest version of Draft NP to show the meeting. She indicated that there had been some rewording of in the Development Sites section, to clarify that West of Palm Cross Green site was “under construction” so not part of the NP.
5. Regarding the maps; CR was thanked by AT on behalf of the group for all her hard work on drawing up maps for each proposal. CR showed the meeting the map which included all proposals on one map, as had been advised by Lee Bray. CR felt that although it might appear complicated she felt it was useful, because it showed areas that overlapped and abutted (e.g. development sites, conservation area, AONB)

There was discussion regarding how to distinguish JLP sites i.e. the West of Barracks Road site which NP agreed with and the Penn Parks site which NPG would like removed in favour of East of Ayleston Park site. It was decided that the JLP sites would be in same colour with West of Barracks Road a solid colour and Penn Park site hatched.

CR confirmed in response to a question from BT that the retail area of the town was defined in the draft NP.

#### **d) CONSULTATION PERIOD**

- a) CW said he had written an article, due out in the next Modbury Messenger; the article reminding residents that the NP is their plan, developed on their views and encouraging people, therefore, to engage in the consultation process. For those who did not have time to read the full plan the overview document provided the salient points.
- b) Those at the meeting reinforced how well CW had set out the Overview Pamphlet, making it more manageable to read than the full plan and again motivating everyone in community to see it as something that they are part of.
- c) It was queried whether overview pamphlet could be prepared in time for it to be delivered with the Messenger. CW felt he could probably get it finished by Monday (26<sup>th</sup>) but that SHDC graphics could not print it time. Alternative printers were discussed.
- d) ML offered to discuss with Sue Rogers who organises delivery distribution of the Messenger if it could be held until Monday. He would also work out delivery routes for outlying areas,
- e) Details of putting up the exhibition were discussed. It was arranged that on Friday 2<sup>nd</sup> March at lunchtime CW, AT, BT, AW would put up display on boards to be stored on the stage for Saturday.

#### **e) FORTHCOMING JLP PUBLIC HEARING :**

- a) ML said he had already appeared at the hearing, when housing numbers across South Hams and West Devon were discussed. His query regarding market uplift had not been accepted, since market uplift statistics were a national standard. However his point that housing numbers in the South Hams were elevated (900) because of insufficient supply in West Devon was noted and was going to be considered.
- b) Both ML and NS, who had also attended the hearing, described the process at the hearing, saying that the inspectors ask questions, therefore rather than being able to deliver a prepared speech it was important to take opportunities, as they arise, to make the points that one wanted to convey.

## 5. FORTHCOMING JLP PUBLIC HEARING (CONTINUED):

- c) NS said she had been able to raise points about evidence of poor communication with SHDC and also had been able to emphasise the position of the centre of Modbury and how this related poorly to the proposed development sites.
- d) PS ,who has been nominated to speak on behalf of the Parish Council at the JLP hearing, distributed notes he had made about the points the Parish Council and NPG(under auspices of PC) had indicated that they wanted to be raised. He asked if those present could check these notes to ensure he had encapsulated the salient issues. (See Appendix A).
- e) ML raised a minor point as to whether point B4 might be more appropriately raised before B2. Otherwise all present at the meeting supported the content of PS document and thanked PS for his work. The document will be circulated to all parish councillors by Sacha, Parish Clerk.
- f) Parish Councillors and MNPG members will also be present at the JLP hearing.

## 6. TIMESCALE

- a) It was confirmed Modbury Neighbourhood Plan Development Programme as drawn up and revised at the last meeting, reflected accurately the schedule of tasks and events to date.(Appendix B) Thanks was given to PS for his work on this.

### b) TREASURER'S REPORT

- a) Phil Jolly, Treasurer , had e-mailed all members of the group as follows:

*"Dear All,*

*My report for tonight's meeting is brief:*

*There has been no booked expenditure since last November and therefore the total funds available remain virtually unchanged from my report of 13th Nov 2017.*

*At that time we had £2,181.49. We then applied to the Parish Council for a further £1,250 to meet the expected expenditure to end of Plan. This was agreed in December. In addition Lee Bray informs me that we still have £250 credit left from the £750 we paid him on account. Consequently at this time we have a total of £3,681.49 available.*

*Anticipated expenditure in the next month includes: work by Lee on the draft plan, design & layout work by SHDC print dept (est received of £300 to £375 which appears very reasonable) and costs associated with the 3rd March exhibition. All should be easily accommodated within our existing funds.*

*IMPORTANT: As you know the Parish Council only pay bills at the monthly Council Meeting. Could I please ask that any claims you may have for exhibition or draft plan costs are sent to me by 6th March and I will get them to Sacha for the 12th March Council.*

*I am away on 7th/8th March.*

*Many thanks and as always if you have NPG finance queries please get in touch. Regards, Phil"*

- b) AT noted thanks to PJ for his update and reiterated his message for members of MNPG to submit any outstanding expenses,
- c) BT asked in looking to the future budget for the NPG, whether more expenses would be incurred other than those already accounted for?
- d) AT replied that she was seeking clarity from SHDC about whether further sustainability and environmental assessments were required. If so, these assessments may incur further costs but she would keep BT informed.

**c) ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- a) AT spoke about the Memorial Hall committee having raised concerns about the play park behind the hall having been identified in draft NP as a green space. This contradicts the future plans of the Hall committee to redevelop the area into additional car parking space once a new play park has been developed is on the Palm Cross Green site with Section 106 money.

AT said to address these concerns and the wider play needs of Modbury, she has convened a meeting on Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> of February in Memorial hall Meeting with members of Memorial Hall committee, Modbury Association for Recreation and Sports, Rob Sekula (Countryside and Community Projects Officer) South Hams and West Devon Councils and hopefully parents of young children in Modbury as well as Parish Councillors and members of MNPG who are able to attend.

- b) There being no other business, the meeting closed at 21.45

**DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING TO BE CONFIRMED** (after Consultation period and gathering of responses).

## **APPENDIX A:**

### **Draft Outline MPC Submission to the JLP Inspectors:**

The Council wish to make detailed comment on three aspects of the draft JLP:

#### **A. Overall plan**

A1. The Council supports the overall thrust of the JLP as it affects Modbury, namely for a degree of sustainable development to support a thriving community and local economy

#### **B. Numbers**

B1. The Council does not support the calculation of the overall housing need for the JLP area as a whole, the South Hams district itself and the numbers for Modbury in particular for the following reasons:

B2. The Council considers that the overall calculation of need is based on out-of-date (2011) population estimates for 2034. Latest estimates, due for publication imminently, show a reduction of 20% in the population increase and 15% in the household increase for the JLP area.

B3. The Council is advised that the employment growth proposed in the JLP is insufficient to support an increase of 26,700 homes proposed in the JLP. The excess figure is estimated to be 4,000 homes.

B4. The Council is of the view that the market uplift will not have the desired effect of reducing overall house prices – developers will only build out at a rate that maintains prices and their margins. The Council therefore believes that the target for South Hams should be reduced by 800 homes to reflect this oversupply.

B5. The Council is also opposed to the switching of West Devon's need to the South Hams TTVPA thus putting unsustainable pressures on communities and infrastructure here. The Council believes that the excess need of 900 properties should be returned either to West Devon or Plymouth fringe, recognising that the need to reduce levels of commuting

B6. The Council therefore believes that the current target of 4,500 for the South Hams TTVPA and 172 dwellings for Modbury should be reduced, in Modbury's case to 157.

#### **C. Sites**

C1. The Council supports the inclusion of the proposed site to the west of Barracks Road

C2. The Council opposes the proposed two sites at Pennparks Farm on the grounds that it places all development on the western side of the town, something which the community of Modbury has repeatedly opposed, preferring a balanced approach.

C3. The Council believes the inclusion of these sites conflicts with the JLP's own policies – SO6.2, SO6.6, SO6.8, SO10.2, SO10.3, SO10.6, SO11.4, SO11.6, TTV2, TTV31, DEV1, DEV20, DEV24, DEV31.

C4. The Council believes that a more sustainable solution which would improve compliance with the JLP policies and Modbury's own emerging Neighbourhood Plan would be the substitution of these two sites for a site to the east of Ayleston Park for 25 homes and for which there is a willing vendor and developer.

C5. The Council also wishes to continue developing its proposals with South Hams DC for a CLT to the south of the town centre but will be unable to do so if the JLP remains unamended.

#### **D. Summary**

D1. The Council wishes to seek the support of the Inspectors to reduce the overall housing target for Modbury from 172 to 157, to remove the Pennparks sites from the JLP, replace them with the site east of Ayleston Park and redraw the town development boundary accordingly.

**PS/18.02.18**

# APPENDIX B

