

Minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG)

Virtual Meeting via Zoom

Tuesday 10th November 2020 at 7.30pm

Present: NPSG Members: Alison Alexander (Chair), Mike Loverock, Cheryl Loverock, Tom Lowry, Andrew Mogford and Ian Catherall
Attending: Karen Smith (Clerk).

1) Apologies – Chris Timpson

2) The minutes from the 19.10.20 meeting were approved.

3) Declaration of Interests

Interests were declared, as per previous meetings:

- Alison Alexander (Chair) declared a financial interest in Site 8.
- Ian Catherall declared a financial interest in Site 4.
- Tom Lowry declared a personal, non pecuniary, interest in Site 21.

4) Finances

The SHDC Design invoice had come in at £240.90 net, under the amount expected, and has been paid by the Parish Council. As Chris was not present, reviewing the finances further was deferred until next meeting.

5) Consider replies to emails from Lee Bray and Duncan Smith

Duncan was asked what the SHDC normal 106 contributions would be, but declined to give an exact answer. The group agreed they should flag up improvements that can be justified: 1) relating to specific sites and access, 2) more general aspects such as provision & maintenance of play areas; biodiversity; carbon neutrality; village hall improvements to cater for increased demand. Secondly, Duncan was asked whether the landowner of the brownfield site (Site 15) would be able to build houses there without NPSG or Parish Council approval. He confirmed that planning permission would need to be sought.

The draft strategy was sent to Lee Bray for his opinion and detailed comments were returned. After discussion, the following edits were agreed:

- 1) Tom to edit to say 'the JLP identifies a likely need for around 40 homes'
- 2) Tom will make the necessary changes under 1. Traditional Allocations. The group had been outlining their thinking here, but in the final Plan the intention would be to simply refer to them as 'Allocations'. The settlement boundaries will be redrawn around all allocations, but there will be remote allocations, which are an exception to the normal way of doing things. The evidence behind the group's thinking should be turned into an explanatory preamble before the policies.
- 3) Lee is correct that the wording should read 6-10 dwellings – Tom will amend.

- 4) Lee recommended that if a site is specifically allocated in a plan then it is better not to refer to it as an exception site. It was agreed that the terms 'Central Allocations' and 'Satellite Allocations' would be preferable to Traditional and Exception.
- 5) Lee suggested leaving single and double plots to be the subject of general policy. Debate ensued. The group had not been inclined to follow this approach as it may lead to allocating less than 40, however if say 38 were allocated, then a further two affordable homes might come forward if a policy covering one or two affordable dwellings is incorporated and allows this to happen.
- 6) The group were of the view to allocate the 40, and keep things as tight as possible. It was agreed that if someone hadn't developed an allocated site in say within 5 years then it would ask the question was it ever going to be developed. Any alternative site coming forward would have to be equal or better.

6) Housing – further discussion on Strategy and Policies

Under Policy SNP4: Housing Development the following edits were agreed:

3. the wording of 'satellite sites' replaces 'exception sites and Lee's alternative clause 3 should be revisited dependent upon the final list of sites
4. Here 4 bedrooms should be left
7. Needs an update with Table no. or put in our own requirements instead? Lee has been quite clear that our policies must stand alone.
9. Edit to say 'suitable exception sites will be welcomed'. TTV27 defines the word 'suitable' but the group could re-define it?

Under Policy SNP5: 'Single Dwellings' was suggested by Lee as an alternative to 'Single Plot Exception Sites'. The group then wished to keep the first paragraph and not remove it, as suggested by Lee.

- 1.a.i – the group agree with Lee's edit
- 1.a.ii – remove the word 'could' that Lee suggests and retain the wording as originally proposed
- 1.a.iii – spelling issue
- 1.b – the group preferred the Shropshire wording but were happy to remove 'within and'
- 1.e – 0.05ha should read 0.1ha
- 1.f – the group were keen not to be too restrictive here but happy that 18sqm related to a normal garage size
- 1.g&h – Lee grouped these, the group liked them separate, but agreed to remove the original point h) 'it is served by an adequate access and infrastructure etc etc'
- 1.i. – agree Lee's wording of 'the proposal complies' rather than 'they comply'.

7) Housing Allocation continued

The group used their working allocation (5/10/20 minuted) as a base document for pinpoint discussion.

Site 8

All agreed on its merits. Close to existing development boundary, good connections and close to population. Alison did not vote.

Site 15

Site removed. Although it was agreed that this would be an excellent site for business premises.

Site 5

Site removed. As it is outside the villages, it fits the criteria for an affordable dwelling. As the group are aware this does not fit with the landowner's wishes, it was felt any allocation here would not be essentially deliverable.

Site 1

Close to existing development boundary, this site offers 6 dwellings with 2 of them affordable and this proviso should be stipulated. No adverse feedback was forthcoming during the open consultation from Landscope residents about a development of that size in that location.

Site 26

Within the village boundary and a good site, but not wishing to overdevelop Landscope, the group retained the allocation at one.

Site 13

Adjacent to a population centre, all agreed this site falls under the policy for Affordable Housing. Allocation remains at 3 affordable, 1 open market.

Site 28

Adjacent to existing development boundary and providing 30% in line with the JLP, so at 14 dwellings, of which 5 are affordable, this site meets the group's strategy. The group will specify that they would not wish more than this, as any increase would result in overdevelopment to Woolston Green.

Site 27

Site removed for now. Any property would need to be Affordable and currently the group believe this does not fit with landowner's requirements – however this is to be clarified. Alison to forward copy comms around the group.

Site 3

It is the group's view that a small development on this site would bring some balance to Memory X. Originally 2 affordable units were considered, but a further open market house has been added to ensure that the site is deliverable.

Site 4

Without input from Ian, the group discussed that as this site falls under the same anomaly as Site 5 it can only be considered if 100% affordable. It was then clarified that an affordable property would be offered. On that basis the site is included.

Site 29

Essentially an affordable development with one open market house. The group regard this as an excellent site for self-builds in a great location. Tom will clarify with the

landowner on the point of self-builds and any potential covenants to ensure that this is a deliverable site. Mike will seek further input from Rob Ellis.

Site 7 and 16

These were discussed in conjunction. The group had favoured allocating Site 7 over 16 since it had scored one point higher in the Site Assessment undertaken earlier in the year. It was agreed that if Site 7 were to withdraw for any reason, then Site 16 would be first reserve.

The following table is now updated from that detailed in the 5/10/20 minutes:

Site	Location	No. Houses	No. Affordable Homes	Running Total Houses	Running Total Affordable Homes
8	Land East Southford Lane, Stav	2	0	2	0
1	Field betw Landscope Ch – WG	6	2	8	2
26	Land at Stables, WG	1	0	9	2
13	Land beside Dodbrook Cotts	4	3	13	5
28	Land at Beara Farm, WG	14	5	27	10
3	Land at Memory X	3	2	30	12
4	Land next Beara Hs, WG	1	1	31	13
29	Land at Hillcroft	6	5	37	18
7	Field beside Westpark Cotts, Stav	3	2	40	20

8) Correspondence

Correspondence from a Parishioner requesting a meeting with the NPSG on behalf of herself and 5 others has been received. Alison will invite the group to the next scheduled NPSG meeting and opportunity will be given for the group to speak on their specific concerns before the meeting formally commences.

Bruce will update the NPSG in due course on informal discussions with Dartington PC regarding seeking to extend the South Devon AONB to include parts of both Dartington and Staverton Parish.

Alison to respond to owner of the proposed site opposite the Live & Let Live to confirm that the NPSG are not currently considering that site within its allocation.

9) Date and form of next meeting – Monday 23rd November at 7.30pm. This will again be a virtual meeting.

Meeting closed 9.45pm

Karen Smith, Clerk