

## **Minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG)**

**Monday 25<sup>th</sup> April 2022 7.30pm (via Zoom)**

**Present:** NPSG Members: Alison Alexander (Chair), Ian Catherall, Mike & Cheryl Loverock, and Ed Vidler

**Attending:** Karen Smith (Clerk) and one member of the public

**1) Parishioners Time** – No comments made.

**2) Apologies received** – Andy Mogford and Bruce Thorogood

**3) Approval of Minutes** – the minutes from 11/04/22 were approved.

**4) Matters Arising** – Alison has circulated responses from Parishioners; edits to Plan still to be actioned.

### **5) Declaration of Interests and Dispensations relating to particular Sites**

- Alison Alexander (Chair) declared a financial interest in Site 8.
- Ian Catherall declared a financial interest in Site 4.

### **6) Finance**

Ed still needs cost estimate from Lee before completing Locality grant application. Alison has had a preliminary discussion with Aecom and they raised further points for consideration. As the NPSG do not wish to constrain people unnecessarily, it was agreed not to expand on Housing Design, as suggested by Aecom. The group also do not regard that the Plan is at risk from speculative planning applications, as Aecom suggested it might be. In regard to the Site Assessment evidence, Lee has been asked if there are formal criteria that can be quoted – response awaited. The NPSG have already indicated that they will revisit their assessment of Site 15. The NPSG have taken at face value that SHDC require the SEA and HRA Screening.

#### **Actions**

- Alison to respond to Aecom and answer points raised by Ryan Putt, and advise Barkingdon is listed.
- Alison to clarify with Duncan that producing these two specialist assessments will not lead to the need to repeat Reg 14 Consultation.
- NPSG to update Site 15 Assessment & map showing Site 30 and reduction in development area of Site 1 BEFORE Aecom fully instructed.
- After being caught out by the requirement for the SEA & HRA specialised assessments, Alison also to clarify with Lee what is required to get to the finish post.

### **7) Consideration of South Hams' (Duncan) response**

Members present reiterated the NPSG's willingness to edit the Plan for purposes of clarification/correction, but although noting concerns remain regarding the mismatch between the housing objective and chosen housing strategy, they stated again that they were not willing to re-write the Plan. They do understand however that they will need to explain at Reg 15 why certain SHDC comments were not acted upon.

**Key points for the NPSG to action out of Duncan's response are noted here:**

- Pg 3, 1<sup>st</sup> para to be changed as per Duncan's point *that the NP will not have full force as a part of the Development Plan until it has passed through Examination and been made by the District*
- Pg 7, 2.5 - agreed needs edit – remove (apart from the small piece of Dartmoor)
- Objective Pg 15, 2<sup>nd</sup> para last line – replace with '*we wish all housing to be low carbon and encourage to exceed the current govt requirements*'
- Pg 7, 2.9 – already noted that this needs edit
- 4.2 – reference the Housing Needs Survey which covered large/small, downsize/upsized, bungalow, no. beds etc
- 3.6 – South Hams require full justification for settlement boundaries. If the group remove Memory X, it loses opportunity for CLT at Site 29. Alison to debate the point with Lee unofficially first as NPSG keen to try & justify CLT and see where get. Must also explain why omitted Site 15 – Alison to get Lee input on this too.
- Pg 20 – Cheryl to supply a definition of 'eco-tourism'
- SNP1 – 1) Duncan's points here to be referred to Lee for him to recommend how to tweak in relation to JLP Policy DEV 8; 4) ask Lee if he thinks we should do this as Duncan suggests.
- SNP 2 – a) Alison to provide clear explanation; b) Lee to tidy up; c) to be decided (as per comment under 3.6)
- SNP 3 - Alison to advise Duncan that the owners of local green spaces have been consulted, i.e. PC & SWCS.
- SNP 4 – 1) Shrink area on map re Site 1 and explain it is 6 because adding to 14 at Beara gives the required allocation of 20 for Landscope; 2) Not got sites available at 11+ and Parish Survey results indicated desire for less than 6 dwellings per site anyway; 3) Housing Needs Survey again provides the evidence base; 7) leave in here about the broadband and repeat under SNP8; 8) reference Housing Needs Survey again.
- SNP 5 – the group have no intention to preclude private developer. 'Will be a priority and' will be removed and instead will say '*will be welcomed particularly where*'; 2) although repeating JLP policy, the group wish to leave this in as it clarifies the thinking behind our exception site policy – useful to have an explanation of it; 3) NPSG understand Duncan's viewpoint but are not including the Shropshire model – it has been amended to our own model. Group have considered TTV27, but are unsure what this evidence has to look like. Fundamentally agree to disagree here.

- SNP 6 – Duncan’s comment (1) not consistent with a rural area where public transport is de minimis. Barkingdon proposal is to reduce car journeys by providing employment where people are already working. Current Barkingdon business facility does not allow for growth, that a particular local business requires and we would like that business to remain. Current Barkingdon premises does set a light industrial precedent. Lee to assist with wording of the relevant section on Site 30 to meet criteria.
- SNP 7 – Lee reword
- SNP 8 – Lee reword
- SNP 9 – again Lee to tinker with wording. Paramount that any development includes appropriate parking provision, as the local infrastructure does not sustain additional parking and there is a lack of public transport to service need.
- SNP 10 – 1) In adding Penn Reca and Bumpston Clapper Bridge to list of non-designated assets, the NPSG are not minded to have to consult again – specific requirements to be clarified here. Alison also to clarify further what Historic England said?
- SNP 11 – refer all to Lee; including suggestion made to remove 3b from the policy?
- SNP 12 – Alison will try and find a Dark Skies Policy – standard cut & paste from an adopted Plan – Lee?
- SNP 13 – 1) needs work, not sure what to do with it; 2) add ‘new development will be expected’; 3) group want to keep this point in as an aspiration.
- SNP 14 – 1) remove where the purpose is to generate power for use within the Parish; 3) rewording to be referred to Lee
- SNP 15 – refer rewording to Lee
- SNP 16 – NPSG do not intend to consult Environment Agency.

### **Actions**

- Alison to explain group’s thoughts to Lee and clarify how long he will need to work on this.
- It was discussed how to display NPSG responses to SHDC concerns raised by Duncan. A response column will be added to the table. The NPSG responses will also need to include relevant elements from Lee, before publication.

**8) Date of next meeting** – Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May, 7.30pm (zoom) to look at Site 15 Assessment. Clerk not required.

The meeting closed at 9.30pm.