

Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting 13/01/22 12:00pm

In attendance: Cllrs Kingdom, Cllr Walker, David Jury, Peter Smith, Rebecca Ward, Jude Wood (Administration & Projects Manager), Stuart Todd (Consultant)

DJ explained that the group would like to run through the document point by point, most of the comments/changes the group agreed with but some needed discussion.

DP01 – All agreed with suggestion by ST

DP02 – DJ explanation asked for figures/protocol required on homes that meet the needs of first time/single buyers.... ST normally a percentage is used so that together you would have a range of percentages for each, numbers can change. If you have got evidence to support those percentages, they 'developer' has no room to argue. DJ - we have some local evidence and on top of that statistical evidence – can this be used. ST there is a range of evidence that you can provide, the more you have the better, in NH planning consultation is half the story, greater weight in the past (for example on the Local Plan) has been based on written evidence rather than consultation, in the past they would listen to consultation but only take 10/20% of that because they want factual based evidence consultation is argued that it's although is 50/50 try and get more quantitative data – in the form a Housing Needs Assessment (an assessment is across all types and tenures) – that be done by the steering group alternatively you can commission it, at the moment the Government support the grant funding they provide by locality there is also tech support, housing need assessment is funded but you need to qualify – technical support is separate from other grant funding. Such pressure around affordability but also around second homes, national data indicates this; Acorn who are the consultants they are awarding this programme to groups that aren't allocating housing because of market issues.

DP03 – Add that to policy above – agreed SK glad that 'perpetuity' is being kept in the policy wording.

DP04 – The consultation that was done felt very strongly about this policy, as did the Council – how we can change it so it can be included – SK does it mean we have to define what infrastructure is? ST – at the moment national policy says it is onerous to place that requirement on a development/developer when they don't necessarily get their money from the scheme until the end. Certain things are required as they are a statutory undertaking such as sewage works outside the planning system so they have to be done through regulation. The variety of the infrastructure that the planning system has influence over has got less over the year, partially because of that but also because of things like schools, doctors are considered businesses now so if you wanted an extra classroom for example you could work the Education Authority but it usually be typically be funded through a section 106 agreement. So saying in advance 'we need a classroom here' because of this development it would typically need 1000's gathered through section 106 monies. DJ - problem we have is where we have had proposals for such things as roads, schools etc that haven't happened and that's why the community feels so strongly about this policy. ST – footpaths and cycle paths etc could be placed in the plan elsewhere as projects and

then a policy which suggests that development should be contributing towards those or development will be supported where it contributes towards those. Identifying projects is helpful for a number of reasons, often developers see it and they want to know what they have got to do and pay to get their development approved so you can flag up priorities that way. A site in mind makes it more robust. DJ – would like to include basic infrastructure in this policy – is this something that can be done. ST – you can draft a policy where there are requirements ‘timely deliverable completion of’ certain types of infrastructure, you could add on something that relates to completed dwellings; completion in planning is it’s got a door on it it’s water tight it’s ready to go on the market – the question is the degree to which the LPA puts that in to conditions and that’s where in NHP that once you have got you plan in place don’t assume that’s it, even if you get that policy through and it sticks in the plan is only half the story the other half is when planning applications come along you keep pushing, check conditions to try and hammer home that message.

Stuart going to draft up a new policy based on the above.

DP05 – Can a draft Policy be done around Principal Residence – ST agreed to do this. HW – mentioned St Ives in that they are having problems whereby developers are no longer building but this has made house prices very high – Georgeham Parish Council put in their Policy ‘local people only’.

SP01 – Not needed as a Policy as included in the Planning process. – Some priorities are identified they just be included throughout the plan.

SP02 – agreed with ST suggestions

SP04 – DJ Fremington Parish is that is not just Fremington it includes Bickington, Yelland, Bickleton to name a few and traditionally it was very clear which areas where which; relatively speaking it remains unchanged. During the consultation there was a general consensus that strategic gaps should be preserved so that traditional environment of Fremington Parish is preserved, part of that is the estuary view up to now that is pretty much unspoilt but we all feel strongly to suggest lumps of the view along the strategic gaps should be preserved and to keep housing of those. ST – can see what the group is trying to achieve but this is the wrong policy tool there are other ways of doing it. Local Gap/strategic gaps they are traditionally to keeps settlements separate – so they way to do it is you can have a policy on views a vistas if you identify where those views are and you catalogue and document as much as you possibly can because views are subjective. You need photos, maps with view cones – a policy can be drafted to respect that – you need two things one is your evidence to be a descriptive as possible and secondly you need to couch it in landscape terms because planning is about land use and not just something you see, the wording you put in needs to set that out. Second layer in terms of policy protection are for things likes green infrastructure within that blue infrastructure (rivers) one way is to say areas of habitat, biodiversity (woodlands, saltmarshes) those sorts of areas which are largely all ready identified but that you can give policy weight to, you identify them on the map you can say for the reasons of habitat and biodiversity will protect X Y & Z. MAGIC Natural England has GIS mapping that can be used to identify areas which need to be protected. ST – to write a Policy.

EP01 – agreed with ST comments/changes

CP01 – agreed with ST comments/changes

GP01 – agreed with ST comments/changes the same sort of thing as just discussed in SP04 - DJ in reading some NHP they have sometimes made a policy come up twice, in other words if you have written this previously would you suggest there is no reason to include this in GP01 or is it a good idea to prompt it again. ST – depends how you phrase it; you wouldn't necessarily repeat the same policy, but you might come at it in a different direction.

GP02 – agreed with ST comments/changes – provide some evidence for allotments/identify locations

GP03 – agreed - might be worth contacting sports governing body and try obtaining a letter of support.

BP01/BP02 – agreed but perhaps an action plan should be included that says we should go and ensure that some of things that we think should be protected are because they may not be. SK concerned about Conservation Areas. ST - if there are areas that you think need to be protected/listed the key would be to get them on the Local Authority Local List – discuss with Local Authority/Conservation Officer.

TP01/TP02 – agreed with ST comments/changes – create a Transport/Travel Plan/action plan

TP03 – agreed – perhaps an action plan to go with this?

TP04 – agreed with ST comments/changes

CEP01/CEP02 – agreed ST comments/changes

CEP03 – PS suggested a policy along the following lines would be beneficial:-

Where appropriate renewable energy studies identify land is suitable for future solar and wind energy farms, reserving these sites for future renewable energy generation will be supported.

Group have looked at possible sites in principle. There was a general view amongst the community that we should be doing more for renewable energy. ST - now Gov policy is changing and it's going to have to change to recognise climate change etc. At the moment Planning Policy and the NPPF if neighbourhood plan groups wish to identify areas for renewable energy sources such as solar a site or sites needs to be allocated on a map and if you are going to do that that needs to be based on what you have done plus and the plus is landscape character which can be done through a consultant.

CEP04 – agreed ST comments/changes

CEP05 - Drop this because the government have put out a consultation document, Jan 2021 with the aim to change the building regulations in order that all new build is to be to zero energy efficiency standards by 2025 and have an interim energy efficiency improvement of 31% reduction on current emissions by 2021.

CEP06 – agreed ST Comments/changes

CEP07 - Drop this as will be covered by building regs.

CEP08 – Delete

CEP09 – Delete

CEP10 – agreed with ST comments/changes

G101 – Delete

G102 – agreed with ST comments/changes

G103 – move to an action plan

G104 – move to an action plan

G105 - agreed with ST comments/changes

G106 – agreed with ST comments/changes

Next Steps: Updates to be made to the draft plan

To receive further policies from ST

Meeting finished at 2:00pm