

PAIGNTON NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

- Blatchcombe
- Clifton with Maidenway
- Goodrington, Roselands & Hookhills
- Paignton Town
- Preston



MINUTES OF A FORUM MEETING

held at the Gerston Chapel Hall, Torquay Road, Paignton
at 6.30pm Thursday 16th May, 2013

www.paigntonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk

www.torbay.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning

In Attendance:

Cllr Jane Barnby, Roger Bristow, Jane Brooksbank, Cllr Stephen Brooksbank, Cllr Ian Doggett, Freda Bamford Duane, Louise Gilson, Eddie Harris, Alan Hill (Minutes), Karen Jemmett, Nigel Jones, Helen Kummer, Cllr Chris Lewis, Sam Moss, Linda Norman, Richard Parish, Cllr Ruth Pentney, David Pickhaver, Richard Stevens, Ann Waite, David Watts (Chairman), and David Wotton.

Apologies:

Gesche Buecker, Tracey Cabache, Anne-Marie Curror, Ian Curror, Cllr Bobbie Davies, Eileen Donovan, Lorna Gardner, Paula Hermes, Andrew Mackmurdo, Melvyn Newbery, Mike Parkes, and Cllr Alan Tyerman.

AGENDA ITEM – 1. APOLOGIES RECEIVED AND WELCOME

1.a Apologies received were as listed above.

1.b Welcome. David Watts, the Chairman, welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked Gerston Chapel for the use of the venue. In the absence of Mike Parkes who is attending an unwell family member, Alan Hill had volunteered to take the Minutes.

AGENDA ITEM – 2. MINUTES OF THE LAST FORUM MEETING (18th April 2013) AND MATTERS ARISING

2.a Minutes (i) Melvin Newberry who had offered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting wanted an extra paragraph added to the minutes. This was read out by the chairman, and members present voted that it should not be added as it went beyond the scope of the matter discussed.

(ii) It was suggested by Nigel Jones that more detailed minutes were now necessary in order to give fuller account of individual member's contributions at forum meetings and any key decisions made henceforth. This was seconded by Karen Jemmett. It was agreed they still needed to be 'Minutes' not 'Hours'.

(iii) With no other matters arising, David Wotton proposed, and Sam Moss seconded that the Minutes of the Forum meeting held on 18 April 13 be agreed as a true record and they were unanimously accepted subject to the following typographical corrections: in Attendees listed, Kevin Tremmett should be Karen Jemmett, and Item 3.a. paragraph 3, line 3 a 'not' should be added to read "...as it is not the norm in the country for deaths to exceed births".

(iv) Under heading 3.a. New Household projections paragraph 6, David P undertook to respond to a question raised by KJ about the accuracy of the statement recorded in the previous minutes that Plymouth and Torbay had an equal amount of benefit properties. He said this referred to the number of 'private' rentals and explained that any such parity with a larger city like Plymouth was due to the fact that the latter has a much higher level of council housing than Torbay. KJ thanked DP for his transparency in explaining this apparent statistical anomaly to members.

ACTION: David Pickhaver agreed to research further and report back to the next meeting.

2.b Forum Resources. The Forum's current account balance at the Bank and Fronrunner resource held by the Council on the Forum's behalf are as before. At the meeting held on 8 May 13, the Chairman reported that all three Forum representatives had concluded that the bid for up to £7,000 additional funding from 'Locality' would be more appropriately made for direct grant support for Stage 3 given the large size of the three Neighbourhood Areas involved.

2.c. Referendum success – Thame Neighbourhood Plan 76% yes vote of 39.8% turnout, was conducted on the 2nd May, the same time as the local elections. Exeter St James NP has similar problems to ourselves, but is a very much smaller area. They had a 91% YES vote on 2 May 13 and are the first to have reached the Referendum stage as a non parish council body.

2.d Draft Tor Bay Masterplan David W gave a brief summary of the latest report and referred to the interim reply letter sent on the Forum's behalf. This noted that there was no mention of the North Quay and harbour entrance, only the East Quay in respect of works to minimise flood risk. The draft proposal for the East Quay was for it to go the other side of the quay and create a wet landing area. He felt that this seemed OK in principle, but they could be affected by the vagaries of current EU regulations. He therefore had queried that an environmental assessment may be needed first and the letter asked for a copy of any such study to be sent to PNF members. Comment was also included that the extent of redevelopment implied appears to go beyond the wish to see the 'quaintness' of the Harbour maintained as an attraction for future visitors as well as existing community members. The meeting agreed with the interim reply that had been sent.

2.e. Proposed development at Collaton St Mary. (i) The Chairman informed members that there was a town hall meeting scheduled for Friday 17 May 13 to discuss Taylor Wimpey's new application, which is expected at the end of May. Both he and Alan Hill had been invited to attend. In summarising his main objections, Roger Bristow said that he was amazed that there was any suggestion of having two access points on Totnes Road, since Torbay Council have previously always rejected plans to increase the number of access points on this site. He also raised concerns about positioning a pond behind the school, stating this was "an accident waiting to happen." More generally, Roger drew attention to the Planning Minister's latest assessment of housing need. There was a lengthy discussion of this between DW, DP and Roger who felt that we have 7-8 years, not 5 years supply. Roger also said that the field has been used for agriculture, and this was evident because silage was still cut there, so the land should be left dormant for at least 5 years. He concluded that the development doesn't create any permanent jobs at all. DW agreed that all objections the forum have previously raised still hold true now and he undertook to make members aware of any conclusions arrived at during Friday's town hall meeting at the June Forum meeting.

(ii) DP confirmed that Taylor Wimpey have now indicated they will not be attending Friday's meeting, so it's unlikely that anything conclusive will arise for a while yet. Nigel J again asked that the next set of minutes contain a detailed summary of what's discussed at Friday's meeting because he was worried that details of discussions held behind closed doors would not be available to all members. He added that the Freedom of Information Act now facilitated such openness and transparency in respect of the planning process and urged DW to make this information available. Cllr Chris Lewis said that council 'briefings' do not have formal minutes and the meeting on Friday was a 'briefing', not a formal meeting with developers. DP confirmed to say that the meeting was about key planning issues, but no decisions would be made at this stage. A number of members still felt that they should be told about any outcomes from this meeting, briefing or otherwise. DW undertook to include something at the next forum meeting. Alan H suggested that the briefing note and note of the meeting outcome could be added as an appendage to the next set of minutes, which was agreed. Ann Waite also made the point that the apex of the field was part of a bat flight path and this could have some impact on the Greater Horseshoe Bat colony nearby.

2.f New Local Plan revised 'Headline figures' (i) It was agreed that the Report submitted to the Torbay Council meeting on 15th May 2013 be considered with Item 3.b later in the Agenda.

2.g Torbay Economic Strategy 2013-18 – Final draft showing jobs numbers considered by Torbay Council Scrutiny Committee on 30th April 2013

(i) David Wotton, Torbay and District TUC Delegate, was invited to speak on 'Jobs led growth' in the draft Local Plan. The local TUC branch has 2500 members with potentially 5000 votes.

(ii) He replied that it was job figures that interested him more than anything else. He said that the figures were badly flawed and raised some concern about what isn't involved in discussions about the Link Road. For example, the impact of shorter journey times to and from Newton Abbot and surrounding towns following completion in 2015. He said that the figures for 2018 indicated 200 new jobs associated with the Link Road and wondered where these are going to come from? He went on to say that trade unions were concerned about the lack of a living wage in the Bay if any projections are to be viable. Cllr Ruth Pentney said that the Council's economic strategy was a separate document. DW said that the economic strategy was a supporting document. He added that there was no associated housing strategy in place yet. Sam Moss asked if a housing strategy will be available by the next full Council Meeting. He also indicated that the latest calculation of what would be a living wage in rural areas was £7.45 per hour. Cllr Ruth P gave her understanding that there would be a Homelessness Report next year. David Wotton indicated the local branch members would be looking more closely at the Final draft and he will relay any further views to the Forum.

AGENDA ITEM – 3. PROJECT PLAN PROGRESS

3.a Stage 3 – Steering Group and CP progress (i) DW reminded the meeting of the process and timetable agreed. Emphasis was made that we must have a greater than 50% 'YES' vote from those that vote on the Neighbourhood Plan and how different this was to the process the Local Plan goes through where there is no such requirement. A councillor said that the 18 July 13 meeting clashed with a Full Council Meeting and a discussion ensued as to whether we should change the date of the-Forum meeting to enable councillors to attend both. There was initially strong feeling about this as the meeting dates to 19 September 13 had all been agreed, the venue was already booked, and changing the date on a previous occasion had not worked. By the Chairman's casting vote it was decided to leave the timetable as it is and to remind all councillors that attend a separate steering group ahead of the forum, which other members were not party to.

Report of SG meeting held on 7th May 2013

(ii) The Plan preparation is now in Stage 3 and all were reminded that the next step immediately precedes the first statutory public consultation. The five CPs reported on their progress to-date, which remained as reported to the Steering Group meeting on 7 May 13:

Blatchcombe CP – have discussed Blagdon Farm so far in the Western Area

Clifton & Maidenway CP – are progressing discussion with potential volunteers

Goodrington, Roselands & Hookhills CP – are intending to hold a meeting soon

Paignton Town CP – have a shop for publicity that will open for 6 weeks from 20 May 13

Preston CP – have met recently

(iii) DW read a submission received from Melvyn Newberry about the Oldway location and undertook to send it to Preston CP for initial consideration. There was some discussion about whether it was realistic in thinking that Oldway could be turned into a country club in future and suggested that perhaps Melvyn was merely looking ahead and the situation in the event of any later changes.

(iv) Roger Bristow said that lot of people have done a lot of work in the Forum but he remained concerned about a lack of any real experience among members in some areas.

3.b Stage 3 – Facts about Paignton – incorporating 2.f and 2.g above (i) The Chairman drew attention to the words of Question 15 that the Forum had included in the Stage 2 community engagement, which the recent ONS projections had born out:

There are not enough jobs or homes to meet the needs of existing residents. The draft Local Plan confirms that a 5 year supply of new sites exists for new homes. Pressures beyond 5 years will depend on how many people move into the area from outside of Torbay. Without more people from outside, Torbay's population level will drop, because deaths exceed births every year, with mixed consequences for our town. "

(ii) Attention was also drawn to the importance of the replies received which were three times greater in respondents than had been received to the draft Local Plan consultation. The results were displayed in the order of greatest support.

Do you agree with the following proposals ?		Yes	No	Not answered
b)	Give priority to employment led growth, not housing led growth	91%	4%	5%
d)	Keep the number of additional jobs and homes in 'balance' always	86%	6%	8%
c)	Allocate further land for jobs only in sustainable locations	81%	9%	10%
f)	Increase the amount of Affordable housing to meet local need	71%	19%	10%
a)	We should plan for a drop in the level of resident population	62%	28%	10%
e)	Provide more local shops only if the population increases	62%	29%	9%

(iii) Comparison was made with the Local Plan revisions in the report submitted to the full Council meeting last night (15 May 13) in response to the replies received from the draft Local Plan consultation last September / November 12. The report approved contained the following revisions:

- The Plan establishes a maximum capacity based on clear evidence
- 5-6,000 net new FTE jobs (not max) (was 15,000)
- 8-10,000 homes (no change)
- Major review every 5 years, sub-regionally (Teignbridge have now withdrawn their objection)
- Monitor annually - if growth exceeds levels, will trigger strategic review of sites to meet additional demand

Over the first 5 years:

- 400 homes pa +/- 25% (300-500 pa as before)
- More than adequate 5 yr land supply (homes)
- Job losses & gains more difficult to quantify

Longer term:

- With improvements – could accommodate up to 10,000 homes
- Simple extrapolation suggests 9,000 homes needed over 20 yrs:
3,000 for 'natural change' (including decreasing household size)
3,500 for inward migration (mainly retirement)
2,500 for 'economically active' in-migrants
- 5-6,000 net new jobs:
Reducing unemployment from 8.3% to 5.5%
85% of new jobs taken by Torbay residents

Options considered:

- "Do Nothing" – less likely to achieve best outcomes
- "Do Little" – unlikely would be accepted, or resolve issues
- "Positive Intervention" – exceeds Bay's capacity
- "Environmental Capacity" – strains environmental capacity
- "Hybrid Option" – realistically ambitious (the reports recommendation)

(iv) In the discussion that followed, concern was raised that reducing unemployment from 8.3% to 5.5% seemed only to involve 1,250 new jobs for existing residents (e.g. a reduction of unemployed from 3,700 to 2,450) which implies 4,750 of the 6,000 jobs going to in-migrants, and 6,000 of the 9,000 homes going to in-migrants, which did not appear to be the job-led growth approach being proposed.

(v) Roger Bristow felt the revised proposals were unsatisfactory. Eddie Harris believed that everybody at the meeting supported the need for jobs led growth but we must not forget the number of households on the social housing waiting list and the number of households in private high rental properties who would dearly love to own their own homes. DP drew attention to the importance of the 3,000 natural change figures and the need to make allowance for economically active migrants

over at least a 10 year perspective. Roger Bristow added that the recent meeting between Sarah Wooleston, MP and the Housing Minister revealed that amendments were based on 8,800 for 20 years as the blueprint, not 10,000. KJ made the important caveat that wider cultural change still needs to be factored into the Plan, and she agreed with DP that a 15-20 year perspective was needed for this. She added that it was important for forum members to realise that housing need and local job take-up would inevitably be affected by welfare reforms and changes in adult social care currently under way. DP said that there was public support for self-build projects. Although the Council had still to confirm how they propose to implement this into their strategy.

Next Steps

(vi) DW drew attention to the Council report which said the next step would be the Council's Place Policy Development Group receiving officer reports to finalise Proposals Map(s) & proposed revisions. Following this the reports says the Executive Head of Planning would determine the need for further consultation and further Council decision before the revised Plan is placed on statutory deposit. DP and councillors present confirmed this was correct. The meeting agreed that the meaning of many terms not clarified in the report mattered greatly, such as a major review also being able to make downward revisions of additional home numbers if the ONS revisions continue their downward projections.

(vii) In debate that followed DW drew attention to the words the Forum agreed at the meeting on 22 February 2012 should be included in the draft Local Plan, but hasn't yet been fully implemented. DP said that jobs and housing was a balancing task. The NPPF requires us to meet housing and employment needs. Cllr Lewis said if we create 6,000 jobs, there will need to be housing too. Nigel Jones said that Collaton St Mary was a case in point where proposed homes and jobs were not in balance. DW replied that this is precisely the point of relevance to Friday's meeting and drew attention to the Council report confirming that there was a more than adequate 5 year supply. Reference was also made to sewerage and infrastructure issues. Roger Bristow reminded members about the drainage problem that had occurred over the winter at Collaton. He stressed that a solution must be found before any kind of development can be considered.

(viii) It was agreed unanimously by the meeting that the Forum request for a specific Aim and wording to be included in the Plan as agreed at the meeting on 22 February 2012 should be sent again for inclusion in the revised Local Plan:

Because of the reliance on inward migration for any further growth in Torbay, it will be important to ensure further development is achieved in a balanced manner throughout the Plan period to ensure that unintended adverse effects do not arise

Aim – Achieving a balanced provision of new opportunities

To ensure that new development provision does not create conditions of lost opportunity and adverse impact during the period of the plan. This will be achieved by the following objectives:

- *To ensure that allocations of land and buildings for new development are phased in a manner that fosters achievement of a balanced provision.*
- *To resist new development that would result in an imbalance of housing supply and employment provision, or population growth and shopping facilities.*

(ix) David Wotton repeated his point that 'jobs' was a simplistic term and what is really meant is 'Permanent well paid jobs.'

AGENDA ITEM 4 - DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

To achieve a 19th September completion date CP's have agreed to work to 1st September and the following monthly meeting dates have been agreed to marry with the bi-monthly meetings of the Steering Group so that Forum decisions can be taken on any Steering Group recommendations with minimum delay:

Forum	Thu 13 June 2013	Gerston Chapel Hall, Torquay Rd, Paignton
SG	Tue 9 July 2013	Methodist Church Hall, Palace Ave, Paignton
Forum	Thu 18 July 2013	South Devon College
Forum	Thu 15 August 2013	TBC
SG	Tue 10 September 2013	Methodist Church Hall, Palace Ave, Paignton
Forum	Thu 19 September 2013	TBC

All meetings start at 6:30 pm, for target completion by 8:30 pm

This meeting closed at 8:20 pm