

PAIGNTON NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

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



MINUTES OF A FORUM AND STEERING GROUP MEETING

held at the Gerston Chapel Hall, Torquay Road, Paignton
at 6.30pm Thursday 19th December 2013

www.paigntonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk

www.torbay.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning

In Attendance:

Cllr Jane Barnby, Roger Bristow, Anne-Marie Curror (Minutes), Ian Curror, Cllr Ian Doggett, Eileen Donovan, J. Gibson, Louise Gilson, Alan Hill, Colin Hurst, Karen Jemmett, Helen Kummer, Sam Moss, Melvyn Newbury, David Pickhaver, Cllr Ruth Pentney, Richard Stevens, Cllr Alan Tyerman, Ann Waite, David Watts (Chairman), David Wotton.

Apologies:

Pam Bristow, Cllr Dave Butt, Jane Brooksbank, Cllr. Stephen Brooksbank, Tracey Cabache, Lorna Gardiner, Eddie Harris, Paula Hermes, Linda Norman, Mike Parkes, Martin Rolfe.

AGENDA ITEM – 1. APOLOGIES RECEIVED AND WELCOME

David Watts, the Chairman welcomed everybody to the meeting and thanked Gerston Chapel for hosting the meeting. All were invited for mince pies at Gerston Chapel Hall on Saturday December 21st between 10.00am and 12.00pm. Apologies received were as listed above.

AGENDA ITEM – 2. MINUTES OF THE LAST FORUM MEETING (21st November 2013) AND MATTERS ARISING

2.a. Minutes With no matters arising, David Wotton proposed that the Minutes of the Forum and Steering Group Meeting held on 21st November 2013 be agreed as a true record; seconded by Ann Waite and were accepted unanimously.

(i) David Watts reported a significant result in the Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan Referendum, on October 24th 2013. There was a 52% turnout with 905 (96%) in favour and 38 against. Tattenhall had published their Neighbourhood Plan before the Council's Local Plan. The Independent Examiner said in his report:

'The fact that there is an emerging development plan in a local authority area is not unusual and there is nothing in the legislation to support the contention that such a situation should stop or slow down the progress of a Neighbourhood Plan'.

There is a legal challenge from house builders pending, but not on this point, which David Pickhaver confirmed. He said that Torbay Council were not against Paignton NF publishing their Plan in advance of the Council's Local Plan but do not wish the NP to be out of date, by following the 2004 LP. The question was asked 'Would the NP become defunct if it doesn't agree with a later Council LP?' The answer given was 'Not necessarily'. The Council would then have to take account of the NP in their LP, as long as we were using the same data.' DP said that hopefully, the pre submission LP would be published in February and consultation would take place during the Summer.

(ii) An enquiry was made about the progress of the Goodrington contribution to the LP. It was reported that their consultation will be finished by the end of January 2014.

2.b. Forum Resources The budget is on target.

2.c. Reference Group 3rd December 2013

(i) There was a report on the Reference Group meeting on 3rd December 2013. English Heritage is very interested in our NP and wish to work directly with us, because of the large quantity of heritage sites in our area.

(ii) The disparity between the projected 9,000 population increase and the 9,600 new houses in the Playing pitch study had been queried. These figures do not tally in a study designed for use until 2021 as the housing figures seem to be for a 20 year period. David Pickhaver confirmed clarification to the consultants is underway. He agreed 9,000 population increase could only relate to a 10 year period, and 9,600 houses to a 20 year period.

(iii) Local Plan Progress. The Forum reaffirmed the need for the LP to have a monitoring policy on population growth rate, that can go down as well as up (the Lockgate mechanism). David Pickhaver commented that it is unlikely that the Council will agree that figures for population growth may go down as well as up. However, it is 'implicit' in the draft monitoring policy being produced that the 5 year review would be able to take into account slower growth than expected. Sam Moss commented that their plans must be evidence based and slower growth in population must be allowed for given the very clear pattern of downward projections from ONS.

(iv) David Watts reported that he had had no response so far to the letter to Pat Steward which the Forum considered and endorsed at the last meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 3 – PROJECT PLAN PROGRESS

3.a. Housing sites

(i) Roger Bristow as Sub-Group Chairman confirmed that a number of new sites have been found for housing as a result of reviewing the information from the Local Plan Employment Land Review (compiled by Peter Brett Associates) and comparing this with the SHLAA. From 1998-2008 jobs grew at the rate of 400 per annum. Since 2008 there have been job losses of 50 pa. However the draft LP proposes job growth of 5,300 jobs that need new space. These are going to be essential to achieve in the light of these losses. Sam Moss said that the Draft LP says that new houses should be built on brownfield and greenfield sites with a ratio of 60/40 respectively. He asks who will monitor this. DW said that the NF could do so. Roger Bristow commented that all new housing developments taking place now are on greenfield sites and therefore future ones should be on brownfield sites. In answer to a question about prior consultation by developers, DW reported that there is an implied requirement in the NPPF to consult the NF. DP said that there is no legislation that can compel developers to use brownfield sites. The Planning Inspectorate says that there is no presumption of a sequential approach – brownfield to greenfield. Attention was drawn to NPPF 110 and 111 which clearly support allocating land with least amenity value and encourages re-use of 'brownfield' land. Also NPPF 47 which supports phasing of land release. The comment was made that brownfield land should be cheaper – the cost of restoration should reduce the residual price.

(ii) In the Employment Land Review It states that only 17 hectares are needed for employment increases (5-6000 jobs) but that there are 42 hectares allocated. For the Sub-Group Roger confirmed some of this land could be released for housing, meaning that fewer extra housing sites would need to be found beyond those already supported by the Forum, and thereby safeguard greenfield sites for even longer. Cross referencing the two studies with a visual display at the meeting showed that:

- At Bookhams (Site 13263 - Nortel), 75% of the land could be released for 270 homes (SHLAA years 2018-2023).
- At Yalberton Estate (50% Site T826) the Council wishes to rearrange its Depot which would release land for 40 houses (SHLAA years 2013-18 earliest).
- Jackson land (50% Site T843) could yield 125 new homes (SHLAA years 2018-23 earliest). The consultants noted that although a 'Greenfield' site, the whole is allocated for employment development in the current LP, thus a presumption of acceptance for development is already in place that cannot be ignored. However, Roger felt it more realistic to allocate 50% for housing no earlier than 2023-28, which the meeting agreed was more realistic.
- In the town centre (Site T787 – Victoria Centre) the report proposed 60 homes could be built but it was noted had not attracted community support in Stage 2 and should remain as a potential site for post 2033.

Roger confirmed that added together this provides sites for an additional 435 additional homes without requiring new 'greenfield' land (reaching 3,453 total planned for or being built). This supply should be more than adequate for well beyond 10 years. The NPPF says that the NP does not have to indicate sites for a post ten year period (para. 47).

(ii) Roger Bristow said it would be useful to know the sizes and capacity of industrial sites and how many are empty. DP said he will look into whether this information is available from the TDA. RB

enquired whether sufficient space for garages, bins etc was being given to new housing estates currently being built. There were currently 30 dwellings per hectare assumed. RB also commented that unemployment is still rising and there are no new jobs at present. He felt that a robust monitoring mechanism must be put in place and a meeting allocated to it. The Council decided on 15th May 2013 that 8-10,000 houses should be built over a 20 year period and 5-6000 jobs created. There remains deep concern that these figures are based on inflated inward migration rather than realistic prospects of growth. RB repeated that the available Jackson land is currently greenfield and that it should be developed last of the available land. The Forum agreed with this, and accepted the Sub-Group conclusions.

3.b. Stage 3 – Skeleton Draft 3

(i) The draft was presented (still assuming that the Neighbourhood Plan is running in parallel with the emerging Local Plan). DW referred to the previous meeting and asked for considered thoughts on the stated aim of the plan overall :-

To make our town and surroundings more attractive to tourists and a superb place to live and work.

This could be even fewer words, as advised by DCLG following the Winsford NP assessment e.g.

To make Paignton more attractive to tourists and a superb place to live and work”.

It must be clear so that it is easy to use by decision makers. We must continue to avoid changes of key points in the plan if they haven't been tested with consultation and if we insert new ideas and our community reject them then all the work so far is wasted. Sam Moss commented that some detailed questions had not been asked in the consultation, such as eco-friendly and low carbon building criteria. DW answered that an NP does not have to include all the detail in the way that an LP does. We need to set out area wide proposals as well as getting down to details in the different areas. SM also felt that the word 'Tourist' was not vital in the wording of the general aim; we cannot be sure that tourism will always have such importance and the words 'live, work and visit' might be preferable. Attention was drawn to the continuing importance of tourism to the local economy. It was agreed refinement would be possible as the Draft Plan develops.

(ii) The question was asked, if shops are really driven mainly by the size of the resident population, how far should shops be aimed at tourists? DW replied that shops could not run on the short term trade of tourists, but if tourism increased over a longer season, more shops would be realistic. However, Paignton's catchment size made it clear that expanding retail of itself would not attract tourists. DP said that a retail update will be out in the New Year with details relevant to the debate.

(iii) DW said that far more detail is needed in the policies of the NP and this constitutes the next portion of writing and work. The NP document is 24 pages so far but could be 150 pages on completion, although hopefully will be fewer.

(iv) David Wotton said that with such importance being placed on tourism, should we be talking to the South Hams Society about the South Devon National Park, which has its own website? We should also be aware of Natural England's interest in the region and the proposal recently published to extend the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). David Watts suggested it would be a good idea to contact them. David Wotton suggested it should be done jointly with the other NF's (Brixham and Torquay).

(v) David Watts suggested that we need to be very clear about who future development is aimed at. Is only family accommodation needed? The evidence considered by the Forum does not show this as the need. We also need to show on the Proposals Map land use policies because this is the essence of the NP.

(vi) Sam Moss, referring to page 21 of the draft, asked what was happening about the "other suggestions received" at Stage 2. DW confirmed that there will be a summary of them included in the NP.

(vii) DW said that Part 7 of the NP, 'Community Partnership areas', could include non 'land use' matters eg traffic and Tweenaway Cross, where ugly brick walls and fences have been erected.

(viii) The Forum was happy with Draft 3 of the Skeleton Draft Plan.

AGENDA ITEM 4 – Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Forum will be on Thursday 23rd January 2014 at 6.30pm in Gerston Chapel Hall (Gerston Place entrance). All meetings to start at 6.30pm, for target completion by 8.30pm.

Future meetings:

Forum	Thu 23 January 2014	Gerston Chapel Hall
Forum	Thu 27 February 2014	Gerston Chapel Hall
Forum	Thu 27 March 2014	Gerston Chapel Hall
Forum	Thu 24 April 2014	Gerston Chapel Hall

The Meeting closed at 8.35pm