

# PAIGNTON NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

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



## **DRAFT MINUTES OF A FORUM & STEERING GROUP MEETING**

held in the Gerston Chapel Hall, Torquay Road, Paignton  
at 6.30pm Thursday 24 July 2014

[www.paigntonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk](http://www.paigntonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk)

[www.torbay.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning](http://www.torbay.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning)

### **In Attendance:**

Pam Bristow, Roger Bristow, Cllr Ian Doggett, Eileen Donovan, Alan Hill, Karen Jemmett, Leaf Lovejoy, Helen Kummer, Sam Moss, Melvyn Newbery, Richard Parish, Mike Parkes (Minutes), Cllr Ruth Pentney, David Pickhaver, Martin Rolfe, Ken Rowe, Richard Stevens, Anne Waite, David Watts (Chairman), David Wotton.

### **Apologies:**

Jane Brooksbank, Cllr Stephen Brooksbank, Anne-Marie Curror, Ian Curror, Cllr Bobbie Davies, John Gibson, Sally Grant, Linda Norman.

### **AGENDA ITEM – 1. APOLOGIES RECEIVED AND WELCOME**

1. David Watts, the Chairman, welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked Gerston Chapel for the use of their hall. Apologies received were as listed above. DW pointed out a typographical error in para 2.(a) of the Agenda - the date of the Draft Minutes for approval should read 26 June (not May) 2014.

### **AGENDA ITEM – 2. MINUTES OF THE LAST FORUM & STEERING GROUP MEETING (26 June 2014) AND MATTERS ARISING**

2.a. (i) Draft Minutes. DW referred to the following substitution that had been requested to Draft Minute 3b(ii)c, to read:-

*“PNF attendees had been asked to help draft parts of the Neighbourhood Plan. It was suggested that the compliance statement should be exemplary in showing how every NPPF paragraph had been addressed. Leaf Lovejoy offered to prepare an NPPF analysis. It was recognised that LL is an observer to the meetings so her help would be in the capacity of a ‘friend’.*

The amendment was agreed.

(ii) The draft minutes of the meeting held on 26 June 2014 were then agreed a true record. Proposed by Anne Waite and seconded by David Wotton and approved unanimously.

2.b. Forum Resources. These remained on target and the following summary of the Budget Plan was displayed on screen:

<u>Costs:</u>	£/ 2014	£/ 2013
Required Documents	7,000	7,000
Pre-submission 6 wk consultation	11,100	11,100
Referendum & ongoing costs	<u>6,900</u>	<u>7,300</u>
	£25,000	£25,400
<u>Resources:</u>		
Forum bank balance	2,600	3,000
Fronrunner balance	15,400	15,400
Locality Grant (conditional)	<u>7,000</u>	<u>7,000</u>
	£25,000	£25,400

The Chairman reminded everyone that the Locality Grant of £7,000 needed to be spent by 31 December 2014. He also pointed out that the expenditure by the Exeter St James NP Forum was

£20k and that Paignton was over four times larger, 46,000 people had to be contacted! There might be additional support from 'Planning Aid' who had recently been in touch.

2.c. Paignton 'Windmill Site'

(i) Ken Rowe gave an interesting presentation on the Paignton Windmill. This is a Grade 2 listed building built in 1769 and requisitioned for an unknown reason by the Royal Navy in 1821. It is a 'Tower Stock Mill' built of stone and as such is thought to be the only one of its type in the UK. It is in a state of some disrepair and the owner is considering selling it at auction (the land has already been given to the Council, but not the building itself). The Council Planning Department has already indicated that adding former sails to the building is no longer acceptable in what has now become a residential area. KR and others would like to see it restored and asked that it be considered as a 'Heritage Asset' for the purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan. There was a unanimous show of hands in support of this idea except for Cllr Pentney who pointed out that she had to abstain as she sat on the Planning Committee. KR was asked and confirmed that he would also be keeping the Paignton Heritage Society informed and forward the relevant information to them.

(ii) DW explained that English Heritage had already agreed to visit any future Forum Meeting in order to discuss heritage related topics. David Wootton added his support for such a visit and took the opportunity to highlight the importance of also checking if Preservation Orders had been taken out on two rare post boxes: one erected in the reign of Edward VII on the corner of Little Gate Road and Torquay Road and a second one in Conway Road erected in the reign of Queen Victoria in 1840. David Pickhaver agreed to contact Tony Garrett (Heritage Officer, Torbay Council) to both check details and to also enquire if the Forum could complete associated paperwork if these post boxes had not already been listed.

**AGENDA ITEM – 3. PROJECT PLAN PROGRESS**

3.a.(i) Collaton St Mary / Taylor Wimpey Appeal. The following pre inquiry documents were issued at the end of June and can now be read in full via the Forum website under 'Downloads / Collaton St Mary Inquiry':

- Statement of Case – Torbay Council (13 pages)
- Statement of Case – Appellant (22 pages)
- Statement of Common Ground (16 pages) + 11 Appendices
- Draft Core Documents List (4 pages)

See: [http://www.paigntonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk/?page\\_id=70](http://www.paigntonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk/?page_id=70)

(ii) Proofs of Evidence (PoE's) would need to be completed before 3 September with the Public Inquiry being held at the Toorak Hotel, Torquay between 30 September to 8 October 2014.

(iii) It was noted that a further Habitats Regulations Assessment had been produced-within the last few days by the Council and an important point embedded within this HRA was the careful consideration that had to be given "In combination" with other areas i.e. the cumulative effect of proposals in neighbouring areas. It was felt that the HRA had originally not been completed fully enough and LL felt that the late completion of the HRA meant that the LP was therefore not fully legally compliant. Additionally, it was noted that Natural England had expressed serious concerns with the Local Plan for similar reason.

(iv) In answer to several questions from the floor, DW confirmed that, despite the Council withdrawing their opposition to the 'Traffic' issue, this was something that the Forum could carry forward to the Appeal. He also confirmed that the Council was fully aware of the historical planning refusals associated with the area.

(v) Of especial concern to Collaton St Mary residents was the statement within the Appellant's Statement of Common Ground (para 1.9) that "*It is anticipated that Transportation, Ecology, Flooding and Drainage will be the subject of further common ground and as a result, a short inquiry statement can be submitted instead of PoE's.*" Residents felt that necessary studies had not been carried out when the application had first been submitted and that their experiences of the reality of the situations had been overlooked.

(vi) Referring to earlier Core Strategy Council documents, RB asked DP why the Council had ignored the public's preference for Option 1 / 'Restrained Growth'. (73% had expressed a wish for Option 1). In reply, DP felt that there needed to be an 'Inquiry debate' on the matter. DP was further

asked to find out why this Options document had not been listed along with others for the Inquiry. Several people expressed concerns as to whether the Council fully opposed the Taylor Wimpey development.

(vii) It was noted that under Inquiry Procedural Guidelines, both the Appellant & Council were expected to cooperate. It was inevitable that more information and documents would arise and that this is allowed. However, key issues are just how will local residents be kept updated by the Council and TW, and are negotiations going too far without local residents, including the Forum, being involved. However, DW added that, to date, any information that he had requested from the Council had been emailed back promptly. DW asked DP if, on the grounds of 'natural justice', it was preferable for the Council to keep the Forum fully informed. DP expressed uncertainty about this but saw the point.

(viii) The meeting noted that the Appellant (Taylor Wimpey) considers the Saved Plan as being out of date whilst the new Local Plan shows a need for significant growth.

(ix) Letter to PINS. A recent meeting of the volunteers in Collaton St Mary had highlighted concerns regarding the proposed extra Statements of Common Ground. These were now causing problems regarding public awareness. Additionally, the process was starting to involve documents not yet in the public domain e.g. LP Modifications and Master Planning. DW displayed and read out a draft letter that had been suggested should be sent to PINS re changes that might affect the Appeal. Its content was fully approved and endorsed by the Forum. A vote was requested and was Proposed by RB; Seconded by AH and given unanimous support by all 17 voting members with none against.

3.b.(i) Draft Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan. DW reported that he had attended (as a member of the public) the Council meeting that considered the final stage of the LP submission on 17 July 2014. The following points were noted:

- Council approved the submission of the Local Plan:
- Received summary of all representations (*see(iii) below*)
- Natural England not happy with HRA position
- Paignton NP Forum views has other supporters
- Council agreed to send to Inspectorate for Examination
- No information given of Modifications being submitted

(ii) DP said that a reply to this submission could be expected from the Inspectorate by the end of August. As a follow up, DW asked DP the following 3 questions and received the following replies:

- |  |                                    |
|--|------------------------------------|
| Q. When will the PINS submission pack be available?  | A. Next week.                      |
| Q. When will the Masterplan draft be available?      | A. By the end of the month. (Aug?) |
| Q. When will the Drainage Study Report be available? | A. By the end of the month. (Aug?) |

(iii) DW referred the Meeting to some of the other responses to the LP that had now been published and especially highlighted the following comments (or lack of them in one case!):

- **English Heritage:** *“Object that the Plan and SA give inadequate reference to historic environment. Not clear how growth option is achievable within built environment constraints. SHLAA is not available so cannot assess whether growth strategy is appropriate.”*
- **Natural England:** *“Object that Plan does not meet HRA requirements. Plan is too dependent on “down the line” assessments. Need to clarify what constraints considered by SHLAA and HRA. Waste water polices should safeguard bathing water quality. Marine economy policies should consider effect on marine conservation and cSAC/ Conservation Zone. See More detailed summary/response on HRA/SA comments.”*
- **Environment Agency:** *“Overall support. Minor technical amendments requested re flooding etc. Refer to economic benefits of a good environment”.* (Forum queries 'Minor technical amendments!').
- **South West Water:** “No comment”. !

(iv) Additionally, the following observations were also made from the same Council Agenda on 17 July taken from an extract of the update of the Council's Scheme of Delegated Functions which states:-

**“Prosperity”:** *Job-led regeneration focusing on specific sectors. “*

**“Happiness”:** *Ensure an appropriate supply of quality housing within communities. “*

The meeting agreed these words reflected Torbay's needs much more clearly and accurately but have not been reflected in the proposed Local Plan being submitted to the Inspectorate.

(v) The meeting agreed that the point had been reached where the strategy section of the Neighbourhood Plan needs to summarise the overall direction proposed. These ideals are reflected well in the Neighbourhood Plan which aims to secure:

- **1. Job led growth** which is the priority  
*(without more well paid jobs – local housing stays unaffordable)*
- **2. Housing growth** that actually meets local need  
*(only meeting external needs would fail our community)*
- **3. Sustainable growth** that will enhance our unique environment  
*(especially our position at the historic heart of the English Riviera)*
- **4. Balanced growth** at all times  
*(especially between jobs/housing & population/retail)*

The meeting agreed these 4 aims but David Wootton thought that Aim 1. should be amended to read 'Permanent Job Led Growth', which was a view supported by all.

(v) DW asked if anyone else would like to join the editorial sub-group. Sam Moss expressed an interest and DW suggested that others could contact himself or the Secretary at a later date.

3.c. 'Snap Shot Survey'. David Wotton representing Torbay and District Trades Union Council briefly outlined a survey which addressed issues considered important by Trades Union members should their employer seek to relocate to Paignton. Whilst it was explained that the survey was random and unstructured the Survey's importance was acknowledged and it was agreed to include it as an Agenda Item for the next meeting on 28 Aug 14.

#### **AGENDA ITEM – 4. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING:**

The date of the next meeting is Thu 28 August 2014 at 6.30pm in the Gerston Hall, Paignton with other dates agreed as:

- Thu 25 Sep 2014
- Thu 23 Oct 2014
- Thu 20 Nov 2014
- Thu 18 Dec 2014
- Thu 15 Jan 2015
- Thu 19 Feb 2015
- Thu 19 Mar 2015
- Thu 16 Apr 2015
- Thu 21 May 2015.

The meeting was closed at 20:35hrs.