

PAIGNTON NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

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



MINUTES OF A FORUM & STEERING GROUP MEETING

held in the Gerston Chapel Hall, Torquay Road, Paignton
at 6.30pm Thursday 25 September 2014

www.paigntonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk

www.torbay.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning

In Attendance:

Pam Bristow, Roger Bristow, Anne-Marie Curror, Eileen Donovan, Mike Gotham, Alan Hill, Jane Hirsadegh, Janet Jones, Nigel Jones, Helen Kummer, Leaf Lovejoy, Aaron McClusky, Sam Moss, Melvyn Newbery, Mike Parkes (Minutes), David Pickhaver, Martin Rolfe, Rosemary Rolfe, Richard Stevens, Anne Waite, David Watts (Chairman), David Wotton.

Apologies:

Jane Brooksbank, Cllr Stephen Brooksbank, Tracey Cabache, Ian Curror, Cllr Bobbie Davies, Cllr Ian Doggett, John Gibson, Sally Grant, Eddie Harris, Paula Hermes, Karen Jemmett, Cllr Ruth Pentney,

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.

AGENDA ITEM – 2. MINUTES OF THE LAST FORUM & STEERING GROUP MEETING (28 August 2014) AND MATTERS ARISING

2.a. There were no matters arising and the draft minutes of the meeting held on 28 August 2014 were agreed a true record. Proposed by David Wotton, seconded by Sam Moss and approved unanimously.

2.b. Forum Resources. These remained on target.

2.c. Local Plan. DP reported that he had just heard that the dates for the Local Plan Examination would be 18th to 21st November 2014 but subject to final confirmation. The Inspector would be Keith Holland.

2.d. (i) Masterplans. DP further reported that there was still no date for the publication of the Masterplans for Collaton St Mary and Paignton Town Centre. He thought that they might be waiting for the finalisation of the two Torquay ones so enabling all 4 Masterplans to be published together. It was noted that no Masterplan had been commissioned for Brixham, possibly because the proposed scale of development was less. (In answer to a query from NJ, DP clarified that no further 'Infrastructure Delivery Plan' is proposed).

2.d. (ii) In answer to a question about development money available for the benefit of local communities, an explanation was given of the difference between CIL and Section 106 monies: S106 is used for that which is 'necessary' for the planned development to be deliverable (in both the short and long term), e.g. drainage requirements. CIL is used for that which is a contribution towards other consequences arising, e.g. a playing field for cricket and football (25% going to the locality). However, there will always be grey areas.

2.e. Torbay 2032 drainage Assessment.

(i) Since the last meeting, this report had now been published and was now available on the Forum website. Information had been extrapolated using computer modelling but had excluded capacities at Brokenbury treatment works. (It was pointed out that Brokenbury is a treatment plant only and treated effluent is discharged into the sea at Sharkham Point in Brixham. This treated water is not potable). Attention was especially drawn to the Conclusions on page 3 of the Report:

[http://www.paigntonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk/PDF/Documents/2014-09-08%20Torbay%202032%20Future%20Sewer%20Capacity%20\(Final\).pdf](http://www.paigntonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk/PDF/Documents/2014-09-08%20Torbay%202032%20Future%20Sewer%20Capacity%20(Final).pdf)

(ii) It was agreed that the following points taken from the Report were of concern:

- There is an assumption that water usage will reduce – *“a substantial challenge”*.
- The effect of climate change & urban creep - *“highly likely to cause significant detriment”*
- *“A robust strategy for removing surface water from the existing sewer system will be required in order to maintain the current level of service; to both the public sewerage network and for surface water management.”*

(iii) Two members commented on positive aspects of the Report. The Chairman read out a note from KJ (who had sent apologies for absence). She commented favourably on the ‘visions’ in the report especially as it affected the possible ‘greening’ of the area. SM supported this view as it helped to develop an holistic approach and furthered the concept of Paignton as a ‘Garden Town’. David Wotton, however, felt that the Report took insufficient account of global warming and possible tidal surges and failed to test worst case scenarios.

2.f. Sports & Playing Fields Reports. In his absence, thanks were recorded for the work undertaken by John Gibson in monitoring the Sports & Playing Field Report. It is now thought likely that there will be a Council Officer’s draft report ready next month with a Council decision made in December 2014.

2.g. Stoke Gabriel Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan. The Chairman referred to a formal notice from the South Hams District Council regarding the formation of a Neighbourhood Plan Area for the village of Stoke Gabriel. DW displayed a map of the area in question and it was agreed that a) it was correct and b) there were no known constraints. It was further agreed that it provided an opportunity for the two neighbouring authorities to be seen to be working together and for local people to further the protection of Yalberton Valley which was shared between the neighbouring authorities. The Chairman was asked to write a letter of support to meet the response deadline of 18 October 2014 and with copies to Stoke Gabriel Parish Council and Torbay Council. David Wotton then took the opportunity to remind people of the increasing potential risk of flooding in the Valley as a result of the number of developments along the Brixham Road. He emphasised the importance of the neighbouring authorities working cooperatively on this and related ecological matters.

2.h. DCLG Technical Regulations. The Chairman referred to the regulations that had been circulated prior to the meeting and displayed on screen the main headings. Out of the 6 main headings, it was his view that the Forum’s response should address only ‘Neighbourhood Planning’. He went on to explain that the response deadline was set for the following day and the meeting agreed unanimously that he should reply taking into account the following responses:

DCLG Question/Neighbourhood Planning

Forum Response:

Q 1–5	Time limits for LPA taking decisions.	Yes.
Q 6	Removing pre-sub stat 6 wk consultation.	Not agreed
Q7	Leave post-sub 6 wk con with LPA.	Agreed
Q8-9	Consulting land owners.	Not agreed
Q10	Basic Conditions test on consultation.	Not agreed
Q11-12	SEA clarification.	Agreed
Q13	Additional suggestions for inclusion: <i>Keep the process ‘light touch’</i> <i>A centrally produced ‘standard leaflet’ for mass circulation would be helpful</i> <i>Keep Locality and Planning Aid help</i> <i>Funding: a fairer position is needed for Ordnance Survey & VAT payments. (As with Local Authorities, Forums should also be exempt as they are a Statutory Body).</i>	

NJ referred back to the 6 Main Headings and after discussion it was further agreed that the Chairman would include an observation on the importance of Environmental Impact Assessments expressing caution needed in altering the threshold, based on the recent experiences resulting from the Collaton St Mary / Taylor Wimpey Appeal work.

AGENDA ITEM – 3. PROJECT PLAN PROGRESS – STAGE 3

3.a. (i) Skeleton Draft 5. This document (previously circulated) was displayed on screen and the Chairman took the meeting through it page by page. It was noted that under Part 3, 4.6 Statement of Compliance, there was no disagreement on numbers referred to but they would not necessarily roll out by 2032 and would be dependent upon net job growth and net inward migration. Based on current projections, the land supply supported in each Neighbourhood Plan is expected to last longer than 20 years to 2032. Additionally, there is no historic backlog of housing land supply shortfall and a 5 year deliverable supply of land for additional homes as required by the NPPF.

3.a. (ii) SM expressed concern regarding the wording in relation to Crossways being a possible supermarket site (PNP 8) and felt that it would be more appropriate to refer to it as a possible retail outlet. It was agreed that this could be referred to the editorial sub-committee.

3.a.(iii) There was some discussion about the size of and geographical differences existing within Blatchcombe CP area. NJ expressed reservations regarding the desirability of Collaton St Mary remaining within Blatchcombe Ward. DW explained that for the purposes of the Neighbourhood Plan and forthcoming referendum there was little that could be done at this stage. He pointed out that electors from other Paignton areas would be legally entitled to vote on matters relating to other areas within Paignton and there was now a real opportunity to get a case across to voters not necessarily from the same area.

3.a. (iii) Referring to Part 7 of the document (Community Partnership Areas), RB expressed dissatisfaction with the way that Blatchcombe CP had conducted their 2nd SWOT exercise. The Chairman advised that, for the time being, it would be better to go with drafts as they existed.

3.a. (iv) Having discussed the above issues, the meeting approved Skeleton Draft 5 without exception.

3.a.(v) Work of the Editorial Sub-Group / Policies. The Chairman thanked all those who had been involved in examining and writing the Policies Section and acknowledged the considerable hard work involved. DW displayed the work to date and all agreed that the work should continue for presentation and decision at the next meeting. A useful document entitled 'Writing Planning Policies' had recently been received from 'Locality' and this would provide further guidance. (Details are on the Forum website).

3.a. (vi) DW emphasised that 'Policies' for other CP areas needed to be considered at the next meeting and that the already completed CP SWOTS would prove invaluable. This point was endorsed by MN in relationship to Preston and especially to Oldway. He expressed great concerns regarding the protection, conservation and restoration of the recreational lands, buildings and annexes within Oldway. He emphasised the health and leisure benefits to both residents and visitors. (PNP 27 refers).

3.a. (vii) David Wotton reminded the meeting of the points made in his presentation at the last meeting, especially with regard to Torbay being in need of well paid, permanent jobs. He was pleased to report back that he considered that a lot was now going on behind the scenes.

3.b. (i) Stage 3 Community Consultation. Suggestions for engagement included:

- Hire of a town centre shop with internal display boards.
- Area wide Poster displays.
- Leaflet to every property (20,000+).
- Banner across town centre high street and other selected locations.
- Community meetings at selected venues.

3.b. (ii) Additionally, AH has recently completed research into leaflet marketing by postcode areas. Paignton NF postcode areas include: TQ3 1(3,664 households), TQ3 2 (4,127 hsehds), TQ3 3 (6,636 hsehds), TQ4 5 (2,953 hsehds), TQ4 6 (2,479hsehds), & TQ4 7 (4,315 hsehds). A total of 24,174 households.

3.b. (iii) It was suggested that members email the Chairman with any further ideas on marketing and community consultation. The suggestion of producing and printing a 'dateless' leaflet for distribution to all 20,000+ properties in the NP Area was supported in principle, with the suggestion that a 'date'

sticker could be added when the Stage 3 consultation period had been agreed. It was also felt that strategically located widow posters in non-residential positions such as shops, clubs and community buildings would be effective.

3.c. (i) Meeting the Basic Conditions. The Chairman referred to a displayed slide previously circulated and on the Forum's website. It was explained how the conditions of Sustainability Appraisal (SA), a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) differed, and how the NPPF could be assessed against the emerging policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. It was agreed that the outline assessment results should be taken forward.

3.c. (ii) LL emphasized the importance of the '3 legs' of any assessment. It took into account: economy, social and environmental matters.

AGENDA ITEM – 4. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting is Thu 23 Oct 2014 at 6.30pm in the Gerston Hall, Paignton with other dates agreed as:

- 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 2100hrs.