

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 21 April 2016

www.paigntonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk

www.torbay.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning

In Attendance:

Jim Bonfield, Carole Box, Helen Boyles, Pam Bristow, Roger Bristow, Anne-Marie Curror, Ian Curror, Eileen Donovan, John Gibson, Alan Hill, Helen Kummer, Leaf Lovejoy, Sam Moss, Melvyn Newbery, Mike Parkes (Minutes), David Pickhaver, Mark Sangan, Ann Waite, David Watts (Chairman), David Wotton.

Apologies:

Cllr Ian Doggett, Lorna Gardner, Paula Hermes, Nigel Jones.

AGENDA ITEM – 1. APOLOGIES RECEIVED AND WELCOME

1. 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. DRAFT MINUTES OF THE LAST FORUM & STEERING GROUP MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING:

2.a. Having displayed the previously circulated Agenda on-screen, the draft minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2016 were then agreed a true record. Proposed by David Wotton and seconded by Anne-Marie Curror. DWn pointed out that a recent article in the Herald Express had highlighted the possible closure of Paignton Hospital and asked if this could be added as an item to the Agenda. The Chairman explained that it would be naturally covered in item 3 of the Agenda.

2.a.(i) **Royal Mail boxes of historical importance.** DP said that he had not yet progressed this through local means but would be contacting Hal Bishop, the Council's conservation specialist.

Action: DP

2.a.(ii). **Meeting of the Reference Group.** Although this Group had not met since December 2013 the LA had agreed that it would next meet on 17 May 2016.

2.b. **Letter regarding Paignton Beach Huts Proposal.** DW confirmed that the letter, as previously circulated, opposing Planning Application P/2016/0083 had been sent as requested by the Forum at the last meeting. The application had since been withdrawn.

AGENDA ITEM – 3. PROJECT PLAN PROGRESS.

Neighbourhood Plan documents

3.a. **Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).** DW confirmed that, further to the discussion at the last Forum meeting, the SEA Screening Opinion Consultation Draft had now been finalised with the Forum's 'Locality' consultant and with the Council's Planning Department. As DP had been on leave, DW reported that another Council Officer had dealt with it but had taken issue with wording in the document where it stated that it had been prepared 'together with Torbay Council'. DP confirmed that he did not have an issue with this statement but did have concerns regarding the need to ensure the social and economic aspects are picked up in the Basic Conditions Statement (BCS) as he felt an SEA should restrict itself to mainly environmental matters and that the Council would prefer that a full blown Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is contained within the Neighbourhood Plan to address Social and Economic aspects. DW pointed out that the government's PPG advice confirmed that this was not a

requirement under law and the Forum has already agreed these aspects will be assessed using the NPPF and BCS testing proposed later in the meeting Agenda.

3.a.(i) The SEA Consultation Draft document had now been submitted to the three Statutory Bodies: Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency with a request for replies by the 11 May 16. Electronic delivery receipts had been received from all three bodies.

3.a.(ii). Discussion moved on to the involvement of the Independent Assessor in assessing the Paignton NF Plan. DP said that the Council would prefer the involvement of the Planning Inspectorate and there was some disagreement as to how the IA should be selected. DW confirmed that appointment of the Independent Assessor in due course has to be agreed with the Forum.

3.b. **Completing the other documents.** Referring to draft 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan, DW went through the supporting documents that would be required for the plan and stage so far reached on each. They were: 'Supporting Evidence' (draft 1), 'Compliance Statement' (draft 4), 'Consultation Statement' (draft 1) and the 'SEA Screening opinion consultation draft' (sent). Members were unanimous that sufficient information now existed to enable each draft to be brought to draft completion stage with updated information where necessary

3.b.(i) Members also agreed unanimously with the information circulated prior to the meeting on the approach to: the 'Independent View on the Paignton Neighbourhood Plan', the 'Guidance Compliance Check sheet', 'NPPF Contribution Check sheet' and the 'General Conformity Check sheet'. In regard to the latter, SM underlined the importance of ensuring that the very latest information on e.g. the risks from maritime flooding, alluvial flooding etc was included.

3.b.(ii) It was suggested that the Editorial Sub Group should examine the Forum Policy Plan with regard to local houses for local people and jobs in light of the example at St.Ives NP in Cornwall. There was discussion on the concerns experienced in other south west areas where local people were unable to afford houses because of the surge in the purchase of second homes. Helen Boyles and Sam Moss agreed to help as volunteer members of the Editorial sub group.

3.b.(iii) **Local Plan.** DP confirmed that the print run for the Local Plan was now underway and explained that hard copies would be available at £100 each and USB sticks at £70 each. He was asked to find out if copies could be made available free of charge to all 3 Neighbourhood Fora. (Afternote: such free copies had been made available to each Neighbourhood Forum when the earlier draft LP was produced).

3.b.(iv) **Empty properties in Torbay.** SM wanted to know the number of '2nd homes' in Torbay. DW said that he was aware of a private company and retained by the Council to establish the number of empty properties and asked DP if he could find out the number of empty properties and '2nd homes'. DWn said that in a recent Fol request, the TUC had been told that there were 1,700 empty properties in Torbay. DP and DW to discuss contact details further.

Action: DP and DW

3.b.(v) **Heart of the South West Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP).** Following discussion on the forthcoming ONS Population figures due in May, SM asked if the LEP had been informed of Torbay's projected reducing population growth and if they had taken this into account when commenting on the Local Plan. DW asked if DP could find this out in time for the next Forum meeting. The Forum was also unanimous in requesting that the Chairman write a letter on this topic to the LEP. CB suggested that DW might also want to appraise the Chairs of Torquay and Brixham regarding this matter.

Action: DP and DW

3.c **Supporting Information Statement (Draft 1).** It was felt that there was a requirement to further develop the analysis of community need in the light of the threatened closure of Paignton Community Hospital and the possible building of a school on the Parkway Leisure facility. Both were seen as a 'Land use' issue that the Forum should take a view on as it affected the area's 'sense of place'. Referring to comments at the last Forum meeting (para 3.a.(ii), DWn felt that the threatened closure of Paignton Hospital (and other nearby community hospitals) was being considered on the grounds of cost by the local Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). He felt that the Neighbourhood Plan should address the actual demand for GP surgeries, hospitals, schools etc. The meeting agreed unanimously that the further development of the NP and supporting documents needs to include these two sites for further Forum consideration.

Related Matters.

3.d. **Torbay Motel Site (P/2015/0709).** Whilst in favour of the site's re-development, Forum concerns still centred on: drainage, access, appearance and ecology. RB highlighted the community's concern over inadequate drainage by reporting that on 20 Apr 16 sewage had burst through a man hole cover in Collaton St Mary and had entered the River Yalberton. 'SW Water' had been called and it was thought they had raised an 'Incident Sheet'. It was thought that the Environment Agency had also attended. DP went on to explain that the LA had recently met with the developers and had asked them to submit revised plans for the site's development asking them, amongst other matters, to address access issues and the direction that some of the proposed houses faced.

3.e **Taylor Wimpey consultation at Collaton St Mary.** In answer to a question DP confirmed that the LA Design Review Panel had recently met with developers. The Panel considered that the proposal had merits but did not reflect 'village ethos'. The CStM SPD had suggested that development should reflect characteristics of a rural village. It was also felt that the road layout should 'wind' far more. DW expressed concern that the Design Review Panel should be meeting with developers at this time as there is no application and as it was outside the scope of the Local Plan timescale indicated. RB felt that any such development was against the scope of the Local Plan especially as the area had been designated for the much longer term. A draft letter (previously circulated) to Taylor Wimpey was displayed for discussion and Members were in complete agreement that the Chairman should forward this letter as the Forum response to the recent consultation.

Action: DW

3.f **Revised Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).** There was considerable discussion on the Council's proposed CIL document which was now out for public consultation to 29 April and due to go before a full Council Meeting on 11 May 16. Forum Members were referred to the previously circulated draft letter of proposed response which was also displayed on screen. One of the main points the Forum wished to make to the Council was the concern over developers not having to contribute towards CIL involving Greenfield sites. Additionally, by excluding Future Growth Areas from making a CIL contribution to infrastructure provision also means that only sites in the existing urban area would be contributing to the stated need for £20m to fund the South Devon Highway. Subject to the draft letter being amended and to read 'not less than £70', the Forum was unanimous by show of hands that the Chairman forward the letter on their behalf. CB also suggested that the Chairman should bring the letter to the attention of the Chairman of both the Torquay and Brixham Forum.

Action: DW

3.g **SDC Sports/Playing Fields.** (P2016/0188). DW reminded members that the expansion of South Devon College had been supported by the Forum at previous meetings and did not include relocation of the sports facility. Attention was drawn to this recent planning application for an alternative sports field linked with the nearby housing scheme. As had been discussed at previous meetings, the proposed new site for college sporting facilities could have an unacceptable impact for families living in the new houses being built at White Rock and for the biodiversity of Yalberton Valley and the South Hams AONB. Amongst other concerns raised was that of reflected light from pitch floodlights that might even be seen from villages on the other side of the River Dart. It was agreed that the Executive Committee should submit comments to the Planning Department. (CB requested to be copied in for CPRE information).

Action: DW

AGENDA ITEM – 4. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting is Thu 19 May 16 at 6.30pm in the Gerston Hall, Paignton with further dates agreed as:

- Thu 16 Jun 2016
- Thu 21 Jul 2016
- Thu 18 Aug 2016
- Thu 15 Sep 2016
- Thu 20 Oct 2016
- Thu 17 Nov 2016
- Thu 15 Dec 2016

The meeting closed at 2040hrs