

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 19 January 2017

www.paigntonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk

www.torbay.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning

In Attendance:

Adam Billings, Jim Bonfield, Pam Bristow, Roger Bristow, Eileen Donovan, John Gibson, Alan Hill, Karen Jemmett, Helen Kummer, Maggie Loates, Leaf Lovejoy, Sam Moss, Melvyn Newbery, Richard Parish, Mike Parkes (Minutes), David Pickhaver, Ann Waite, Richard Stevens, Christine Watts, David Watts (Chairman), David Wotton.

Apologies:

Carole Box, Helen Boyles, Anne-Marie Curror, Ian Curror, Lorna Gardner.

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. The previously circulated Agenda was shown on-screen. The draft minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2016 were then agreed a true record. Proposed by Maggie Loates and seconded by Roger Bristow.

2.b. **Devonshire Park (Old Nortel site)** (P/2014/0947 and P/2016/1372). With regard to the former Planning Application, DW drew DP's attention to the fact that the council website has transposed '0947' for '0479' in the applications section. DP agreed to double check this. Although the public consultation had finished on 18 Jan 17, the LA had confirmed that this deadline could be extended to enable this meeting to consider proposed changes by the developer to the 2014 planning consent. These are:

- "Omit reference to Masterplan" (condition P1)**: the meeting noted that the Masterplan substitute layout proposed is materially different to the consent previously granted and will result in over development. The meeting agreed that any layout and boundary change would have an adverse effect on the kerbside appearance of the site and also reduce the garden spaces for proposed houses to the north of the site and affect business units to the west. It was also noted that vehicular access points have been reduced from three to two. It was considered that the smaller 'banjo' area for HGVs behind Unit D would be detrimental for HGV turning and would add to congestion and increase noise levels. Such points conflict with the Masterplan.
- "Vary minimum size restriction for retail unit 1" (condition 34)**: the meeting agreed with the Masterplan that in order to protect the vitality and viability of Paignton, Torquay and Brigham Town Centres, (with the exception of no more than one retail unit) the minimum gross floor area at ground floor level of any retail unit formed from the retail floorspace (Use Class A1) permitted shall be 929 sq m and the retail units shall not be sub-divided into smaller retail units. (Policies TC1 and TC3 of the Adopted Torbay Local Plan and paragraphs 24 and 27 of the NPPF refer). The reason for the proposed variation seems to be to accommodate a speculative Unit B. It was noted Unit D was shown as being occupied by "M&S". A food or non-food use of the this would conflict with the conditions of the previous consent. This would then require a separate application and DP confirmed

that it should then include a formal retail impact assessment and sequential test. (On another matter, it was noted from the drawing that an additional retailer interested in this site was "The Range").

(iii) **"Clarify restriction of concessions" (condition 35):** The proposed variation conflicts with the clarity of the consent granted which already enables a cafe/coffee shop concession to sit within the much larger floorspace of a retail operator. The proposed variation wording conflicts with the consent granted because it would allow a retail unit operated by a single retail operator to be sub divided for use by multiple retailers. This would conflict directly with the intent of the consent granted and reason for the restriction.

(iv) The Chairman explained that South Devon College (SDC) also had reservations about the proposed changes and their representation could be found on the Council's planning website. He then displayed a possible letter of response and went through it in detail. The meeting unanimously supported the points made and asked that this letter be sent to the LA with a copy to SDC.

2.c. **"Claylands"** P/2016/1123. This is the old brickworks site which has already been approved for notional development but has yet to attract developers. It is thought that access is a big problem. The meeting noted the proposal at this stage only involved provision of the access and general siting.

AGENDA ITEM – 3. PROJECT PLAN PROGRESS - Stage 3 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PREPARATION

3.a. The Neighbourhood Plan is now at Draft 12 stage and this and the remaining 4 supporting documents had been circulated prior to the meeting. The following points were noted during discussion and by reference to on-screen displays of the documents:

(i) The aim was to complete all documents in time for the next meeting in February.

(ii) **LGS document**, pages 56 and 59: it was agreed that maps should be displayed along a 'North-South axis'.

(iii) **Basic Conditions Document (Draft 8):** wording at para 3.2 (re unincorporated Forum), para 3.4 (re Neighbourhood Development Plan) and para 3.5 (re Neighbourhood plan being effective until 31 March 2030) were all agreed.

- In order to save time, DW asked DP if the LA could consider and comment on suggested changes as we went along. DP thought that this would not be a problem.
- Referring to certain phrasing and wording contained in the LA Minute (93 of 2012) that originally approved the Paignton Forum application, DW questioned its legality. DP said that he would not wish to invoke it even if it was legal.
- DW asked members to submit any further comments on this Basic Conditions Document direct to him and well in advance of the next meeting.

(iv) **Community Involvement (Draft 3):**

- It was agreed that the title of this document be slightly changed to "Community Involvement and **Consultation**".
- It should show how we have proceeded.
- SM said that the graphics for the PN Forum logo (bottom of cover page) needed attention and DP undertook to seek advice from his Graphics Department.
- A timeline would be needed as now proposed in the draft update.
- A group photograph of a Forum Meeting should be included in this document.

(v) **Supporting Evidence (Draft 3):**

- There was agreement on the use of 'Rural' instead of 'Landscape'.

- The wording at Appendix 7, page 169 was agreed.
- At this point there was discussion on the current road widening near Churscombe Cross and several members expressed anger about a Compulsory Purchase Order relating to a proposed retaining wall that had recently appeared retrospectively arising from the statutory notice in the local Herald Express newspaper. The meeting wanted to know why road works had been allowed to start before the granting of this CPO. Concern was also expressed about the extensive removal of trees and hedgerows and of the unknown effects on local wildlife. DP said that he would investigate further and the Chairman was asked to send an email asking on whose authority 'Highways' had commenced this work before the submission of a CPO.
- SM pointed out that 'Secluded Valleys' were peculiar to Torbay. DW requested that JG add this to the list of definitions.
- Referring onscreen to page 171, DW asked that members decide before the next meeting if they wished to see these Secluded Valleys overlaid on the map, as it had merit.

(iv) **Sustainability Appraisal / HRA (Draft 3):**

- In addition to work done since the last meeting by the Editorial Sub-group there has also been involvement by 'Locality' who consider the document to be in good order. However, they still consider that the SA is not strictly needed but do suggest that it is made more distinct by marking it clearly as a separate report or 'Part'. All members agreed with this suggestion of strengthening the separation but staying within one document rather than two.
- DW displayed onscreen the previously circulated amendments to the SA document (including the slight change in the document's title). These were then gone through and discussed in detail. All proposed amendments were agreed to unanimously.
- The return from the LA (DP and Ashwag Shamin) suggested a few minor changes to the layout but regarded the document well written.
- At this point, DP reiterated his point made at previous meetings regarding his concern over there needing to be a sufficient 5 year housing (Last Meeting's minute 3.f. (iv) refers).
- AB queried if it was the Council's understanding that Neighbourhood Plans contained HRA clearance for each site. There was no evidence that answered this directly.
- DW pointed out that the Local Plan had not contained on HRA on sites and the accompanying LP HRA had stressed area wide mitigation plans would be needed together with individual second stage appropriate assessments submitted with applications as explained in the NP draft .
- Freedom of Information: due to his having to leave early, it was agreed that DWn could present Torbay Council Fol facts (21 Dec 16) that were considered important for the members to be aware of regarding the opening of the new South Devon Highway:
 - 89 inward investment enquiries had been received from 1 Oct 14 to 1 Sep 16
 - Only 4 companies had relocated to Torbay between 1 Oct 14 to 1 Sep 16
 - Information was not held on the number of Company employees who had chosen to relocate to Torbay with their business
 - Information was not held on the number of additional permanent jobs created as a direct result of the opening of the South Devon Highway.
 - A previous Fol (3 Feb 15) had stated that 862 gross new jobs (out of a projected 1900) had been created between 2013-15.
- Page 6 of the Torbay Economic Strategy 2013-18 had set a target of 1900 jobs by 2015.

(v) **Pre-submission Consultation Arrangements:** DW reported that other NP champions concluded that it was preferable to use a 'traditional' approach given the size and complexity of our area and asked members to consider the following mix in time for the next meeting:

- Public Notice (of 6 wk consultation period)
- 5 Area meetings (evenings) / drop-in sessions
- 6 wk Library exhibition
- Direct consultation emails
- Posters / leaflets (inc supermarkets / health centres)
- Media articles (inc local mags, Radio, TV)
- Website use (inc social media link ?)
- Simple Questionnaire Yes/No to Plan (if 'No' say why)

AGENDA ITEM – 4. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting is Thu 16 Feb 17 at 6.30pm in the Gerston Hall, Paignton with further dates agreed as:

Thu 16 Mar 2017

Thu 20 Apr 2017

Thu 18 May 2017

Thu 15 Jun 2017

The meeting closed at 20:45hrs