

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 29 November 2018

www.paigntonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk

www.torbay.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning

In Attendance:

Angela Ainscough, Jim Bonfield, Carole Box, Pam Bristow, Roger Bristow, Michael Clack, Peter Collis, Bob Davies, Di Fountain, Paul Fountain, Janet Jones, Nigel Jones, Lorna Gardner, John Gibson, Helen Kummer, Maggie Loates, Leaf Lovejoy, Sam Moss, Richard Parish, Mike Parkes (Minutes), Vanessa Snow, Robert Vincent, Christine Watts, David Watts (Chairman), David Wotton.

Apologies:

Phil Chapman, Anne-Marie Curror, Ian Curror, Alan Hill, David Leigh, Jacqui Leigh, Eileen Donovan, Paula Hermes, David Pickhaver, Anne Waite.

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 25 October 2018 were then agreed a true record. Proposed by Jim Bonfield and seconded by Lorna Gardner.

2.b. **Government's Technical Consultation on updates to National Planning Policy and Guidance:**

<http://www.paigntonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk/PDF/Documents/2018-10-26%20Consultation%20on%20NPPF+PPG%20re%20Hsg%20Need+Deliverable+HRA.pdf>

(i) It was noted that this was the 3rd NPPG consultation this year! There followed discussion on the following 'revisions' proposed in the latest consultation. A copy of the consultation questions and suggested response was displayed on screen:

(ii) **Question 1/ Housing Need Assessment** - the Government has been planning on 300,000 units per year but the ONS have revised their projection down by 60,000. The PNF agreed that our stance should be that, "everything must be Evidence Based" as stressed by government guidance many times..

(iii) **Q2 / Household Projections:** the Forum agreed that the 2016 based household projections should be used as a reason to justify lower housing need? as it is evidence based and cannot be ignored as proposed.

(iv) **Q3 / Spatial Development Strategy:** the Forum felt that there was no need for a total number as it should be area driven to reflect local area characteristics.

(v) **Q4 / Proposed clarifications to 'footnote 37' and the glossary definition of local housing need?**
Not agreed.

(vi) **Q5 / Definition of 'Deliverable'** – the proposal was unlikely to remove future scope for challenge i.e. sites for housing should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years.

(iv) **Q6 / 'Clarification' of HRA** – (re European Court of Justice ruling on POW "People over Wind"): *"the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), unless an appropriate assessment has concluded that there will be no adverse effect from the plan or project on the integrity of the habitats site"*. The revision proposed does not deal adequately with the issue that HRA Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment cannot be done to a sufficient degree as at Project level (i.e. planning application stage) e.g. the problem with Local Plan SS2 which requires a total area to be first assessed.

(v) An electronic reply for this consultation was preferred and had been requested by 23:45hrs 7 Dec 18. The meeting unanimously supported the above points and proposed response displayed on screen and requested that the Chairman respond on the Forum's behalf. This to include query of the NPPF status given that a Judicial Review has been lodged against it at national level because it has not been the subject of a Sustainability/Strategic Environmental Assessment as required by law.

2.c. **Consultation - Plymouth and SW Devon Joint Local Plan:** the Chairman referred to the previously circulated consultation document on the Main Modifications to the Plymouth & SW Devon JLP and in particular:

- Plymouth & the Thriving Towns & Villages policy area (MM3)
- Plymouth currently has 5.4 yr supply / TTVA has 9.1 yr supply (MM3)
- Any shortfalls were NOT transferable from one to the other (MM3) n.b. part of Inglewood is in the South Hams
- Trajectories included with annual monitoring requirement (MM3)
- Employment land allocations increased (MM5)
- Environment policy more explicit (MM8)
- Settlement boundary SPD augmented with NPs to define (MM21+34)
- Stoke Gabriel removed from list for housing provision (MM35)
- Tighter control of pollution risks (MM39)
- Tighter protection of AONB / natural environment (MM50+51) - cf. Inglewood.

It was unanimously agreed that the Chairman send a short letter from the Forum in support of the- Main Modifications proposed by the Joint Inspectors.

2.d. **Bloor Homes - Collaton St Mary:**

(i) DW referred to the Minutes of the Meeting held on 25 Oct 18, para 2.c, and reported that the PNF Meeting notes with 'Boyer' (representing Bloor Homes) had now been published on the PNF website: [http://www.paigntonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk/PDF/Documents/2018-10-22%20Email+Attachment%20\(To%20Forum%2029-Nov-2018\).pdf](http://www.paigntonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk/PDF/Documents/2018-10-22%20Email+Attachment%20(To%20Forum%2029-Nov-2018).pdf). There had still been no reply, acknowledgment or exchange of notes/minutes of the meeting held with them on 1 Oct 18.

(ii) Some residents had recently received a flyer through their doors inviting comments on the proposed Bloor development. Concerns were raised about how this mail drop had been carried out as not all residents had received them – it was considered the flyers lacked sufficient information and as such could not be classed as an adequate 'consultation'. Many could not access the information on the web as indicated in the 'flyer' and information available on-line was also very limited.

2.e. **Land Release Fund:**

(i) The meeting was reminded that the LRF award announcement was discussed at a Forum meeting earlier in the year. It was noted the bids had been for: Victoria Square, Paignton £900,000; Preston Down Road, Paignton £1,100,000 and Collaton St Mary, Paignton £1,976,000.

(ii) The L.A. had eventually replied to a Freedom of Information request but considerable information had been redacted. A copy of the FOI response received was displayed on screen.

(ii) Strong concern was expressed by the meeting over the lack of information from the Council and content of the original applications that had been made to the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government in November 2017. The Chairman agreed to investigate further.

AGENDA ITEM – 3. PROJECT PLAN PROGRESS - NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - POST EXAMINATION

3.a. **Regualtion 18 - Council Decision Statement issued.** In accordance with the agreement of all 3 Forums, on 15 Nov 18 there had been an Extraordinary Meeting of the Full Council to consider the Neighbourhood Plans for: Brixham, Paignton and Torquay. All three were approved unanimously and will now proceed to Referendum:

<http://www.paigntonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk/PDF/Documents/2018-11-22%20Council%20Reg18%20Decision%20Statement%20Issued-2.pdf>

3.b. **The Referendum Plan and Draft Appendix 4:**

This had been circulated prior to the meeting and was now displayed on screen. Progress made on the details of Appendix 4 (Policies Maps) were noted and supported.

3.c. **Preparing for the Referendum:**

(i) The voting paper will include the following wording as determined by Parliament in the relevant Regulations: *“Do you want (name of L.A.) to use the Neighbourhood Plan for (name of neighbourhood area) to help it decide planning applications in the Neighbourhood area?”* It will be a simple “Yes’ or “No” vote.

(ii) The campaign spend limit (t.b.c.) - is a maximum of £2,362 (plus £0.059 for each entry in the relevant register of electors) which may be spent in connection with a Referendum campaign. The Returning Officer has been requested to confirm the number of persons eligible to vote so that the spend limit can be finalised.

AGENDA ITEM – 4. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING The date of the next meeting is Thu 17 Jan 19 at 6.30pm in the Gerston Hall, Paignton with further dates agreed as:

Thu 28 Feb 19

Thu 28 Mar 19

Thu 9 May 19

Thu 13 Jun 19

The meeting closed at 20:55hrs.