PAIGNTON NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

- Clifton with Maidenway
- Collaton St Mary
- Goodrington with Roselands
- Kings Ash
- Preston
- Roundham with Hyde
- and Hookhills

Paignton neighbourhood plan

DRAFT MINUTES OF FORUM & STEERING GROUP MEETING

held electronically via Zoom at 6:45pm Wednesday 29 July 2020

www.paigntonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk www.torbay.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning

In Attendance: Freda Bamford, Helen Boyles, Pam Bristow, Roger Bristow, Paul Forsey, Catherine Fritz (Chair), Chris Harvey, Alan Hill, Colin Hurst, Karen Kennedy, Andrew Lavey, Maggie Loates (Secretary), J. Mills, Liam Montgomery, Mike Parkes, David Thomas, Jackie Thomas, David Wotton

Prior to the start of the meeting, Liam Montgomery (**LM**) of the Torbay Development Agency gave a presentation regarding Torbay Council's (**TC**) plans for Crossways. The current buildings will be replaced by two buildings with retail/commercial units on the ground floor and 1 and 2 bedroom extra care flats on the remaining five floors. He showed multiple slides demonstrating how the new buildings will look. There will be 77 flats in the main block facing Hyde Road and 13 in the smaller block facing Torquay Road. On the ground floor there will be a cafe, lobby and reception, a buggy store, activity space, communal lounge, internal garden courtyard, treatment room, and parking for staff and visitors. There will be 2 lifts. There will be communal terraces overlooking the garden on the 1st and 3rd floors and a roof terrace on the top floor. The highest point of the building will be in the centre so the skyline does not impinge on neighbouring buildings.

Mike Parkes (**MP**) asked whether the BT annex was included in the site. **LM** said it was not. Helen Boyles (**HB**) commented that the architectural design seemed very brutalist. **LM** said they were constricted because the sewer ran through the site and they had to use the edge of the site. **HB** suggested that greening the building could soften the contours. **LM** said they could possibly have green roofs. **HB** said Paignton needed to be rentalised, and not just for old people. **LM** said the complex would be good for the town centre, particularly since it is not expected that the tenants will have cars. **HB** said it would be better if there was a mixing of generations. **LM** said possibly one of the commercial units could be a crèche. Catherine Fritz (**CF**) asked how the extra care would be provided. **LM** said there would be a bloc contract for support. **CF** thanked **LM** for his presentation.

Agenda Item 3: - The Chair suggested that because the Agenda departs from that in the Forum's Standing Orders, that they be suspended for this Zoom meeting. The Chair moved to do this, seconded by Pam Bristow (**PB**), and unanimously approved by the members.

Agenda Item 1: - Welcome: The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Agenda Item 2: - Apologies: Helen Kumar, Maggi Douglas-Dunbar, Ian Doggett

Agenda Item 4: - Minutes from the last meeting – 13 February 2020: The draft minutes of the meeting held on 13 February 2020 were approved. Proposed by **CF**, seconded by **PB** and unanimously approved by the members.

Agenda Item 5: - Report from the Chair: The Chair reported that TC had started conducting meetings, including Planning Committee (**PC**) meetings, via Zoom in May. The Forum has been active but the level of activity is limited by the number of people available to monitor planning applications. Alan Hill (**AH**) receives a list of the planning applications filed each week and circulates them to Ward members. Maggie Loates (**ML**) noted that she and Ian Doggett review these each week for the Clifton with Maidenway Ward and indicate if any of them need action. Colin Hurst (**CH**) stated that he reviews the list for the Town Centre and Preston areas. The Chair stated that if an application needs action, the Forum should submit a comment. David Thomas (**DT**) noted that the Forum gets the list at the same time as Council members. The Chair said that the Forum needs to keep the Paignton Neighbourhood Plan (**PNP**) alive by monitoring planning applications and responding accordingly. **AH** suggested that the Forum should have an executive committee for planning matters with which the Chair agreed. The Chair suggested that potential interested parties, including businesses, should be alerted to planning applications. **MP** noted that the Forum should also monitor feedback on approved applications to ensure that what is promised is delivered.

The Chair proposed that the Forum should follow three strands to implementing the PNP: (1) Reactive – responding to planning applications in light of the Plan. We should have people reviewing planning applications and drafting comments; (2) Co-active – influencing policies in line with PNP policies. This could include the Reference Group, sending letters, or notifying the media; (3) Pro-active – encouraging actions/developments/groups that further the aim of the PNP, which is to make our town and surroundings more attractive to tourists and an outstanding place to live and work. This might involve the Community Infrastructure Levy (**CIL**) money allocation, or other means. **HB** said she was concerned about mitigation money. The Chair noted that there was a failure to follow through on Section 106 monies. Karen Kennedy **(KK**) stated that it was good to have these things looked into. **DT** stated that he had looked into Section 106 monies for Whiterock play facilities which had not yet been completed. However, the developer has put money into South Devon College facilities. In future there will be less Section 106 money and more CIL money, of which 25% will be allocated to be spent through neighbourhood fora. He noted that a draft report on this had been released today.

<u>Agenda Item 6</u>: - <u>Secretary's Report</u>: The Secretary reported that as of 29 July 2020: the Forum has 306 members and associate members; 255 members receive documents and communications by email; 51 members who do not have email receive documents and communications by post; 45 envelopes are sent out by 2nd class post to members without email; and included in the email list are Councillors for Paignton wards, Chairs of the Torquay Neighbourhood Forum and Brixham Peninsula Neighbourhood Forum, Chair of the Paignton Town Centre and Preston Community Partnership, and certain TC officers involved in planning and land use.

<u>Agenda Item 7</u>: - <u>Treasurer's Report</u>: Since the Treasurer (Andrew Morrell) was not present at the meeting, the Chair read out his report. The Forum currently has £9,647.39 in the bank, and since April, we have spent £198.60, mostly on printing agenda and minutes, and envelopes and stamps for mailing to non-email members. The Forum has no regular source of income.

<u>Agenda Item 8</u>: - <u>Update on the Local Plan Review (LPR)</u>: **CF** reported that there is a tug-of-war between those who think the LPR must be comprehensive and is likely to take 3 or 4 years, and those who argue that we need a light touch review now, finishing by the end of December, so that the Local Plan (**LP**) will remain in effect and a fuller review can be conducted later. TC has set up a cross-party LPR Working Party and a LP Stakeholder Engagement Group (which will include the Fora, developers and others. **CF** stated she is in favour of a light touch review. Roger Bristow (**RB**) said he does not agree with a light touch review; houses should be linked to jobs – anything else is ignoring the neighbourhood plans. **DT** noted that the LP requires a 5-year review, which period expires on 31/12/2020.

<u>Agenda Item 9</u>: - <u>Update on the 3 and 5 year land supply status</u>: **CF** noted there is no 5-year land supply, but now the PNP has been adopted, only a 3-year supply is needed. **MP** said a report was published on 24 July. **DT** suggested the members of the PC were not aware of this. **CF** suggested the report should be sent to members of the PC. **HB** stated there was an overestimation of the housing need in Torbay. **CH** noted that TC knows it can't continue with the current estimates; the supply must be reduced. **KK** said that it was necessary to look at housing vs jobs; she has been pushing the issue. **MP** said there was general concern about housing numbers. The Office of National Statistics (**ONS**) assessment has been going down. **HB** noted that the ONS figures were over market demand and were not needed. **DT** noted that Torbay was an unusual situation and its housing needs were different. **MP** suggested that annual monitoring was needed. **CH** said objectively assessed needs were required. **RB** said that the ONS was using the same figures from 2012 to 2018. **HB** said the ONS figures should be reduced. She will investigate figures from CPRE. **CF** noted that it is now settled that inspectors must not treat the NPPF glossary definition of "deliverable" as a closed list.

Agenda Item 10: - Reference Group (RG) report: **CF** noted that the RG consists of the 3 Fora, certain TC planning officers, plus certain councillors at times. It has been meeting via Zoom. Steve Darling attended the last meeting. **CF** also noted that there is a new Assistant Director of Planning, Housing and Climate Emergency, David Edmondson. He is knowledgeable as his wife is a key person in the neighbourhood plans in Cornwall.

Agenda Item 11: - Planning application reviews and reviewers: **CF** noted that this item has been covered in discussions of previous items.

Agenda Item 12: - Updates on specific planning applications, including suggestions from people present about applications for comment:

a. **Inglewood** - **CF** stated that she had received an update from Brian Payne on the Inglewood application. The inspector now insists there is a virtual inquiry, the date and processes yet to be determined, but it is anticipated before the end of the year. TC got funding for a primary school. The site was originally to be an employment site but was changed to a school. It was identified and approved. The Forum supports the school. **CF** will draft and circulate a letter. A question was raised as to whether an additional primary school is needed; **DT** indicated that it was and **CF** noted that there was data showing that neighbouring schools were oversubscribed. Even with the present housing, a new school is needed and one big advantage is that Department for Education will pay for building the school.

b. **Collaton St. Mary** - **CF** stated that the motel went to the PC and was approved. **DT** said TC will go ahead with a compulsory purchase order. TC has asked for a virtual hearing. **CF** noted that the Bloor Homes application was approved. The Taylor-Wimpey application is under appeal and a new application has been submitted.

c. **Applications related to Paignton town centre regeneration** – **CH** mentioned Crossways and stated that demolition of the car park on Victoria Square is opposed by the Community Partnership. He also noted that the building opposite the station went for a pittance and the purchaser has no resources to develop it. **HB** stated that there is a projected increase in cars, not least due to 2 new hotels being constructed. **CF** noted that the parking study was inadequate. **HB** stated that there was an extremely serious issue with cars, and all these new developments would result in an environmental catastrophe.

Agenda Item 13: - AOB: There was no other business to discuss.

The meeting closed at 8:40 pm.

Agenda Item 14: – Next Meeting: The next meeting will be on **Thursday 27 August, starting at 6:45 pm via Zoom**. The room will open at 6:30 pm. We aim to complete our meeting by no later than 8:30pm.