

Harberton Parish Neighbourhood Plan (HNP)

7.00pm Thursday 15th March 2018 Harberton Parish Hall (rescheduled from cancelled meeting on 1st March 2018)

In attendance: Ginny Davidson, Roger Hands, Sally Lougher, Nuala McDonnell, Stanley Oldfield, Charlie Wynne (Chair)

Apologies: Alex Williams, Geoff Broom

Minutes: Cat Radford

<p>1. Apologies. Received as above. 1.1 Record of two consecutive meetings missed Alex Williams.</p>			
<p>2. New members to the steering group – None.</p>			
<p>3. Declaration of Interests: To declare any interests (nature and scope) on items on the agenda.</p>			
Name	Item	Detail	Action Taken
Geoff Broom	8, 9	Owner of housing site 4	Steering group members are given the same provision to speak as members of the public, but do not vote on issues relevant to sites on which they have an interest.
Roger Hands	8, 9	Chartered Surveyor with potential business interests in the area	Steering group members are given the same provision to speak as members of the public, but do not vote on issues relevant to sites on which they have an interest.
Charlie Wynne	8, 9	Owner of land adjacent to housing site 9	Steering group members are given the same provision to speak as members of the public, but do not vote on issues relevant to sites on which they have an interest.
<p>4. Consider approval of minutes 4.1 December 2017: The minutes were approved as an accurate record with minor amendments 4.2 January 2018: The minutes were approved as an accurate record</p>			
<p>5 Actions from minutes not included elsewhere on the agenda 5.1 <u>Website</u> Introduction and tree policy to be updated. 5.2 <u>Meeting with Totnes Neighbourhood Plan</u> Ginny had suggested a joint meeting, but hasn't yet had a reply. 5.3 <u>Research to policy SE1</u> Nuala has compiled a list of policies that SE1 refers to. It was AGREED to add this in italics at the bottom of the page.</p>			<p>Charlie Charlie</p>
<p>6. Consider comments from website It was noted that there was a comment on the website in reference to development at Follaton. It was AGREED to circulate to comment via email.</p>			<p>Charlie</p>
<p>7. Parish Council - Receive update from Parish Council meeting None</p>			
<p>8. Review working party actions: 8.1 Proposed site conditions ongoing. 8.2 Proposed aims and expectations for development sites Aims and expectations were discussed and the following comments noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion about the term 'Very high quality' and how this can be interpreted. It was generally agreed to amend wording to that development should be good quality design both in visual and material terms, that is sympathetic and enhances the character of the village. • Agreed to use '<u>would</u> be acceptable with a mix of housing' rather than 'might be acceptable'. • It was agreed to remove reference to 'at worse' in relation to wording around flooding. • Discussion as to whether conditions could include reference to include measures to further reduce flood risk downstream and the use the opportunity reduce the existing run off flood risk. 			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was suggested to include conditions to remove permitted development rights on any sites in which there was concern about flooding/run off. It was suggested to include reference to outcome of the site assessment as a header to site section in aims and expectations. Any external light should be restricted to maintain dark skies and to protect local wildlife, including the bats known to frequent the area. <p>It was AGREED to make amendments as discussed (up to Site 9). It was AGREED to publish on the website.</p>	Ginny Charlie	
<p>9. Revisions to Plan</p> <p>9.0.1 <u>Transport Chapter</u> Geoff had circulated a reworked draft that included more information about the Avonwick Road and adding reference in Policy T1. There was a discussion about compiling traffic data and speeds on both roads. Charlie offered to share traffic data that he is compiling at Dorsley Park area of the Avonwick Road. It was AGREED to accept the revised chapter wording.</p> <p>9.0.2 <u>Housing Chapter</u> Small amendments were made to the introduction to make it more current. It was agreed to remove references to the name 'Winsland House' within the description. Railway field and cottage field were named within the 'Local Need' paragraph. It was agreed to amend policy H1 to '9a Winsland House at Follaton'. With the comment 'Note: To be amended following finalisation of individual site assessments and public consultation'</p> <p>9.0.3 The plan has been proof-read. It was AGREED to ONLY have a downloadable plan on the website (removing the chapter tabs on the website) and include date iterations - archive of dated PDFs. It was AGREED to remove the tabs on the website.</p> <p>9.0.4 It was AGREED to move reference to 'the boundaries' of Harberton Parish in the introduction.</p> <p>9.0.5 It was AGREED to remove any reference to viability of the filling station.</p> <p>9.0.6 It was AGREED to remove reference to 'bus station' and change to 'bus hub' in the introduction under the 'Wider Setting' subsection.</p> <p>9.0.7 It was AGREED to include reference to 'objectives and policies' in 'How this plan has been formulated' paragraph i.e: 'is the basis of our vision <i>objectives and policies</i> for the parish'</p> <p>9.1 Review against local, regional and national policy Not discussed 9.2 Continue review SHDC officer comments on draft plan see below:</p>		
Page/ Policy number	SHDC Officer comment	HNP response
P21 SE2	Not sure if this is reasonable or enforceable. If the wording is changed to 'will be supported' as in policy SE1, it might be acceptable.	The HNP will take legal advice on the wording.
P22 SE3	As above, ensure you are adding something to JLP policy	The HNP will take legal advice.
P23 SE5	Not sure that this would be considered reasonable or appropriate. The LPA has standard information it requires for different types of development. You would need a very good reason backed up with local evidence to require information over and above this.	See text above the policy ' <i>The need for this requirement has been made evident by the refusal of a developer to carry out investigations recommended by the County Archaeologist in relation to a proposed solar farm within the Parish which was refused on appeal (RefAPP/K/1128/W/15/3135465).</i> '
P24 SE6	JLP policy encourages NPs to allocate sites for wind turbines. Can this be considered?	It was considered and rejected by the majority of residents who completed the questionnaire.
P24 SE7	This has been referred to in supporting text and is not really necessary as a policy	The HNP Steering Group disagrees.
P26 The Existing Amenities	Consider a policy to protect existing amenities. See e.g. Ashcott NP Policy 8. http://www.sedgemoor.gov.uk/8314	Agreed.

	Can any of them be listed as Assets of Community Value? See http://old.southhams.gov.uk/article/3604/Assets-of-Community-Value	
P26 SA1	Have you got evidence that this is necessary? Have you had a conversation with DCC about it?	Re protecting land next to school. Not evidence of need, but since the availability of building land with the village is so restricted, this measure is considered to be important in protecting the long term viability of the primary school. NS School and land is owned by Diocese/trust, not DCC.
10. Agree next steps/next meeting agenda Charlie volunteered to update the 'Have we got it right' leaflet for discussion		Charlie
11. Any other business None		
12. Confirm date and time of the next meetings Tuesday 27 th March 2018		