

Harberton Parish Neighbourhood Plan (HNP)

7.00pm Thursday 26th September 2019 at Harberton Parish Hall

Minutes

Present: Roger Hands, Sally Lougher, Nuala McDonnell, Stanley Oldfield, David Sprent, Alex Williams

Apologies: Ginny Davidson

Public: 1

Minutes: Cat Radford

Agenda

Public Session

- The owner of housing site 8: Dundridge Yard came to the meeting to inform the steering group that he was upset and frustrated that his plans for Dundridge Yard had been refused by South Hams District Council (SHDC) planning authority, commenting that:
 - at the time of putting his site forward to be included in the HNP, he had not been given any documentation to explain the process involved in the making of a Neighbourhood Plan and what should be expected;
 - he had not felt supported by the HNP in the planning process – a meeting suggested to discuss the site with the Local Authority had not been successfully arranged within the time it would have had relevance;
 - he was not aware that the HNP was an advisory committee of the Parish Council, nor that the HNP would have no weight in the planning process until it was adopted;
 - there may have been a conflict of interest with members of the HNP in relation to his site;
 - land owners who have sites included in the plan could have been more usefully kept advised of progress of the plan, to ensure that other land owners were better informed as to the benefits and limitations of site inclusion in the plan;
 - as Dundridge Yard has now been removed from the HNP as a housing site, the landowner will be proceeding with an application for the development of industrial units; and
 - a formal complaint will be made to the Local Planning Authority concerning the advice given by one of the Development Management Officers.
- Members of the HNP steering group commented that
 - the HNP wanted to put forward Housing Site 8 and, having a contrary view to South Hams District Council, had discussed this with Local Authority Development Management officers.
 - The steering group and landowner had been speaking at crossed purposes, as the HNP would not have weight until it was adopted, and the process was taking longer than expected.

The member of public left the meeting, following which the steering group agreed to take on board the recommendation made by the member of the public that landowners could be more usefully kept informed with progress of the plan, agreeing to identify owners of sites and write to them with an update. **ACTION: It was AGREED** that this information should be compiled for the next meeting.

1. Apologies. 1.1 No members had missed two consecutive meetings.
2. New members to the steering group - None
3. Declaration of Interests 3.1. Register of Interests: Steering group members are reminded of the need to update their register of interests. 3.2. No interests were declared on items on the agenda.
4. Consider approval of minutes The minutes of the July meeting were approved with two minor amendments and signed as an accurate record. *
5. Actions from minutes not included elsewhere on the agenda 5.1. <u>Parish heritage evidence</u> Stanley reported coming to the conclusion that 'undisclosed land around St Andrew's Well' is probably privately owned. No further action. 5.2. <u>Overhead power cables opposite the garage at Packs Close</u> Ongoing. There was discussion as to whether this was relevant information for the plan. It was noted that land put forward

<p>has to have a reasonable chance of it being developed, so it is necessary to understand if it is possible for powercables to be undergrounded. ACTION: Roger to chase.</p> <p>5.3. <u>Colour coding of Site 7: Greenfield site east of Meadow Close</u> Ongoing. ACTION: Roger to confirm land buffer Meadow Close and any development on the land with the landowner.</p> <p>5.4. <u>Site removal</u> It was reported that Dundridge Yard had been removed from the plan. It was noted that the site map needs to be updated. to write to the owner to confirm removal of the site from the plan and to update on the website. SHDC has advised that unless the HNP wants to promote the development of the site, the site should be removed altogether.</p> <p>5.5. <u>Neighbourhood Planning Officer comments on draft</u> Ginny had produced hard copies and distributed them to all members of the steering group. It was noted that the comments made on the draft had already been circulated to the HNP in electronic format and the HNP group had discussed these over the past year. See Item 8.</p> <p>5.6. <u>Request for map of old settlement boundaries</u> It was noted that Ginny had been given an action to request information from Devon County Highways on the old settlement boundaries to provide a starting point for review. See notes on Parish Council update at item 7.</p>	<p>RH RH</p>
<p>6. Consider response to comments from website, letters or emails – none received.</p>	
<p>7. Parish Council – Receive update from Parish Council meeting, if any The issue of settlement boundaries had been raised for Parish Council view. It was reported that the overall mood of the Parish Council was not to draw settlement boundaries as whilst boundary creep or unregulated development is a risk, should a boundary line be drawn everything within that line could be assumed to be acceptable for development which could lead to greater density of development. If there was a line drawn it would have to be very carefully drawn. It was commented that the biggest impact of development for both villages is car parking. It was remarked that the Parish Council would continue to be a consultee on applications and give a view on whether it is considered within the village or within the countryside.</p>	
<p>8. Consider written notes from South Hams Neighbourhood Plan officer</p> <p>It was noted that the HNP had already attended to comments over several meetings as the minutes note. This, coupled with the fact that the comments made was on a much earlier draft of the plan, members of the HNP did not feel that this was a good use of time to revisit the same comments at this meeting. However, the HNP would like to take the SHDC Neighbourhood Plan officer on the offers that he made to support drafting of wording on particular sections.</p> <p>Members of the HNP commented that they found it useful to have a hard copy of the plan to read, and that the plan is in good shape and could be wrapped up very quickly. It was agreed that all members needed a current version of the plan in print to go through at the next meeting.</p> <p>ACTION: Cat to forward the plan so that it can be printed out. It was agreed that at the next meeting the plan would be projected so to make live amendments to the plan during the meeting.</p> <p>There was a discussion about collaborative working with Totnes Town and Dartington Parish Councils. It was reported that Roger Hands visited the Totnes Neighbourhood Plan Group and was given the opportunity to discuss the HNP nomination of Winsland House for residential development.</p> <p>The Totnes group were clear that they did not support the site , on grounds which seemed primarily to be highway-related. Roger commented that he was given to understand that they had never seen any proposals and so their opinions were not informed by expert views. He proposed to their group that he would sent the potential development plan suggested highway issues as developed by Highway specialists but HNP group felt that this information was not in the public domain. Roger had put to the Totnes group that developing this site could give an unprecedented deliverable affordable housing mix which would benefit both Harberton and Totnes and urged them to reconsider .</p> <p>The Harberton Parish Council want to see the site kept in the Plan as it is submitted for inspection but it was agreed that the potential for the site to be accepted in the approved version will be dramatically improved if there is support from adjoining parishes. It would be very helpful if a professional and considered view as to how the highways issue can be properly resolved</p>	<p>CR</p>

<p>were to be available to Totnes as part of their deliberations but the HNP group cannot promote a particular developer for a particular site.</p>	
<p>9. Continue review of economy section It was agreed to request wording from Neighbourhood Planning Officer to incorporate his advice that to protect existing employment sites there should be a condition that they should be marketed for a year, at a price realistic for commercial retail use, before the proposal to convert (e.g.) to housing can be considered. ACTION: CAT Cat to email Neighbourhood Planning Officer with the request to make suggested amendments to draft wording:</p> <p><i>“Any proposals leading to the loss of existing land and sites which provide economical work places within the plan area will not be supported unless an over riding case can be made showing clear and over riding public benefit assessed against other provisions set out in this plan.”</i></p>	<p>CR</p>
<p>10. Next steps</p> <p>Nuala asked for confirmation on grant monies given and spent by the HNP steering group.</p> <p>In reviewing the Parish Council accounts for the year 2015/16 Cat confirmed that on 4th June 2015 a grant of £4963 was given to the Parish Council by Groundwork UK for work on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>A total of £3918.16 of this grant was spent, and a grant balance repayment (reference NPG-01361) of £1044.84 was returned to Groundwork UK by cheque, which left the Parish Council account on 8th March 2016.</p>	
<p>11. Any other business None</p>	