

Harberton Parish Neighbourhood Plan (HNP)

7.00pm Thursday 27th February 2020 at Harberton Parish Hall

Agenda

DRAFT Minutes

Present: Ginny Davidson, Nuala McDonnell, Stanley Oldfield, David Sprent, Alex Williams

Apologies: Sally Lougher

Not in attendance: Roger Hands

Public: 0

Minutes: Cat Radford

Public Session None.

<p>1. Apologies were received as above. 1.1 Record of two consecutive meetings missed - none</p>	
<p>2. New members to the steering group - none</p>	
<p>3. Declaration of Interests 3.1. Steering group members were reminded of the need to update their register of interests. 3.2. No interests were declared on items on the agenda.</p>	
<p>4. Consider approval of minutes After making minor amendments the minutes of the meeting of 28th November 2019 were signed as an accurate record. It was noted that there were no minutes to approve from a meeting in January as the meeting had been cancelled as it would not have been quorate.</p>	
<p>5. Actions from minutes not included elsewhere on the agenda 5.1 <u>Letter from the owner of Dundridge Yard</u> It was reported that the member of the public had dropped the complaint in January 2020. 5.2 <u>Courtesy email to Totnes Neighbourhood Planning Group</u> Cat reported writing sending a courtesy email to the Totnes Neighbourhood Plan group to note the invitation made within their plan for other neighbourhood plans to follow their model, as the structure of the HNP introduction has followed the Totnes format. It was reported a Town Council member of staff had responded to comment that this will be forwarded to the Chair for information. 5.4 <u>Notice of Designation</u> It was reported that The Executive Committee of South Hams District Council approved the area designation for the purpose of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan on 21st March 2013. 5.4 <u>Recommendation to Parish Council on response to Totnes Neighbourhood Plan consultation</u> It was noted for the minutes that Ginny and Nuala had prepared a recommendation for Parish Council consideration on consultation on the draft Totnes Neighbourhood Plan. This had been done, and the recommendations approved and forwarded.</p>	
<p>6. Consider response to comments from website, letters or emails – none received that are not included elsewhere on the agenda.</p>	
<p>7. Parish Council – Receive update from Parish Council meeting, if any It had been reported at the Parish Council meeting that an appeal regarding a rejected planning application in Harbertonford had been allowed, in which the inspector had allowed weight to the draft HNP since it has been produced following public consultation and questionnaire surveys. It was found that as the draft HNP identifies specific housing requirements for Harbertonford, in conjunction with the Joint Local Plan, the provision of an additional dwelling on the appeal site would contribute towards the identified local housing needs of the local community. It was further noted that the inspector did not find the appeal site to be an ‘isolated’ countryside location, due to its proximity to the western edge of the built-up area of the village, and the ease of access to facilities and services by means other than the car, and that it can be considered to be within Harbertonford.</p> <p>Although asked by HNP representatives whether the Parish Council wished to revisit its’ decision, the Parish Council did not wish to establish village boundaries.</p>	

<p>8. Consider draft letter to landowners</p> <p>The Steering Group had received a draft document, as prepared by Nuala, set out to clarify the role of the Harberton Parish Neighbourhood Plan (HNP) and its relevance to landowners of sites whose land is included within the Housing section of the HNP.</p> <p>It was AGREED to accept this document.</p> <p>After discussion the following actions were agreed: Action: Nuala to draft a cover letter to this document and for this to be sent to owners of sites that remain in the plan. It was AGREED not to send letters to owners of sites that are no longer in the plan. Action: Roger to be asked to ascertain the owner of Site 2.</p> <p>It was reported that the owner of Site 4 had been established and contact details were on file.</p>	<p>NM</p> <p>RH</p>
<p>9. Review of the Neighbourhood Plan Draft</p> <p>9.1. Consider request for re-inclusion of Dundridge Yard/Chaplin Yard into the draft Neighbourhood Plan It was reported that the owner of Dundridge Yard/Chaplin Yard had sent a written request for the site to be put back in the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>It was AGREED that the Steering Group would be happy to put the Dundridge Yard/Chaplain Yard site back into the HNP as a site for housing development. The steering group wished to make it clear that the draft HNP has limited influence with the local planning authority and inclusion does not constitute any guarantee on any planning application being granted. It was agreed to forward the guidance notes (see item 8 above) to the landowner. ACTION: Cat to respond to the landowner.</p> <p>9.2. Consider proposed draft economy section from member of the public It was reported that a member of the public had proposed a draft paragraph relating to support of internet businesses for the Steering Group to consider including in the economy section of the Local Plan. This referred to policies within both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Joint Local Plan (JLP).</p> <p>The steering group did not agree to adopt the proposed policy as draft. It was agreed to review the Economy section considering the suggested policy.</p> <p>There was discussion about the size of the business and the nature of the business and impact on road use. It was commented that there are policies within the JLP relating to development businesses.</p> <p>It was agreed to include a definition of small, medium and microbusinesses within the glossary as ‘the usual definition of small and medium sized enterprise (SMEs) is any business with fewer than 250 employees. Micro-businesses are businesses with 0-9 employees.</p> <p>It was agreed to change ‘Home Based Businesses’ title to Micro-businesses (see item 9.3) It was agreed to respond to the member of public to comment that the HNP steering group believe that ‘internet businesses’ is a subset of ‘micro-businesses’ and changed the text to reflect this.</p> <p>9.3. Consider most recent draft narrative The proposed document was circulated in advance of the meeting. During the meeting the committee discussed and approved the following changes:</p> <p><u>P2 Contents</u> Reformatting and new page numbers <u>P5. Introduction</u> – deleted www.gov.uk quotation and incorporate in narrative text. <u>P7 How has the plan been prepared?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • replacement flow chart with own version using larger font size and pastel colours to make it easier to read. Includes ‘Submit to Parish Council’ and ‘Submit to SHDC’ and remove ‘modification if required’ as modifications will be made at various points. ▪ a dated list of consultation exercises and events that appears after the current descriptive text. 	<p>CR</p> <p>CR</p>

<p><u>P8. How has the plan been prepared - continued</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alter all 'still to happen!' dates to 2020. • Replace 'Summary of the re drafted Neighbourhood Plan to be sent to every household with 'Have We Got It Right' brief questionnaire' with 'Statutory consultation of Parish residents, stakeholders and other interested parties' ▪ Remove subsequent references to 'Have we Got It Right' mailing ▪ Update references to 'NP' to 'HNP' from p8 onwards. ▪ ACTION: Cat to make amendments to the website to reflect the above. <p><u>P9. Background to the Parish.</u> It was agreed to include new paragraph after '<i>avoid diminution of these facilities as peoples life styles and shopping habits change.</i>': <i>One of the issues facing any development within the parish is access which is exacerbated by the predominance of narrow single track lanes. Apart from the A381, and one former B road, almost all roads in the Parish are single track. Even the more main roads lack walkways or even grass verges for long stretches and so are too dangerous for pedestrians. Another issue is the lack of public transport.</i></p> <p><u>P12 Housing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that redraft of housing section (minutes of 11/11/19) had not yet been actioned Ongoing - Roger. • Rewrite of Policy H1 removing reference to rejected sites and putting all sites in without prioritising has not yet been actioned. Ongoing – Roger • Rewrite of policy H2 had not yet been actioned Ongoing – Roger • It was noted consider deleting policy H4 and discuss H3 <p><u>P20 Housing – allocation of space for housing development.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace <i>This draft of the Neighbourhood Plan includes a range of possible sites identified in the initial round of consultations. These are set out below. With: The Neighbourhood Plan recommends the following sites are allocated as spaces for housing.</i> • Remove <i>Potential Sites for Development</i> heading to map. • It was noted that David had proposed to remove site numbers and only refer to sites by name, however it was agreed this needed further discussion. • It was agreed that 'aims and expectations' for sites should be reviewed to ensure parity of approach for each site. • A number of changes within the housing section and appendix required further discussion and are as yet unactioned within the draft. <p><u>P60 Policy E3</u> Insert 'species such as' after <i>In every conversion as above, adequate provision, must be made for accommodation of...</i></p> <p><u>P61 Home Based Businesses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change heading to 'micro-businesses' • Change references to 'home businesses' to 'micro-businesses' as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>There are many established micro-businesses (0-9 employees)...</i> ○ <i>...encourage the establishment of further micro-businesses</i> • Insert '<i>and small workshops.</i>' After '<i>operating from private housing, adjoining buildings <u>and small workshops</u></i>' • Amend policy E6 as follows: <i>The use of dwellings, adjacent buildings and small workshops for micro-businesses (0-9 employees) will be supported subject to their character being compatible with neighbouring houses, residential amenity, traffic and parking.</i> <p>9.4. Consider appendices – i.e. glossary See item 9.2 re inclusion of definition of 'micro-businesses'</p>	<p>CR</p> <p>RH</p> <p>RH RH</p>
<p>10. Next steps Not discussed.</p>	
<p>11. Any other business</p> <p>It was agreed that the next meeting be held between 7.30 – 10:00pm on Thursday 26th March 2020.</p>	