



Northam Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting **Monday 26th 2018, 6pm**

1. Present

Cllr Chris Leather (Chair), Cllr Peter Hames, Val Deering, Josie Gosbee, Angie Whitaker, Cllr Ken Davies, Joy Smart, Graham Ash, Phil Hodson (PHo), Maria Bailey, Jo Johnson, Jane Mills (Clerk), Ian Rowland (IR) (TDC), Dawn Burgess (DB) (TDC)

Special welcome to Ian and Dawn from Torrington District Council who attended this meeting. CL and MB met with Ian and Dawn at the beginning of the Neighbourhood Plan process and they are here to help formulate the plan and provide guidance where needed on the proposed policies.

IR thanked the Chair for the invitation and for the opportunity to be involved at this stage of the Northam Neighbourhood Plan process to ensure the document will work moving forward. He also reiterated the following key points

- Don't repeat; either within the NNP or areas that are included within the Local Plan (LP)
- Ensure the policies are concise to avoid confusion or misunderstanding
- Always use supportive language
- Keep the plan brief
- Evidence all statements and link back to national policies

This was confirmed by CL who attended a seminar with JM recently where a Neighbourhood Plan Inspector was speaking. She mentioned all the comments above in addition the need to have succinct introductions and stressed the need for evidence.

2. Apologies

Nick Arnold

3. Minutes

The minutes of 16 October 2018 were agreed to be a true and accurate record.

4. Discussion and final approval of draft policies (previously circulated)

For the purposes of these minutes, the discussion and decision notes appear first followed by the changes to the policies.

JM confirmed that the Town Council can produce maps. These maps will be used throughout the document to highlight specific areas in question.

IR and DB offered to go through a draft plan, prior to submission to highlight areas that they think will be challenged. They felt that there were some areas that were bold and could be tested so reiterated the importance of robust justification.

Discussions took place surrounding the Shipyard and Richmond Dock and the future of the sites. It was agreed that they should have its own specific Policy within the NNP. The Policy needs to show a need in the area, heritage element, employment, tourism etc. **JG and VD agreed to put initial document together to circulate to the Steering Group.**

Green Spaces and Heritage Sub-Group

It was confirmed that the list of sites included in this policy is from the Devon Biodiversity Records. It was agreed that Appledore Village Green should be added to the list. It was confirmed that this area of land is not currently designated as a Village Green in the LP.

It was suggested that the list should be put into a table format with the site name on the left with a general justification next to it. This should be included in the policy. More specific justifications can be added in the appendix.

Policy NPPF 100 states that land designated for community use should;

- a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves
- b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife
- c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land

NNP2 The new LP includes a strategic policy for Northam that includes the Green Wedge. In this instance, duplication should be avoided and the policy within the Neighbourhood Plan should refer to the LP. There can be however, justification to extend the area beyond to protect the areas not covered.

NNP3 The policies for NNP3 have a strong relationship with ST09 in the LP. Question needs to be asked, what additional value does our policy bring? Suggest changing wording and include map.

1. Is it necessary? LP Policy ST09 picks out main 2 components and the policy is probably better suited for all developments
2. This policy is covered by the LP Policy DM17 and 18 and covers tourism accommodation and attractions within the developed coast.

NNP4 This was met with approval, possibly change title (as below)

NNP5 Suggest inclusion of views within the plan to provide evidence of why areas need to be protected. Ensure vista shots are taken from all angles, including looking back at the area concerned. Another process to consider is to put together a 'Landscape Character Assessment' that focuses on the visual elements of our area.

NNP6 Many Local Authorities hold a 'Heritage Local List' of all historical assets in the area. The 'Local List' can be added to and should include heritage assets that are not currently listed anywhere else, ie as a Grade*. The Neighbourhood Plan can lobby the Local Authority to add specific assets to that list. TDC don't currently have one, so it was seen that the list included in the Neighbourhood Plan could potentially be the start of that list.

- 1c. Focus on what this policy is trying to achieve. Possibly re-write
2. Possibly re-write. DB and IR unsure about sentence from 'as a community facility or for an economic purpose' as Planning Permission can't be prioritise use of a building. The

need is to protect the asset. If the asset is already a community facility, this is already protected under other policies.

NNP7 It was felt that Policies 1, 2, 3 and 4 were already covered in the LP, under DM8 and should either be re worded or removed.

Policy 5 should focus on specific sites as the evidence is strong, however care should be given not to duplicate what is already written within the LP.

NNP8 Discussions took place surrounding wind turbines. It was decided that all reference to turbines and wind generators should be removed as the installation of turbines impacts on other areas.

Heritage and Green Spaces Policy – changes to policy detail

Issues remove 'to development' in vulnerability **to development** of under designated

NNP1 Policies move NNP1 Local Green Spaces title to above 'The Plan designates ...'
Add to introduction paragraph; 'principle reinforced fields intrust include land owners for deed in perpetuity'
e) include 'off Jacket's Lane'

NNP2 move 'NNP2' after introduction and next to Policy

NNP2 3) change 'accommodation' for 'development'

NNP4, Policy change title to read 'Protecting Boundary Conservation of the Undeveloped Coast ...'
add 'where feasible' after para end 'rural character of the area ...'

NNP5, Policy 1 remove the words 'considered' and 'permitted provided' and replace with 'supported where'

NNP6 Move NPP6 next to Policy

change the name 'local list' to 'locally important as it could cause confusion with the Local Authorities list

Policy 1 Rewrite from the sentence 'This is irrespective to the level ...' to DM Policy form of wording

Northam Local List of Assets change name to 'Locally Important' to avoid confusion with the Local Authorities 'Local List'

2 Site of New Quay Dock ... add '(Richmond)'

NNP7 Policy 5 Change wording from 'actively encouraged' to 'actively supported'

Policy 6 Change wording from 'protected from development' to 'conserving and protected where possible, enhanced by development.'

Para starting 'The following wildlife corridors ...' add to point 2 '... South West Coast Footpath in green wedge'.

NNP8 Policy 1 Remove 'strongly'

Policy 2 Remove 'wind generators and'

Housing and Residential Sub Group

- Issues The Issues paragraph needs to be more specific by stating evidence and remaining positive. It was suggested to use evidence from the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment (ST17, pg 180) that gives breakdown of bed numbers. Further in that document, (pg 190) can be found information on bungalows, popular to older people. In addition, Northam Town Council's Housing survey will add value for local level evidence.
- The statement about second homes and holiday lets was challenged with the question being asked whether there are disproportionate levels of second homes in Northam Parish. It was suggested that it probably was the case for Appledore, rather than Northam and as such the paragraph should be reworded and evidence supplied.
- NNP10 b) Discussions took place surrounding the '5 sq meters per person' statement. Whilst IR liked the sound of the statement, he raised caution about how feasible it would be in practice. If developers are faced with an additional cost burden it could lead to a viability study having to be carried out and could jeopardise the project. He suggested that the statement should remain to 'test the water', however it may be necessary to alter the wording to something like 'appropriate private amenity space'.
- c) It was felt that this statement would impact on current building regulations, which isn't an area that the Local Planning Authority can influence. However, if specific items were in mind, and as long as it can be evidenced, they could be included in the supplementary text.
- e) Remove para as this is covered in the Green Spaces and Heritage Policies
- f) Remove para as this is covered in the Green Spaces and Heritage Policies
- NNP12 Discussion took place referring to the suggestion that new builds should not occupy more than 50% of the plot. It was suggested that instead of restricting the policy to 50%, a phrase like 'adequate private amenity space' should be included instead as IR and DB felt that the policy will struggle to fit universally as every site is unique.
- NNP13 b) It was felt that this policy contradicts the Tourism Accommodation policy and will need to be looked at. The policy also needs to be more rigorous. KB's comments regarding the St Ives wording were noted and agreed.
- It was questioned whether this policy would cover all the NNP areas or be specifically for Appledore and Westward Ho! It was agreed that census data should be consulted to aid the decision. It was agreed that the consultation events will give residents an opportunity to question the need in other areas.
- NNP14 Remove this policy as it is already covered in the LP and the NPPF have changed the thresholds.
- It was suggested that the LP policies need to be checked to see confirm that it meets all the requirements that we need. It was confirmed that the need for affordable housing came out highly in the questionnaire.
- NNP15 Currently DCC have guidance that looks at size of car spaces and garages for new builds. It was suggested that the policy looks at the number of spaces relevant to the

size of the proposed property, however evidence to support this could be an issue. It was suggested that the NNP could encourage electric charging points.

NNP16 DB felt that this policy would be difficult to apply across every site, and the plan may need to identify specific sites. She went on to say that the LP is very strong on design supplied by the NPPF.

NPPF17 Remove CIL policy but possibly include within a 'Priority Project List'. The reason for withdrawal is that Central Government completed a review of CIL and have made amendments to S106. There is an expectation that TDC will still progress CIL after the LP is in place.

Housing and Residential – changes to Policy details

Issues	Remove 'which reflects the needs of the local population' and the word 'Unfortunately'
NNP11 a)	replace with KG's wording 'Be accompanied by supporting information which clearly demonstrates how existing key features of the site such as natural views, built structures, landmarks, mature trees, water courses and hedges are impacted by the proposal. Any negative impact on these features must be accompanied by appropriate mitigation measures.'
c)	remove the word 'sourced locally' and replace with 'produced locally, where practical to do so'
Conformity	add ST05 to list
NNP15	remove c)
NNP16 a)	add 'where appropriate/feasible' after 'more bungalows'
b)	Need to make this policy stronger. As it relates to the need, include %
Conformity	remove 'DM22' and add 'ST17'
NNP18 b)	change wording 'reflect' to 'respect'

Business and Employment

Objective f) The Planning Process can't influence the type of businesses that move into an area, however, weight can be given to the vitality of centres. It was suggested that this policy needs clarifying.

The group discussed the conflicting arguments for both the need for business in an area and its environmental impact and the difficulties in balancing the two.

NNP20 b) It was agreed that this area is covered in the LP so should be removed.

c) It was suggested that this policy should be reworked.

Business and Employment – changes to Policy details

Objective Reword sentence 'Development within the Undeveloped Coast ...' not using the word 'resisted'

NNP19 c) Add after 'will be supported.' 'where it could not be reasonably located outside'

Conformity Include DM15

NNP20 b) Remove

NNP21 b) Replace 'encouraged' with 'supported'

5. Next Stages

Once the changes have been completed, the plan will be collated and circulated to all Steering Group Members. This draft will then go to IR and DB for comment before the public events, that will take place in Wesward Ho!, Appledore and Northam.

The meeting ended at 8.50pm