

Minutes of the Colyton Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

30th August 2018 2.00pm

Town Hall Boardroom

Members Present: Caroline Collier (Chair), Steve Real, Robert Griffin, Colin Pady, Helen Parr, Steve Selby, Elaine Stratford & Paul Weston plus 2 members of the public

Apologies : David Page

Minutes of Meeting held 1st August 2018: were signed as a true record

Matters arising: None

Update on Ceramtec Site: The planning application has been submitted to EDDC but they had asked for more details before verifying the application. It was hoped it would be available before our two consultation days. Paul Weston pointed out that we can ask for a delay in the planning decision as it is the focus of one of our policies and impacts on other policy decisions. Homes England to be asked for an update

Review of comments from EDDC on 1st Consultation Version (Draft):

No.	Aspect	LPA Comment	Changes Made (as result of SG 30/08/18)
1	Para 3.2	<i>The revised NPPF (2018) is used as the main reference. Just to note this is acceptable if you are planning for submission after January 24th, 2019. Any plan submitted before that date must reference and be assessed using the NPPF (2012).</i>	No change
2	Para 3.4	<i>East Devon Villages Plan was adopted on 26 July 2018.</i>	Date of adoption added to para. 3.4 (page 6)
3	Para 3.5	<i>Not essential but might be worth referencing the quote (East Devon Local Plan, 2016, p159)</i>	Footnote added referencing the quote from the Local Plan (page 7)
4	Para 4.10	<i>We'd suggest you add the East Devon Villages Plan to this section.</i>	Added East Devon Villages Plan to list in para. 4.10 (page 9)
5	Para 5.4	<i>We'd suggest rephrasing 'A neighbourhood plan policy has been introduced where it is felt that it strengthens or brings local specificity to the Local Plan.' Maybe... 'All policies contained within the Neighbourhood Plan strengthen or bring local specificity to better determine planning outcomes for Colyton Parish beyond those policies contained in the Local Plan'</i>	Amended para. 5.4 as suggested (page 10)
6	Policy Coly1	<i>Could you link to the Natural England list of priority habitats/species in the footnote? 'Development proposals should: ... ii) protect, manage and enhance the network of habitats, species and sites of importance including trees and woodlands' hedgerows and</i>	Criteria ii amended (page 14)

		<p>roadside verges' – intention is sound, however in reality we cannot demand that development proposals manage and enhance an environment, the focus needs to be on limiting the adverse impact of development and demanding mitigation measures and contributions where adverse effects are identified. If a resident applies for a minor extension it would be onerous to request that the proposal includes a scheme to manage and enhance the local network of habitats.</p> <p>Does Coly1 add any local distinction to the Local Plan policy as it is written? We'd suggest adding specific reference to map 2 in the policy to drive home the locally informed aspect</p>	
7	Para 7.8	<p>We'd suggest avoiding reference to the remainder of the land outside of the AONB and BUAB as being treated as equal to AONB as that may undermine your policy. The parish wide reference may also appear to conflict with national and strategic AONB policy. The AONB designation should be recognised as being distinct and associated AONB national and local policy should be supported in the plan (no need to repeat what is already highly restrictive policy contained in the Local Plan). Coly1 should be specific to areas outside of the AONB / BUAB to avoid conflict with AONB or BUAB strategic policy.</p>	<p>Para's 7.8 – 7.11 re-ordered, reference to AONB limited and additional words added (page 14)</p>
8	Map 2	<p>Very blurred, needs to be a better quality for final version for effective management. The map in the original linked document is clear, would just need to match that resolution.</p>	<p>Map left unchanged for this current version</p>
9	Policy Coly2	<p>Great to see woodlands specific policy. Could be enhanced in line with guidance linked below: Woodland Trust's manual for planners: http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/publications/2017/09/planning-for-ancient-woodland/ Woodland Trust's neighbourhood planning microsite: https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/campaigning/neighbourhood-planning/</p>	<p>No change</p>
10	Policy Coly2	<p>National Planning Context - Suggest your text is brought in line with below final copy: NPPF paragraph 175 states: When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles: c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons [58] and a suitable compensation strategy exists; Footnote 58 states: For example, infrastructure projects (including nationally significant infrastructure projects, orders under the Transport and Works Act and hybrid bills), where the public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss or deterioration of habitat.</p>	<p>Policy extended to take account of NPPF exceptional reasons clause and explanation given in new para. 7.16 (pages 16-17)</p>
11	Para 7.14	<p>...major contribution to the rural and natural character of the area and should be afforded be protected from development. Included amongst their... (extra words 'be afforded'?).</p>	<p>Word deleted (page 16)</p>
12	Para 7.20	<p>We'd suggest removing any reference to Green Belt designation, the two designations of Green Wedge and Green Belt are distinct, and the reference potentially risks undermining your rationale.</p>	<p>Reference to Green Belt deleted (page 19)</p>
13	Policy Coly6	<p>'Development within or immediately adjoining the Built-Up Area Boundary will generally be supported provided it: ' –</p>	<p>No change</p>

		<p><i>'Immediately adjoining the BUAB' would allow for significant development outside of the boundary and not conform to the Local Plan, we suggest 'or immediately adjoining' is removed. Development within BUABs has robust policy in place through the development plan for East Devon including the Local Plan and the Villages Plan. Does policy Coly6 improve on those policies or provide local specificity? We consider that as it is written it may supersede existing policy that provides more comprehensive development control for the parish. This is an opportunity to introduce locally specific design policy to add detail to the Local Plan should you wish.</i></p> <p><i>Not sure that the second point is necessary- Colyton is recognised as being sustainable and so has a Built-up Area Boundary- there is no need to refer to the settlement hierarchy? Is there any scope to include renewable energy/carbon reduction measures?</i></p>	
14	Section 8	<i>The section title includes 'Heritage' but there aren't any heritage policies?</i>	No change
15	Policy Coly7	<i>Not complete at this stage for comment.</i>	No change
16	Para 8.9	<i>Add 'the' before local planning authority.</i>	Word 'the' added to para. 8.9 (page 27)
17	Para. 9.4	<i>'It is the only oak bark tannery in the Britain' (extra word 'the').</i>	Word deleted (page 29)
18	Policy Coly8	<i>'small-scale' – Could do with defining small-scale and why limit the scale of employment opportunities if a proposal could meet all of your criteria?</i>	'small-scale' deleted from policy Extra words added to para. 9.11 (page 30)
19	Policy Coly8	<i>'predominantly residential areas' is a little vague and could be open to interpretation by potential developers, could do with defining this as within the BUAB or specifying where you support employment development proposals outside of the BUAB. In addition, the revised NPPF para 84 requires policy to allow for development outside of existing settlements to meet local business and community needs, 'predominantly residential areas' may not conform to that requirement.</i>	Extra words added to para. 9.11 (page 30)
20	Policy Coly9	<i>i) 'scale of development is small' – suggest small needs some definition, in any case the policy works well without it. Suggest removal of 'is small'.</i>	'small' deleted in criteria i (page 31)
21	Policy Coly11	<i>'All new residential, educational and business premises development will be required to make adequate, appropriate and effective provision for high speed broadband and other communication networks.' - This cannot be enforced as a 'requirement', suggest rephrasing to 'All new residential, educational and business premises development should seek to make adequate, appropriate...' or similar. We cannot insist that a developer (of any scale) installs a communication network.</i>	Wording of policy changed in line with LPA suggestion (page 32)
22	Policy Coly12	<i>Does this policy have any impact or local advantage beyond Strategy 5B? Coly12 doesn't have the checks and measures to reduce the impact of any development on the environment. You mention interchanges / linkages / bus refuges, but would the community want a bus depot built in the parish backed by this policy? We think the policy may not serve any real planning purpose, if you feel you wish to maintain it we'd suggest</i>	Policy revised to add criteria and extra words to para. 10.9 (page 35)

		<i>tightening up the criteria to avoid any potential impact.</i>	
23	Policy Coly15	<i>Proposals for public car parking areas within or adjoining to town of Colyton, will be supported in their entirety or as part of new developments on suitable sites where: - suggest rewriting this section, not clear as it is written.</i>	No change
24	Para 11.4	<i>Woodrolfe should be Woodroffe.</i>	Spelling corrected in para. 11.4 (page 38)
25	Policy Coly16	<i>Should this include a reference to development carried out as part of these uses? e.g. sheds/ subdivisions/ hard standings/ parking as they can be detrimental to the landscape and visual amenity if they are 'haphazard'.</i>	Additional clause added to policy (page 39)
26	Policy Coly17	<i>New recreational facilities may result in impacts wider than residential amenity and traffic/parking. Potentially noise, landscape impact, floodlighting and impact on wildlife and the historic environment are important considerations.</i>	Criteria added to policy (page 40)
27	Glossary	<i>The term 'Use Classes' is not in alphabetical order.</i>	Glossary re-ordered (page 44)

Paul would circulate the amendments and asked for any comments from SG members by Monday 3rd September. He would circulate the Draft Plan circulated by the end of the week, it could then be circulated as widely as possible

Arrangements for Public Consultation Days: Elaine had done much work in preparing posters, flyers etc. Flyers had been delivered in Colyton and Colyford delivery was in hand. Helen & David would deliver to outlying districts. Colyford – copies of Draft Plan to be placed in the Chapel and Memorial Hall. For those unable to attend the Consultation days comment boxes to be placed in Chapel and Colyford Post Office

Colyton – copies of the Draft Plan to be placed in the Library & Parish Council Office, with comment boxes in the Little Shop and Premier for those unable to attend on the day

A statement re GDPR to be printed on comment sheets, wording to be agreed by Parish Council
Closing date for comments to be 13th October

Posters A1 in size needed for each Consultation showing policies, Helen, Colin & Caroline to meet to agree wording, EDDC be asked to print. Also EDDC be asked to print copies of the Draft Plan.

Display panels to be borrowed from EDDC

Post-it notes and green and red dots to be used at consultation days as we did at previous exhibitions. Attendance sheets to be at each day

Public Question Time: It was suggested that we clarify what changes there may be to the rules relating to exception sites for settlements of over 3000 population. Re the Ceramtec site, there was a need to balance the number of jobs and maybe part of the site could become available for car parking. Also suggested we look at the greater Exeter Strategic Plan which includes housing development east of Exeter.

Any other business: Paul was again thanked for all the work he is doing for us

Date of next meeting: 24th October at 2pm in the Boardroom

The meeting closed at 3.35pm