



## MINUTES OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN TORQUAY

### Steering Group Meeting

TCDT Building, Temperance Street, 18<sup>th</sup> September 2017 6.30 – 8.30pm

**Officers of the Steering Group:** Leon Butler, Chair,  
Pat Bishop, Treasurer

**Steering Group Members:** Sue Kenway, Len Short (for Paul Raybould), Alan Griffey, Brian Roberts, Steve Darling Cllr Excell, Margaret Forbes-Hamilton.

**Residents/Public Attendance:** Andy Gunther (AGu), Torbay Council, Nigel Goodman, Chris Davies, Tracey Cabache, Rodney Horder, Jontie Williams.

Joanne Ginger and Mark Smith (Minutes)

**Apologies:** Darren Cowell, Vice Chair, Julie Brandon, Communications Officer, John Rawson

Item	Minute/Action Agreed
1.	<p><b>Welcome, Housekeeping and Apologies</b> LB welcomed all to the meeting. Apologies were recorded from Darren Cowell, Julie Brandon and John Rawson</p> <p><b>Minutes of the last meeting and matter arising</b> With reference to elected Officer Appointments: LB advised there was an error in the May Steering Group Minutes which should be updated with the correct Officer Appointments. The Officers were listed correctly in the June minutes.</p> <p><b>ACTION: JG/MS to update May minutes as instructed above.</b></p>
2.	<p><b>Town Hall car park and other regeneration projects – Review of any changes required to our Plan in the light of the current development proposals</b> <b>The Town hall car park meeting has been deferred.</b></p> <p>The status of the Masterplan was requested.</p>

	<p>AGu advised that the Masterplan was a snap shot in time and is continually evolving and not set in stone. The housing numbers have not changed and it a supplement to the Development Plan. LB asked if it would be reasonable to expect the Masterplan to be updated. AGU advised there were not the resources to expect the Masterplan to be refreshed each time there was new information.</p> <p>LB said there were 50 houses planned for the Town Hall Car park but that the owner of the land may not come forward. AGu commented that the town centre had other regeneration projects that were sure to hit numbers.</p> <p>SD asked if the Neighbourhood Plan could list out expectations and write a policy that has statutory Power (2011 Act). LB commented that it would force the Council to have a community consultation on projects in the Masterplan. AGu did not think the Neighbourhood Plan could prescribe it. The group discussed the statutory obligation of planning. AGu advised each planning application is available online and there is an option to register an email address to be notified. AgU commented that it was important to liaise with the council as the Councillors set the strategy.</p> <p><b>ACTION: LB will circulate Planning Applications to the group as and when received.</b></p> <p>LB questioned if the group needed to include a statement re the Town Hall Car Park in the Masterplan. The group debated the Town Hall Car Parking site along with Lymington Road Coach Park site.</p> <p>LB commented that the Masterplan may have an effect on the area and can be used as a tool, outlining hooks and strategy for the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan in between, if significant.</p> <p><b>ACTION: LB to draft</b></p>
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Sladnor park – Update</b></p> <p>RH provided an update on the Slander Park proposals.</p>
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Consultation feedback and review and agree any Changes – Greenspaces</b></p> <p>It was agreed that agenda item 4 would be discussed first due to some attendees needing to leave the meeting early and the conflict of interest for RE in relation to the Car Park agenda item.</p> <p>The TDA has responded to the request for local green space designations and have objected to each one. Each site states ‘Object to LGS designation possible future development of all or part’ apart from TLGSM1, TLGSC18, TLGSC19, TLGSC4, TLGSC8, TLGSS6, TLGSS11, TLGSH4, TLGSS10 and TLGSTU2 which has a</p>

specific reason allocated to each.

LB read out Appendix 2 from the original proposal DC was due to meet with the TDA to review which areas of Nightingale Park could be designated areas.

**ACTION: DC to advise chair if/when the meeting will take place.**

The chair opened the conversation to all for comments on the TDA response:

It was widely felt that the response was unreasonable and that due thought had not been given as there was a blanket of objections to each proposed green space.

AGu stepped in to advise he had met with various Council departments to formulate a response from the Council as the asset holder. AGu had voiced to the TDA the Forums position to safeguard spaces, however AGu explained that the TDA's view that any additional protected spaces hampers future decision making as there would be an additional planning layer added in to the process. This in turn would make it more difficult when decisions are required for future development. AGu suggested to not send a blanket response but to be specific and list details for each site including features of support which may be considered a more reasonable approach.

Clear explanations of why the space is beneficial to the community should be demonstrated. The group had tried to cover all the green spaces and assured that there would be no changes to the Green Spaces list unless any member of the group felt strongly. SK explained that the list had already been cut to the minimum and suggested a paragraph be added to explain this which stated all the areas in the elected list were those that were well used and loved by the community.

MFH aired concern at the term 'footprint' and suggested footprint plus modest area. The group then discussed allowance area terminology.

JW asked if spaces could be graded to prioritise, however, LB advised the audit had already been completed, pictures taken and the spaces listed are fully justified as they are currently used by the community as green spaces.

SD said the group should have confidence in the list of green spaces and LB confirmed the group do.

AGu advised that all supporting documentation is usually given at submission, however LB said this was not a statutory requirement and that he would not be happy for the Council to use the documents against the proposal. LB felt that the examiner would ask for supporting evidence as and when required. AGU reiterated his point that it is highly unusual for planning not to have any supporting documents.

SD said that understandably the Council would instruct the TDA and it would be surprising if it had not been seen by members/seniors officials. TC suggested opening up a conversation with Kevin Mowat.

RE commented that the green spaces had been revalued this year. He also commented that King George playing fields should not be forgotten and that we ensure that it is not lost sight of. RE suggested raising this issue at the next full council meeting. RE left the meeting at 7.15pm.

It was felt that landowner 'Torbay Council' are intent to sell off sites to developers to garner income into the Council. A distinct lack of confidence was felt across the group as they discussed the possibility of flats on Princess Gardens and that a proposal to build on Cary Green has been 'quietly withdrawn'.

**ACTION: SD to check on land valuation/sale process and report back.**

	<p>LB has circulated feedback as and when received and discussed feedback given by Natural England and Paignton Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p><b>ACTION: LB to circulate Maidencombe H19 objection.</b></p> <p>The group went on to discuss the future growth area. AGu stated that it had been assessed and that it is a specific part in HRA re appropriate habitats assessment. The table covers a site by site basis and can be added in as part of updates. It would be beneficial to mention Natural England. There are no massive outstanding issues. There is complete sustainability. The detailed bat survey should give enough information to satisfy Natural England.</p> <p><b>ACTION: AGu to send an email to formally respond.</b>  <b>ACTION: LB to write to AGu to request SSI maps and coastal zones from the Council.</b>  <b>ACTION: DC/LB/TC to review responses received and each policy wording.</b></p> <p>The group gave an enormous thank you to LB for all his efforts in co-ordinating the project.</p>
5.	<p><b>Statement of Community Involvement &amp; Consultation – Review and agree</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: TC to liaise with LB to finalise by 22/09/17. Speak to RH by 22/09/17.</b></p>
6.	<p><b>Basic Conditions Statement – Review and agree</b></p> <p>RH confirmed the statement had been drafted and that the table needed to be updated to a final appraisal report/scoping report (if different)/regulated assessment.</p> <p><b>ACTION: LB/AG to send a paragraph of text for the general statement.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: LB to draft email of draft plan to allow the final appraisal/scoping report to be completed.</b></p> <p>LB confirmed he did not want include a basic conditions statement with regards to Greenspaces.  PB said she was concerned with it not being there for the inspector to refer to and should be consistent with Paignton and Brixham.</p> <p><b>ACTION: LB to send Torquay Neighbourhood Plan area designation and decision process.</b>  <b>ACTION: AGu to send LB minutes.</b>  <b>ACTION: RH to draft and send for review.</b></p>

<b>7.</b>	<p><b>Review of graphic design and committed Submission date</b></p> <p>LB asked the group if there was the need to have the document designed graphically and if it was essential due to the time constraints. The design does not alter the content but makes it visually more enjoyable. 2-3 weeks would need to be allocated for the design work should it need to go ahead. The longer this takes the longer it takes for the plan to be submitted. It was also said that as it is community engagement a mini version was suggested for when the referendum takes place.</p> <p>RH suggested an examination version to be submitted. This was agreed. It was confirmed that once the document is submitted to Examiner it cannot be changed or amended. AGu said if an additional 2 or 3 weeks could help make a big difference then it may be worth taking the time to ensure it is in its best format. Submission date currently 2<sup>nd</sup> October, 2017. The group then discussed mapping. LB took on board AGu's comments but was concerned at the length of time it may take.</p> <p>NG queried the process of checking the document before submission. LB said it could be split into sections and given to various groups for checking.</p>
<b>8.</b>	<p><b>AOB and next meeting</b></p> <p>There was no other business.</p> <p>The next meeting is due to be held on the first Monday after submission date at 6.30pm at the Torbay Community Development Trust office.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 9pm</p>