



**MINUTES OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN TORQUAY**  
**Steering Group**  
**TCDT Building, Temperance Street,**  
**6<sup>th</sup> June 2016 6.30 – 8.30pm**

**Officers of the Steering Group:**

Leon Butler, Chair,  
 Julie Brandon, Communications Officer,  
 Andy Baker, Treasurer

**Steering Group Members:** Darren Cowell, Steve Darling, Len Short (for Paul Raybould), Alan Griffey, Brian Roberts and Pat Bishop

**Residents/Public Attendance:** Hugo Williams (MRA), Andrew Gunther, Torbay Council and Tracey Cabache TCDT (minutes)

Item	Minute/Action Agreed
1.	<p><b>Welcome, Housekeeping and Apologies</b>            LB welcomed all to the meeting.            Apologies were recorded from Margaret Forbes Hamilton, Sue Kenway, John Rawson, Paul Raybould and Cllr Robert Excell.</p>
2.	<p><b>Matters arising : Steering Group Meeting May</b>            Item 2: Revise 'LB and PB are unhappy that there is nothing in writing about Community Projects in the Neighbourhood Plan' – to 'Revise LB and PB are unhappy that there is nothing in writing about how the CIL funds will be allocated in the CIL guidelines'.            Re Council discussion – Steve D advised that after discussions with officers it was agreed the priority was to get the tariff correct and then we can deal with the engagement afterwards.            Item 5: Formal public consultation is now programmed for 4<sup>th</sup> July to meet with Council's deadlines – to run to the 1<sup>st</sup> week of Sept.            When we go to formal statutory public consultation our NP begins to carry weight in planning decisions (1/10), and will become significant once submitted to Torbay Council (3 or 4/10).</p>

	<p>Results of the public consultation has to be recorded, methodology has to be recorded also. The TNF are at liberty to amend the Plan in line with developer's comments or not.</p> <p>Recent meeting of Neighbourhood Forum Chairs, Planners, Cllr Mark King – Council needing assurance that NPs are going to come forward in time. Positive progress in Torquay and Brixham, Paignton resisting allocation of sites until more recent population figures are available. Aiming for Referendum in April 2017. All agreed the minutes were a true record of the meeting - Pat Bishop proposed and Brian Roberts seconded, all agreed.</p>
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>Treasurers Report and application for locality grant for SA &amp; SEA</b></p> <p>£5,148.46 in hand. £12,000 being held elsewhere for the TNP. It has been agreed to put in an application for Locality for £10,000 to fund the SEA.</p>
<b>4.</b>	<p><b>Elections for Treasurer, Communications Officer and Chair</b></p> <p>As the meeting is not quorate it was agreed to undertake the election via email. Proposed Leon Butler, seconded Steve Darling, all agreed. Election to include Vice Chairperson. <b>ACTION: Tracey to confirm procedure and email Steering Group members.</b></p>
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>Final CP Plan submission and top level Policies update</b></p> <p>Leon, Darren and Tracey have worked on the policies over the past week and tightened up some of the wording. Two policies needed further discussion.</p> <p>The first was:</p> <p><b>Policy H4</b></p> <p>To help encourage regeneration in the town centre, there shall be a presumption against developer contributions for all brownfield sites designated as development sites within this plan and the Town Centre Master Plan area until 2026.</p> <p>Should we do this or not. Steve D asked how this related to Community Investment Areas (CIA), and how does this link to our Neighbourhood Plan. Andy G responded that the Council are identifying a policy for deprived areas which is where the CIAs are located. The Local Plan allows for incentivising the development of affordable housing in these areas. Steve D responded that as the CIAs can be used as a funding sources for the projects in the Neighbourhood Plan we should mention this in the Plan. No blanket policy – but based on the merit of each site. Andy G – You cannot mix and match CIL on different developments, you need to set this from the outset. The bit that we can negotiate are eg affordable housing contribution, highways contributions etc. We must also be aware that the Government wanted to bring in a limitation on developments of 10 and under. Only CIL can be charged. This has been challenged recently in the high court judgement. The Town Centre Masterplan area is a CIA including the Harbour area so there will be a cap on CIL, the Council can charge higher rates of Section 106. But this</p>

does not mean that community projects cannot be supported.

Leon raised the issue that we do not have access to the Section 106 funds.

**ACTION: We need to have a discussion with the Council on allocation of Section 106 monies in CIA areas.**

In light of the above it was agreed to delete the above policy.

Is it possible to create a policy in the Neighbourhood Plan that requires a level of Section 106 that is commensurate with the site location?

Is the CIL set in stone or is it reviewed? Andy G advised we can review, but it has to go through the examination process and so is likely to only happen every 5 years.

The only way a CIA can change is if there is a change in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) at the Super Output Area (SOA). Built up area has been split into 2 - £70 per sqm, but within the CIA it is £30 per sqm. Detailed viability report that sits alongside the CIL and it would be good to have reference to this – go to [torbay.gov.uk/planning/applicationsandCIL/LDFplanningcontributions/CommunityInfrastructurelevy](http://torbay.gov.uk/planning/applicationsandCIL/LDFplanningcontributions/CommunityInfrastructurelevy).

It was proposed that we add a policy stating that the Council will compensate the Neighbourhood Forum with the lost CIL through its Section 106 income. NB. Section 106 has to have a clear link to the development in hand.

ACTION: Andy G to provide more information.

**ACTION: Leon to draft a policy related to developer contribution and circulate it**

**ACTION: Leon also to add a review of capped CILs in CIA areas at least every 5 years.**

The second policy that requires discussion:

#### **Policy H6**

Any development of the Edginswell Future Growth Area will not be commenced until the community infrastructure identified in the relevant Torquay Gateway (Edginswell) Masterplan SPD are complete and not before the second half of the Neighbourhood Plan housing allocations period. **All homes sold within the Edginswell Future Growth Area shall be the purchaser's sole residency.**

The addition in bold was agreed.

**ACTION: Leon to amend.**

Pat Bishop asked about care and the future of care homes, but also more importantly the lack of future facilities for Dementia sufferers and their care, her concern is that Torbay Council is not providing any services for the less well-off residents, given that Teignbridge is building three dementia hospitals from which Torbay residents may have restricted access due to not having a 'local connection' with Teignbridge.

Do we want to promote retirement villages in the TNP? Can we draft this? Is it governed by market forces only? How can we incentivise this? We could say areas are suitable – is this just guidance or can it be a policy? Andy G confirmed could phrase a policy that encourages development of housing that alleviates isolation or 'Encourage developments for an ageing population'. Local Plan requires health impact assessments for developments of 30 homes and more which can help sift out poor developments.

**ACTION: Leon to modify existing policies to include a generic statement on this.**

**ACTION: Leon to complete the policies section, Tracey to create version showing the comparison and circulate**

	<p><b>Sladnor Park</b> St Marychurch and District Community Partnership will be opposing the current development proposals due to scale. <b>ACTION: It was agreed it was worth adding a few sentences on this within the St Marychurch CP section – Pat Bishop to action.</b></p> <p><b>Torquay Golf Club</b> St Marychurch and District Community Partnership has not yet formed a view – but this site is one of the designated Local Green Spaces. The development may have more impact on residents in Barton and Watcombe. The vast majority of Golf Club members are now in favour. Club has been advised to liaise with the community asap. Very early stages.</p>
6.	<p><b>Statutory Consultation Plan Review</b></p> <p>Andy G shared the draft maps for the TNP – showing CP boundaries, housing sites, employment sites, designated Local Green Spaces – also to be circulated electronically. Leon suggested the 5 years sites be shaded out so it is clear it is a Local Plan site and does not cause confusion.</p> <p><b>ACTION: All to comment on maps</b></p>
7.	<p><b>Next Meeting and AOB</b></p> <p>i) Blue building on the harbour: Do we need to add something to our NP to resolve this. Members had been advised that the Council will be enforcing this issue. Julie Brandon raised the issue that other greater eyesores are not been enforced. <b>ACTION: Julie to raise this in writing with the Council</b></p> <p>ii) Monday’s Development Management Meeting will consider the change of use at Abbey Sands of 13 holiday lets to residential. If approved £800,000 is available to go into affordable housing and £62,550 for community/green infrastructure as this takes the developer over the section 106 threshold. A precedent will be set that undermines the Local Plan. The Forum’s view is in support of the change of use because Abbey Sands were developed prior to the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan it this was a development.</p> <p><b>Date of next meeting: Monday 4<sup>th</sup> July 2016</b></p>

**Meeting Closed at 8.45pm**