

CHPC Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting

December 13th 2017 at 6.48 pm



Present: Janvrin Edbrooke (NP Lead), Graham Williams (Member of Community), Michael Burden (Member of Community), Grant Harrison (Cllr), Alice Gent (Clerk/Secretary).

Apologies: Lynne Askew, delayed apologies from Grant Harrison.

Janvrin congratulated Mike Burden on his successful interview for the Councillor vacancy for Clyst Honiton Parish Council. He will be co-opted at the next PC meeting on 21st December 2017.

Acceptance of Minutes: The CHNPSG Minutes from Tuesday 7th and 14th November 2017 were accepted as a correct and accurate record of the meeting.

In relation to the Minutes, Mike asked for detail on the consultant Darren. Darren is a paid consultant to help with policy writing, and he subcontracts others who have more expertise, for example Rachel Hogger, a Planning Consultant specialising in bringing forward Neighbourhood Plans.

Clyst Honiton Parish Council Website and Clyst Chatter: The website is now live with 10 draft policies, which have been amended by Darren since last SG meetings. These policies are advertised on the homepage of the website. SG happy that these have gone onto the website, and that the policies discussed today will be put up soon by Janvrin and Clerk, after being amended by Darren.

These will also be mentioned in the next Clyst Chatter, saying what has been done. Suggested the policies could be printed out as an infill into the Clyst Chatter, and possibly include certain documents such as an Airport Contour Map and the Safety Zone.

Noted the rewording of NE3 (Protection of Highest Grade Land): Following the concern from the Steering Group about wind and solar farms, Darren has explained that there is no need include anything about solar and wind in this policy as such uses do not fall under agricultural use in planning terms. As Darren writes:

“In planning, ‘agriculture’ includes horticulture, fruit growing, seed growing, dairy farming, the breeding and keeping of livestock (including any creature kept for the production of food, wool, skins or fur, or for the purpose of its use in the farming of land), the use of land as grazing land, meadow land, osier land, market gardens and nursery grounds, and the use of land for woodlands where that use is ancillary to the farming of land for other agricultural purposes.

Therefore, there is no loophole through which farmers could just introduce a wind or solar farm without planning permission. Planning permission will always be required for such a change of use.

Moreover, as regards wind farms, the current government has introduced robust planning rules that ensure such development can only come forward with the full support of the community – see below:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/giving-local-people-the-final-say-over-onshore-wind-farms>

As regards solar farms, national planning policy makes it clear that local planning authorities should take into account the quality of agricultural land when taking decisions about any development, including renewable energy projects such as solar farms. The NPPF states that:

111. Planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. Local planning authorities may continue to consider the case for setting a locally appropriate target for the use of brownfield land.

112. Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality

Based on the above, the policy in its current form, alongside government guidance and policy, gives you a strong basis upon which to object to any proposals for wind or solar farms on agricultural land. Indeed, to introduce more detailed policy-requirements in relation to areas deemed suitable / not suitable for wind and solar farms, I would suggest much more evidence would be required (landscape assessment, etc), which would be time-consuming and costly, and ultimately be in a lot of effort for an issue that has received little mention during public consultation, which is already quite robustly dealt with in national policy."

Therefore, this means that the PC can be in support of certain things if they want to, for example solar panels on roofs. Must be aware of benefits solar/wind can bring. This has also been altered in the actual policy.

Noted the rewording of E2 (Opportunities for new and improved business development): Identifying Artisan Crafts as a need in the area. Janvrin has gone back to Maureen Gori de Murden, who has shown that there *is* evidence for that need in the area, which there wasn't in the past. Artisan Crafts are now classed as a business for government. Maureen was able to do website hits and bring up those that include evidence of Artisan Crafts, and can therefore be included. Artisan Crafts include saddlery, willow making as examples – people working with raw materials as a produce for sale.

Noted the rewording of DES1 (High quality design): Has been altered to include tree replacing. Developers must replace cut down trees with the same tree, even if they are unable to replace it with a tree of the same age.

Also in relation to house design, the policy has been changed to ensure that developers use 'the best' designs as examples to follow from Clyst Honiton rather than 'the worst'.

These following 7 Draft Policies are for the Steering Group to approve or amend, and to then go on to the website:

Policy E3 – Local priority development areas for business and enterprise

- This policy has identified 3 business sites. Home Farm is business site within village, Exeter Inn Car Park COULD BE, and Old School Business Park is a business site within the village.
- The 4 points following this in the policy are proposals that all business and enterprise developments should meet, and can only go ahead if they do so.
- **Old School Business Park:** There is a final section in the policy about the Old School Business Park, as it is felt strong that the old School should be celebrated. However, the current playground, fencing and flat-roofed section are 3 areas of the site that are not felt so strongly about, and could be changed one day. Owner of Old School Business Park is very positive about this policy, as it would be beneficial for him.
- **Exeter Inn Car Park:** Janvrin has had discussion with Heavitree Brewery about NP and their future. It was understood that the possible plan is to close Exeter Inn and turn it back into residential use, and to build

some sort of facility such as a hotel on the Car Park. Janvrin has been told that this has been done previously on other sites and that it was successful.

- As a result of this discussion, it would be good to see if Heavitree Brewery can provide a model so that the community can see what the Car Park could look like. Although this is not publicly shared knowledge yet, by the time the NP is shared with the community, it is hoped that the Heavitree Brewery will have informed the tenants of the Exeter Inn.
- Noted that there is a template for a hotel on Skypark. It is thought that Heavitree Brewery's future thoughts should be included in this policy, as they have stated that they want to be included in the policy.
- The plans are not definite, but the fact that Heavitree Brewery wanted to be included in the policy seems positive. Although it would be sad to lose Exeter Inn, it would bring benefits to the village and its landscape, especially as it is a gateway site to the village.
- Noted that this policy won't be put on the website yet due to confidentiality, and timescales are unknown. Nothing will happen with Exeter Inn for 18 months, and there is a chance their tenancy might not be rolled on. Once the policy is in the public domain, we must inform the tenant. There is an important discussion ahead about how we manage the news and information, as it is key that the NP is seen as positive by all, including the tenants of Exeter Inn.
- Heavitree Brewery can review this policy and get back to us if there is anything they want to change. However, it is not thought that this policy is too restrictive – they are only limited by a few things, such as having adequate off-street parking.
- It was questioned why this policy only includes the village, and not Hill Barton for example. Janvrin responded that this is because the part of Hill Barton within the Clyst Honiton Parish is already fully built out, and there is no room for development. If a space in Hill Barton within CH Parish does come up, and change is due to happen, the PC would receive the planning application and planning history on it. Even though this policy doesn't directly include Hill Barton, we can say whether our local priority for developments is/isn't being adhered to. Suggested to possibly change title of this policy?
- **Action:** The Clerk will contact the Business Site owners re having discussions on feedback for this policy. Need to specifically pick up whether a, b, c, d is too restrictive. Heavitree Brewery must also be looked at for timelines of rolling out.

Policy C1 - Community facilities and services

- 5 Community facilities have been identified that make important contribution to creating cohesive and inclusive local community. Parish field not included, nor allotments, because they each have their own policy.
- Two parish noticeboards and their seats have been added as they are regarded as a community facility.
- **Amendment:** cross out duplication about pumping station.
- Exeter Inn Public House can be replaced with another community facility, but can't go. In a way that encourages/forces Heavitree Brewery to continue with their plans, which the CHNPSG wants to encourage.
- For the Duke of York, if the tenant is struggling, this policy means that it must be marketed as a pub for at least 12 months, but if no sale after this, it can go back to residential use.
- Noted telephone box is going to be taken away. There is no phone, and community has been asked if they wanted to adopt it, this period has closed.

Policy H5 – Residential Storage

- Looking at providing accommodation which will be ‘lifestyle houses’: they have to be designed so they can take people with young families but also people with wheelchairs. E.g. Slate and Tile houses will be on flat ground and must cater for wheelchairs and push chairs, especially as it is by a bus stop.
- This policy means certain design aspects cannot be squeezed out when developers come to profit margins and try to cut things out.
- In response to the good recycling system in the area, it is also essential that new houses have good storage facilities for all their recycling boxes/bags etc, and stored in places that won’t get in the way for wheelchairs.
- There will be external storage for bikes, garden equipment, other outdoor items, and refuse and recycling. This means the visual impact of refuse and recycling minimises is minimised on the public realm – it is telling designers to be smart.
- **Amendment:** Last sentence about internal storage – get rid of internal and change to “should be designed *within* each new residential unit. Therefore, means last sentence can be got rid of.
- (Grant arrived at 19:52.)
- Each residential unit will have to have a parking remit. It was questioned whether the parking would be in-front or behind the houses of York Terrace, would probably back road. Something for PC to look at when plans come through.

H6 – Residential Infill Developments

- Within village footprint, there are limited infill spaces left. But if someone comes forward with an appropriate residential infill, we have a policy for it.
- **Amendment:** With second sentence, change ‘or’ to ‘and /or’ so it reads ‘respect and/or enhance’.
- **Amendment:** Suggested that statement about access have its own sentence, to make access more of a priority. So, it would read: ‘There should be no unacceptable loss of garden land which contributes to the quality of the built-up environment. Satisfactory arrangements will need to be in place for parking and access *considering neighbours*.’
- Need to have strong wording such as ‘there should be *no unacceptable*’ (as above) when talking about access.
- **Action:** Janvrin will liaise with Darren to make sure access is worded as strongly as possible. Capacity and appropriateness of access needs to be a priority. Suggested that these points be bullet-pointed to make them clearer.
- Can infill to the side or back of a property, but not a front garden. There must be distance between each property.
- Using example of potential infill development by School Houses, these could only be put in if they match the School House, as all the houses down this street at built in twos.
- Other possibilities of infill sites are up at Ship Lane, and therefore access needs to be thought about.
- Discussion of whether house extensions are affected by Airport Contours? Although extensions are different to an infill development, it is thought that the 57-decibel rule would probably still apply to extensions.
- Old School houses are outside the Airport Public Safety zone.
- There is a tiny part of the School site that could be residential, but it is so small it is unlikely to happen.
- Airport Noise Contour legislation means no infill developments can happen in certain noise contours. Maps will be in document to show where.

AC1 – Parking provision for non-residential developments

- Having talked a bit about economic development, this is parking for business development.
- Noted by Grant that justification is strong, and justifies the need for parking in Clyst Honiton despite East Devon wanting to enforce the use of public transport, as this is not viable in Clyst Honiton.

AC2 – Improved car parking provision

- This has proven to be a big issue when receiving feedback from the community.
- If we have this policy in we can approach landowners e.g. Church Commissioners, and say we would be interested in some land being used for car parking, and discussions can go for there.
- The problem with approaching landowner is that car parks don't provide any money except for the purchase price.
- Due to national devolution, in 2020, EDDC will receive no money from Government and must be completely self-funded.
- Therefore, they are prioritising frontline services, and everything else they have been doing is now being run through businesses. Profit from these businesses is being used for frontline services. E.g. Streetscape, IT, LED Leisure.
- Beer Parish Council have said to East Devon they will do everything themselves, without any funding. They will make money from certain things that allow them to provide other things for free. For example, they will make money from pop-up festivals, alternative car-parking, and economic spaces on Council land. Possible that Clyst Honiton could (with a loan) create its own fee-paying car-park. There are a lot of loan facilities which can allow parish councils do things for themselves.
- To have this in the future would bring huge benefits. Off street parking being supported through this policy means we can get land and use it for car parking.
- Noted that this could be quite high up on the list of CIL projects. Would involve negotiation with Church Commissioners. Would be a SUD-like structure, not tarmac.
- Noted that up at the top of St Michaels Hill, there is lack of parking. Could procure some land of Bypass for car parking space, but will have to wait and see.
- **Action:** Thought that 'chat' below policy and justification by Janvrin should be pulled into one document.
- **Amendment:** from these notes, change total number of vehicles in Clyst Honiton *Parish* to 208. More data about actual village instead of parish, to strengthen our evidencing.
- Discussion about disabled parking – thought that this is resident driven, and when needed, it will be put in place. Thought there should be more disabled parking spaces in case of visitors. **Action:** Janvrin will look into this, and whether disabled parking has to be resident led or there is any way to get provision – such as through this policy.

AC3 – Pedestrian and Cycle movement

- This policy has not been looked at since August, and feedback is needed. Certain links are planned that could connect to Clyst Honiton, such as Topsham link.
- Churchside will have a cycle park walkway with the new development on the Bypass, linking it to Skypark.
- In the future, the most local school will be in the Mosshayne Tithebarn development. Therefore, Clyst Honiton needs to fight for the Clyst Honiton bridge to be our link, for children to access the school.
- At the moment, the existing pavement for Waterslade lane is only wide enough for pedestrian, not both pedestrian and cycle. Might have to make it a shared path. It important to integrate cycle links into the village.

- Suggestion of link using alleyway at the top of St Michael's Hill, but would have to be bought off the current land owners. Could be part of a CIL project.
- **Amendment:** Make actual links more specific and isolated – bullet point them. Have previously noted percentage of parishioners using cars, and therefore providing a cycle network is the only way to reduce this. When we list cycle link section, need to differentiate between those that are existing and those that in the future. Need to list future connections, so points should first list existing links, and *then* future cycle links. This will help question the housing sites and say why we want it linked. Also important to adapt existing cycle routes to new routes.
- A factor of justification for needing cycle links is in the feedback from the community, no one is looking at using a bike, as the system is just not in place for this to be viable.

AOB

- Four housing policies left to look at.
- These will be confirmed and readjusted once Bypass Masterplan has gone ahead.
- Janvrin has had discussion with agents who sold Home Farm that we are doing a Neighbourhood Plan and the Policies will affect what they can do. There are new owners of Home Farm, and Janvrin will need to discuss this with them, to start a conversation about enhancing their site. Agreed by SG that the Clerk would need to attend any meetings to do with this, and any meetings to do with Exeter Inn.
- Noted that Chris Rudge of Old School site doesn't need to be met with as he is already happy with policies.
- **Action:** Clerk will mention recent correspondence with Heavitree Brewery that confirms they will continue their development by the Exeter Inn car park, at next meeting.
- **Need to have our own CIL list**
 - Can either be written as its own policy, or can be just written as a section within the NP. Could invite Newton Abbot to a SG meeting to talk to us about CIL as a policy.
 - Next meeting will look at CIL in isolation, and at the end of this meeting a decision can be made whether we put in a policy that writes CIL and becomes statutory law, or just as a loose document.
 - Can make a guess as to how much CIL money we will get, but also CIL can be used as a way to open up funding streams that aren't open at the moment. If community projects are on the CIL list, these funding streams can be pulled our way, and means we can other money can be pulled our way.
 - Suggested by Janvrin that it would be better to write CIL list as its own policy, e.g. as Newton Abbot has. Better to go down policy avenue. Newton Abbot has written theirs into a policy.
 - Questioned if this CIL policy could be updated every few years, to keep constantly up to date. Government are releasing funding to modify plans.
 - CIL could be used to create an empty shell for community facility.
 - Noted that we've also got 25k from the ID that must be linked to community facility.
- **Community Consultation Event**
 - Janvrin has costed for carpeted, decorated, heated, lighted container on the Bypass site for the consultation site. Budgeted for coffee, tea, security, insurance.
 - Thought that consultation actually on the Bypass site would help the locals.
 - Will probably be March 2018. Exact site unknown.
 - **Action:** Clerk to ask Victoria at Church Commissioners what services/utilities already exist linking to Polish hut area?
 - **Action:** If consultation is to be on the Bypass site, the Clerk will have to liaise with Victoria at Church Commissioners regarding removal of concrete bollards.

- Could invite Newton Abbot to a SG meeting to talk to us about it.
- Date of next meeting: Wednesday 24th January 2018, 6.30pm, Janvrin's house.

ACTIONS:

1. Discuss with Keith about including section on Policies and associated docs in Clyst Chatter
2. **Action from E3:** Clerk/Janvrin to go to Business Site owners and have discussions with them for policy feedback. Ask them specifically to pick up whether a, b, c, d is too restrictive. Advice on release of policy from Heavitree Brewery.
3. **Amendment for C1:** Note amendment to cross out duplication about pumping station.
4. **Amendment for H5:** Last sentence about internal storage – get rid of internal and change to “should be designed *within* each new residential unit. Therefore, means last sentence can be got rid of.
5. **Amendments for H6:** Amendment 1: With second sentence, change ‘or’ to ‘and /or’ so it reads ‘respect and/or enhance’.
Amendment 2: Suggested that statement about access have its own sentence, to make access more of a priority. So, it would read: ‘There should be no unacceptable loss of garden land which contributes to the quality of the built-up environment. Satisfactory arrangements will need to be in place for parking and access *considering neighbours*.’
6. **Action for H6:** Janvrin will liaise with Darren to make sure access is worded as strongly as possible. Capacity and appropriateness of access needs to be a priority. Suggested that these points be bullet-pointed to make them clearer.
7. **Action for AC2:** Thought that ‘chat’ below policy and justification by Janvrin should be pulled into one document.
8. **Amendment for AC2:** from these notes, change total number of vehicles in Clyst Honiton *Parish* to 208. More data about actual village instead of parish, to strengthen our evidencing.
9. **Amendment for AC3:** Make actual links more specific and isolated – bullet point them. Have previously noted percentage of parishioners using cars, and therefore providing a cycle network is the only way to reduce this. When we list cycle link section, need to differentiate between those that are existing and those that in the future. Need to list future connections, so points should first list existing links, and *then* future cycle links.
10. **Action:** Janvrin to arrange meeting with owners of Home Farm and Exeter Inn, and for the Clerk to attend.
11. **Action:** Clerk will mention recent correspondence with Heavitree Brewery that confirms they will continue their development by the Exeter Inn car park, at next meeting.
12. **Action:** Clerk to contact Victoria of Church Commissioners and ask what services/utilities are in place at the Polish Hut area, and to see when concrete bollards will be moved.
13. **Action:** Clerk to send out email for next meeting/venue/time, for Wed 24th Jan 2018, 6.30pm Janvrin's house, about CIL.
14. **Action:** Janvrin will send out docs in advance about CIL, and she will get information from EDDC about the maximum and minimum amount of money we will get.