

NP/NDO Steering Group, Meeting at 7pm at the Bell Tower, Clyst Honiton, 2nd July 2019

Present: Lynne Askew, Sue Hales, Grant Harrison, Rob Martin, Gary Collier; Nick Pring; Janvrin Edbrooke

1. Welcome and Apologies

No apologies were received

2. Members to be elected: Councillors and Public

Gary Collier and Nick Pring were introduced and it was agreed that both were now formally Steering Group members.

3. Minutes of last meeting

The minutes of the 26th March 2019 meeting were agreed as correct

4. Finance

Rob explained that the Parish Council reserves did not currently have much NP/NDO money left. The 'Reserves' situation remained at the level it ended 2018/2019, detailed below

CHPC NP Reserve

Balance brought forward		£9,971.82
Expenditure		
TorEcology	£578.60	
Trace Design Transport	£1,967.50	
A.Kirby Architect	£3,060.00	
A.Kirby Architect	£1,020.00	
Anna Lodge Consulting	£2,000.00	
J Edbrooke Expenses	£213.92	
		£8,840.02
Current Balance		£1,131.80

Clyst Honiton Parish Council has a current year budget for the Neighbourhood Plan of **£4,000**, of which **£72.86** has been spent on Janvrin's Expenses.

The question of grant funding was introduced and answered with the statement that no 'Locality' grant money had yet been used, although expertise had been provided.

The project started in 2014, and was now 5 years down the track. Money would be sought to make this happen.

Rob would look at the position of external funding to date, including a promised £21,100 from the County Council under a fund for community projects and what could be obtained in the future. The contact person at DCC was Stuart Shire and the promise obtained from former County Councillor Peter Bowden.

5. EDDC letter: content and decisions

This item related to the letter dated 10th May 2019 from EDDC sent following the meeting held with the officers on 16th April 2019. Janvrin wanted to consider the letter page by page and to analyse what was being offered within it.

The letter contained a number of statements, but it was clear that, reading between the lines, it contained more than it appears to.

1st Page – General Conformity with Local Plan

There had been no response to this letter and the aim would be to produce a response setting out how the NDO work to date would enable compliance with its requirements, in particular the main sticking point the effect of noise.

At the meeting Janet Wallace (EDDC Environmental Health) had made clear that she had written the last paragraph of policy to provide wriggle-room. Show the mitigation and you can comply with this general conformity.

The points to be made were

- Evidence could be provided for development around airport
- The NDO Viability Assessment indicates that developers could mitigate for noise and still have a viable project.
- We should provide evidence of need for the project and evidence of mitigation
- The orientation of the housing would be one mitigation
- Send letter and response to Locality and detail mitigations
- Complaints made from Clyst Honiton of noise were few and far between – everywhere else around, but not CH
- Building within the bowl and not on flat ground would reduce noise effect
- A further, EDDC sponsored, noise investigation with noise receptors on site should be carried out. The ones used to produce the initial report were all at the end of the runway.
- Further expert advice on noise should be sought from EDDC, as offered in their letter.

2nd page – Satisfy strategy 17

Answering the concerns:

- There would need to be an addendum to report in more detail the AECOM studies for NP, which would be provided free of charge.
- Ground noise (WHO) v Airport Noise Contours, reliance on Janet Wallace to communicate this distinction.
- Maps showing noise contours – no sites between 57-60 db. All housing etc in 63db area not acceptable without mitigation.
- AECOM viability assessment to give detailed costed mitigations
- An important sentence was believed to be:-
- *'It may however be possible for a noise consultant and expert team designing the development to mitigate noise levels to an acceptable degree'*
- In other words, you can do it!

Rob pointed out that the way a planner looks at a development is not clear-cut. The requirement is for each matter to be given 'weight' in the decision and that no development complies completely with all planning policies. The more mitigation, the more weight can be given to the application.

Reference was made to a development of 39 dwellings which was withdrawn in 2016, but this failed because of the Open Countryside policy not mitigation on noise matters. Under Strategy 7 – development in Open Countryside can come through NPs

3rd page - Summary

In principle, EDDC support development of business and housing in CH
Reference was made to alternative sites in village – the Steering Group has looked at other sites – this is the only viable one.

Question whether EDDC have a different site in mind, that they would let us develop.

Action

- Appointment of noise consultants, having talked to EDDC first – address EDDC concerns.
- Janvrin has included Church Commissioners in correspondence – explained noise – what can they bring – share EDDC letter with them.
- Make clear that EDDC have stated that they want to keep communities alive, precisely what this project I looking to do for Clyst Honiton
- Thank EDDC for letter, draft a reply with Bullet Points – and state present intention of proceeding with current site.
- Talk directly to Janet Wallace and look to her for any recommendations.

6. Anna Lodge Consultation Report

- Some text errors – Lynne picked up.
- Dig for information – further condensing necessary – boring.
- Summary of findings and selling success and a celebration of results.
- Masterplan on it with graphs etc.
- Academic report, not good for presentation. More visual aids necessary
- Rob referred to the Plan **Evidence Base** which is what EDDC and the Inspector will look at – there is an argument for both this report untouched and a separate summary to be included
- There is no doubt that, as a proportion of the population, there was a very good attendance, much better than normal for such consultation.

7. Meeting with the Church Commissioners

The proposed meeting dates with Church Commissioners – neither can be made. Awaiting a response on when they can meet.

Matthew and Joshua, of Deloitte, dealt with us before.

It is hoped that there will be a meeting soon. Janvrin suggested that Dave Chapman should be invited to attend on our behalf, for which he would charge nothing. This was **AGREED** unanimously.

Dave Chapman provided information that lead to the group going for an NDO rather than normal development. This way the community facility could be provided without developers wriggling out of their commitments.

David is Community-led development person. He should attend the Church Commissioners meeting, but there would be a need for him n the others attending to have a tactical meeting beforehand.

It was AGREED that Rob would produce, before the Church Commissioners meetings, a paper using his experience on possible models of bringing project forward.

8. AOB

Janvrin explained that although the NDO complicates things. The idea was to finish both that and the NP together.

Rob had three questions:

- 1) What grants had been used and/or applied for both projects, as he was not clear? He believed that a timeline, with costs and income clearly defined should be produced.
- 2) Why has the NDO been set at providing full planning permission, when others he was aware of had been just for Reserved matters level?
- 3) Why was it not possible to bring the Neighbourhood Plan to fruition before the NDO?

Finances

Nick Pring had secured £12,000 – but was not sure what had been spent.

There was a need to check financial position – it was believed that this money was still at DCC. Rob would link with Lynne to find out from Stuart Shire – the money was from the DCC Initiative in Devon (IID) funds. Lynne believed there was a further £9,100 from the same fund secured by former Devon County Cllr. Peter Bowden, making £21,100 in total.

NDO Planning

The reason that Rob had asked about the full permission situation was because this had the danger of making the NDO too proscriptive, meaning that a developer might not be able to comply without the flexibility to do things their way. Janvrin assured the meeting that the necessary flexibility would be allowed within the NDO.

Advancing the Neighbourhood Plan

Rob explained that he was cautious, based on previous experience, of using just the emerging NP policies to object to unsatisfactory applications, as they carried very little weight and, without reference to Local Plan policies, such objections were certain to fail. Bringing the NP work to a quicker conclusion would give more weight to the policies it contained and make it more effective. The NDO was in the hands of other people, at the moment, and would still take some time to come to fruition.

Janvrin stated that there were two problems with this, firstly that a new policy would need to be written for the NDO development within the NP, and secondly that she would not have the time as a volunteer, to complete the NP work in a short time scale.

The group would look to the Parish Council for guidance on this.

9. Date of next meeting

Date of next meeting – to be set once the date for the Church Commissioners meeting was known.

Meeting closed 8.30pm

Rob Martin

17 July 2019