



Clyst Honiton Parish Council

CHPC NP Steering Group Meeting 7th November 2017 at 7pm

Present: Janvrin Edbrooke (NP Lead), Grant Harrison (Cllr), Lynne Askew (Cllr), Alice Gent (Clerk), Graham Williams (Member of public)

Policies

Policies are the end product of a long journey.

Policies will only pass examination if based on gathered evidence. Around 420 documents have gone into the CHNP Policies providing evidence.

Over the last 4 months, these documents have been shared with Darren so that policies can be written.

All policies need evidence. Evidence is multi-layered, and has different weighting.

The voice of the community writes each policy.

As a Parish Council, the NP is a bible for Planning Applications until 2031.

There are three types of evidence:

A: Information gathered from the community. For example Sticky Notes written by members of the community on what they like and what changes they would like about the area they live in. However, it was noted that this was a fairly small group that took part in the first consultation event.

Material from this first session material was then put into the survey, so the rest of the residents could agree or disagree with it, and that rest of community could have a say. This material is evidence on what the community is passionate about.

A lot of this material missed out on certain elements of village life. A Steering Group meeting was then held on the elements that didn't come up, and decisions made about whether these things should be included in the survey.

B: Academic research on the area of Clyst Honiton. This is using data from the Census, Environment Agency, Devon County Council, East Devon District Council, and statutory bodies for history. All Members were given specific areas to research. This evidence is mostly written documentation using legislation, projects, and plans.

Evidence B tells us what is in place in Clyst Honiton, what is missing, and what the gaps are. This is regarded as evidence that can be used to highlight gaps and see if the community agree or disagree.

This type of evidence can be used as questions in a Community Survey. The community survey amalgamates information from Evidence A and B. The survey outcome is to produce unquestionable data and statistics. This is deemed 'concrete data'. Cannot be argued with.

Survey gives data and statistics confirmation of the issues, and provides new data on the gaps that have been identified. Very powerful data.

[Graham arrived at 19:30]

C: Technical Work. Purpose of this is to have expert advice and evidence and proof. If the residents of Clyst Honiton want something, expert advice is often needed to ensure delivery. E.g. the Green Infrastructure Strategy (GIS). It confirms and expands on needs from the community (evidence), and confirms how things/issues might be achieved for the community.

Evidence C technical work has included: Character Assessment, Call for Sites, Site Assessment, SEA (not quite completed), Housing Need Assessment, Viability Assessment, GIS, NDO Legality, Policy Writing.

To every single policy there is an evidence trail that argues and proves why a policy exists, so the needs of the CHNP area population is supported.

Policy TL1 – Communications Infrastructure

Each policy has an intent. This intent is what the community wants. There is a lot of evidence that the community wants better Broadband. This policy is then justified at local, regional and national level.

Relevant questions from the Community Survey:

Q 25: Would you work from home if you could? If yes, what is stopping you?

Q 26: Should we encourage small businesses?

The feedback from this gave us concrete evidence, as did the Sticky Notes. Business Breakfast that was held also said broadband is not good enough. This is limiting to business. This all gives evidence that broadband is not at a good level.

This policy is split into 3 areas. There are 2 proposals followed by an enforceable statement. This second proposal includes mobile technologies, as this is important as well as broadband.

Is a debate that can be had with the developer that there is an issue, that the internet infrastructure is not good, and that we are looking at businesses bringing improvements to the community.

When it comes to the CIL project, 25% of CIL from every house comes to community. Could be that this is one of the areas that this money could be spent on. CIL must be spent on infrastructure: technology, lines etc are deemed infrastructure. But these options must be on the 'CIL list', which must be done by the Steering Group at the end.

By having this in the NP, it means that if development brings forward improved technology, we are more likely to support it. Can say that with an NP. Can't have that discussion with a developer without a NP. E.g. Pre-app discussions.

For the first statement on this policy, Grant suggested that it should end with 'on sites agreed by the community', when referencing the placement of communications infrastructure e.g. the

placement of telephone masts. This would prevent communication infrastructure from being in undesirable areas in the parish.

Graham asked if infrastructure for services such as broadband can be sub-terrain, such as it was for Cranbrook. Although this is possible to do, Janvrin thinks this would be very expensive to a developer and would make viability questionable. This demand would make it a very hard policy to get through.

This TL1 Communications Infrastructure policy proves that we are in support of projects going on that support mobile/internet infrastructure, and therefore can attract other funding.

In terms of the structure of this policy, it was suggested the strong enforcement proposal be put in at first, followed by the 2 less forceful proposals. However, it may have been done this way purposefully.

Overall: no typing errors noted, one change noted. **Action:** Janvrin will contact Darren to ask about having a say on the siting of Communications Infrastructure.

Policy E1 – Supporting the rural economy

This is looking after the community that is away from the village. Is also supported hugely by residents of the village. Like the previous policy, intent is what the community wants and is happy with. Justification is national, regional, and in relation to the Local Plan. There is evidence nationally, regionally and locally of a need to support rural economy and diversification.

Relevant questions from the Community Survey:

Q 2: Does our remaining countryside need protecting?

Q 3: Should we protect and support our working farmland?

Q 27: Should we encourage small businesses?

Q 28: If yes to Q 27, should we specifically encourage the development of small business units / offices / live/work units / artisan/craft workshops / small-scale manufacturing / retail outlets?

Answers to these questions gave us evidence that this needs to be supported.

Technical study on the call for sites showed that 100% of the farms agree that this needs to be a policy, and there was 100% support from private ownership properties that had brownfield land or previously development land.

The community has proved that they support it and recognise the need for this policy.

A big debate is that a lot of places in East Devon and nationally are worried about green land being lost to rural development. Nationally, this would be difficult for the policy to go through. Part of the evidence nationally, regionally and with the ED Local Plan is that they are in support of land that is already built on or has a development on it.

This policy is based on the types of development that exist in the area and are supported in East Devon. In terms of highways safety, Grant questioned whether anything can be done through these businesses to improve the roads. It is thought that this would have to be taken on a one-to-one

basis, depending on each case. However, it is thought that future developments e.g. Holiday Accommodation would have limited capacity, as would live/work units.

Businesses would need to be looked at individually to see the scale of traffic that will be coming to these businesses. This is where it could be checked to point C of this policy ('would be compatible with the existing landscape setting').

Conditions have been put on these things for example it only being allowed on Brownfield sites. It is difficult to create a balance between preserving and enhancing the existing area. The policy must be strong about how much it goes beyond what you're willing to do.

Discussion about **solar farms**: It is thought that these policies could be put in, but in the evidence gathering, there was only 1 comment on solar panels, and a policy cannot be written on one comment. But it is possible at Reg 14 to say that there is a concern about solar panels in our area. These comments would be powerful and must be taken seriously.

It thought that putting solar panels on greenfield sites could be a loophole made by farmers.

Local example with solar farms: Lympstone area has solar panels, and part of their set up is that some of the money must be spent on the community. This is something to be thought about for the future.

Returning to the policy, we must look at planning applications that mitigate the landscape. The last sentence of the policy is a condition, and means that a barn cannot be pulled down and have something built in its place three times the size. It was suggested that this sentence should have some sort of scope – would depend case-by-case. Each case is dealt with in its own merits. This policy is the template. When a planning application comes in, it must be specified by the group and the planning report how they felt in relation to each point of each policy e.g. a, b, c and d. This would be the planning consideration reply.

Grant gave example of a Dutch barn building; it is hard to develop a Dutch barn without entailing substantial rebuilding. However National Planning Framework says that dilapidated Dutch Barns have permitted development rights, and takes a different avenue of legislation, and therefore would never come to us as Planning Application.

Should be aware that we are entrepreneurial and should support the future, as community lifestyles change and can change dramatically. With the changes brought by Brexit, rural dynamics could all change.

Lynne questioned whether it is worth mentioning the specific fact that there is an airport, to show that it is a very well networked area. Has unique situation of being a parish with road, rail and plane.

Action: Agreed that a sentence could be added that adds that there is road, rail and plane infrastructure existing.

Policy E2: Opportunities for new and improved business development

This policy looks at two areas: new business development, and improving existing business developments.

There is a section in the Community Survey on Businesses in the area and resident's feelings about businesses and working in Clyst Honiton. 75% agreed to encouraging small businesses within the *village*. 87% would encourage small business activity *elsewhere* in Clyst Honiton. This shows support to having businesses in the parish, but not on people's doorsteps. Community NIMBYism is possibly evidenced in this, as well as evidence that local businesses are supported.

Evidence for this from Community Survey, the call for land, Landowners Breakfast, and the Business Breakfast.

The final point in this policy outline is about local food and drink products and what that would entail. The evidence for this has come from the Economics Officer for EDDC (Mo), who has a website that hits the types of businesses that want to come here. Mo can match the type and size of location with the business. Following a meeting with Mo, Janvrin and Lynne, she can offer a facility for her website to match business to the business space on the bypass once it has been master planned.

This web based data has shown that in the South West, food production is increasing, for example craft beer, gin, cider, cheese, with companies such as the Real Game Company, the Vanilla Pod Company having already been in contact wanting land. Food is a growing business product needing small spaces to produce these products. Research over a 6-month period showed that there was a clear need for space for various types of food.

Is thought that this final point of the policy should read 'proposals for 1) small scale production and 2) artisan crafts.'

Action: Janvrin will seek advice about having this added. There is the problem that there was nothing to back the need for artisan crafts. Can discuss it with Darren but need evidence. This is another area that can get a turn-around at Reg 14. In relation to examiner assessing the policy, this could fail on examination as policies are bound by an evidence protocol.

Nursery provision and associated activities were discussed, and this is an area that needs to be explored and thought about, in terms of the Community Facility.

For this policy's justification, Janvrin thinks that local evidence seems to be a bit lost. It is thought that if the locals look at this particular policy they may question where their needs are. Can the inhabitants' voices be heard in this policy? Group agreed that a section may be needed in the justification section, that locals can read and find that their questions have been answered, and that what they asked for has been answered. This seems to be missing currently. Noted that we cannot include anything about the community facility as this is unrelated.

Graham questioned whether the local need for a shop could be included in this justification. Villagers have specifically asked for a shop, and this talks about encouraging small scale food industry.

Action: Correct typing error on 4th line down of last paragraph of justification, from 'diversity' to 'diversify'.

Meeting ended at 20:45hrs.