

Ringmore Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
Minutes of the meeting held on 21 November 2017

Present: - R A Baker, M. Findlay, D. Vincent, J. Williams, M. Wynne-Powell, M Campbell, R. Piercy (Sec)

1. Apologies: John Reynolds

Previous Minutes: no matters arising; minutes agreed and signed.

2. Finance: RB produced spreadsheet and stressed importance of recording all meetings and costs. DV's mileage costs corrected.

3. Evidence and Data Gathering.

- a) RB has copy of 2008 village consultation.
- b) MC pointed out difficulties of narrowing down statistics from ONS to individual villages. The information currently available had been circulated.
- c) SHDC response to housing needs in Ringmore: - 2 affordable houses and 1 family on housing needs register.
- d) Listed buildings: a list had been received from English Heritage. Discussion as to whether further houses in Ringmore needed to be included. Most listed buildings are on main street and therefore may need protection from heavy traffic. Wells and phone box also listed.
- e) Possible future flood and surface water risks for Challaborough and Middle Manor. Future risk for all river valleys; climate change estimates at best speculative but can't be ignored since they will need to be mentioned in final plan. MF: potential for flooding at caravan park. The Halcrow Report on Coastal Flooding had been circulated.
- f) CPRE: covered in JR's email. They will reply only to a particular proposal.
- g) National Trust on Bio-diversity in Ringmore Nat Trust land had been circulated by JR.

4. Survey Responses.

100 forms sent out: 33% return, which was felt to be a good response. Discussion on the definition of "affordable" homes stressed that this should be at the "budget" end of the official scale.

Some of the points mentioned in the survey (such as owners not cleaning up after their dogs) were not planning issues and thus not relevant to the Neighbourhood plan; but could be included in "other comments from residents" and discussed elsewhere.

A wide range of views was expressed, and the sub-committee were thanked for all their hard work; the questionnaire will be very useful for future consultations.

JW felt there was a need for one to one conversations to gain more in-depth knowledge; maybe independent interviewers should be used, to avoid the situation where local people might be told what it is thought they would like to hear.

Bigbury attached raffle tickets to their questionnaires, and all those returned went into a raffle; this led to a 41% return, and on this basis, it was felt that a prize would be a good idea.

5. Businesses – Consultation.

See MF's report on Parkdean and Bigbury Bay Holiday Park; both are appropriately licensed. It appears that one or two caravans might be unofficially occupied throughout the year; if this is happening this could have a major effect on local housing. The planning objectives were discussed; the importance of the word "holiday" was noted, as was St. Ives' concern over the appearance of holiday parks.

RB stressed the need to explore how the RNPSG can offer to help the parks so that by working together future problems can be avoided.

MF has a good connection with Steve, the manager at Parkdean, but has not been able to meet the Bigbury Bay manager yet.

There was general concern over the use of public roads by large caravans.

Bigbury has asked to be part of any meetings with caravan parks' managers. This was agreed, as was RB's suggestion that Bigbury should be shown the Ringmore questionnaire and asked for comments.

MF was thanked for all his hard work.

Farms: 7 in the parish. No questionnaire for farmers has yet been drawn up. DV volunteered to speak to Madeleine to get the names and addresses of the farmers.

B & Bs, holiday lets, other home businesses: it was suggested that a survey should be carried out to find out how many people work at home. Difficult to know whom to include – would this cover voluntary carers?

Journey's End: needs to be covered on its own.

6. Questionnaire and Housing Needs Survey

Reminder from RB that there is a budget to cover professional assistance, and that the HNS needs to be judged by an outside body.

It was agreed to carry out both questionnaire and HNS together, to incur the costs of production, and to contact DCT.

The template for the HNS was discussed, in particular the question asking for salaries; it was agreed to make it clear to residents that the results would be anonymous, and that any information on salaries would be seen only by DCT.

There were some good definitions of affordable housing.

7. Quiet Lanes

MC suggested that the parish should be asked to identify which roads need to be designated as Quiet Lanes; this is to run alongside any traffic calming measures.

8. **Date of next meeting:** Monday January 8: 7.00pm. but it was agreed that if anything important came up during the Christmas period this would be dealt with by email.