

## Ringmore Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (RNPSG)

Minutes of meeting held on Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> March 2019, in The Ringmore W.I. Hall, at 7.00 pm

### 1. Attendance

In attendance: Mr Richard Baker (Chair) (RB), Mr Mike Wynne-Powell (MWP), Mr David Vincent (DV), Mr Mike Campbell (MC), Dr Malcolm Findlay (MF), Ms Jenny Williams (JW).

Apologies were received from Mr David Milne-Smith and Ms Rosemary Piercy

### 2. Matters Arising from Minutes from the previous meeting, held on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2019

The Group agreed the Minutes as a true and accurate record of the meeting. No amendments were required.

**Item 6.** RB reported that he had been contacted by David Milne-Smith with regard to preparation of draft text on "Landscape, Views and Open Spaces". David had explained that upon his return from New Zealand he is due for surgery and would use his recuperation period as an opportunity to commence work on this draft.

### 3. Report on CLT Meeting

JW reported her attendance at a meeting on Community Land Trusts (CLTs) on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2019, at South Hams District Council, Follaton House, Totnes. She highlighted a book that had been produced on how the CLT concept had been applied at Broadhempston in Devon and suggested that this would be useful acquisition for RNPSG. Having this book as a guide would guide the Group in giving due consideration to the prospects for successful application of the CLT idea in Ringmore Parish. It was agreed that two copies of this book would be purchased from RNPSG funds. It was also agreed that JW would prepare a short paper outlining her thoughts on whether and how CLTs might be implemented in Ringmore Parish

JW explained that deriving accurate information on who might benefit from developing a CLT can be a difficult process. There followed some discussion on this aspect and the difficulty in determining whether there was a difference between "affordable" and "self-build" housing. There was some debate around whether "self-build" as an approach to housing provision would actually be appropriate under the "housing" heading in a neighbourhood plan.

JW noted that, at the CLT Meeting, it had been reported that changes had been made to the Joint Local Plan, to tighten up on development in designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Also that a mock-up of the St Anne's Chapel development, which is now underway, had been on display and that this looked very good. It was noted that previously the JLP had stipulated a target for house building in various villages within the AONB but that this clause had now been withdrawn for Ringmore.

**ACTION:** JW to purchase two copies of book on CLT in Broadhempston

**ACTION:** JW to prepare short briefing on CLTs in Ringmore Parish for a RNPSG meeting in April

#### 4. Review of “Housing” discussion paper

MC gave an overview of the draft submission he had prepared on Housing. He highlighted the reference points he had employed and went on to explain the opening section of his paper, in which he had cited an overarching aim and accompanying objectives. There followed detailed discussion on a range of aspects of the draft text.

A number of points and queries on documentary style and presentation arose from the discussion, including whether each section should include a “vision” statement, or whether this should be rolled into one overarching statement covering the entire Plan. The benefit of having a template to use for compiling the various sections of the Plan was flagged-up and it was agreed that this would be devised, but only after initial thoughts for each section had been committed to text. In terms of structure, it was agreed that the policy (or policies) should appear in advance of the justification(s) in the text. It was also agreed that “heritage buildings” should be amended to read “heritage assets”, and the asterisk removed from the aims/objectives.

A number of amendments were suggested. These included reference to a consistent source, eg the 2011 census, when citing housing-related figures. RB noted that the Challaborough shop is seasonal and this should be clarified. Information from the Housing Needs Survey also needed amendment; with text being changed to indicate only one home was needed, rather than one more. The question of whether it was relevant to discuss house prices in this section drew a range of opinions and it was agreed that MC would consider how this information could be condensed and more succinctly drawn into the discussion around “affordability” of homes in Ringmore Parish.

In the course of discussions it was agreed that MC should retain the text he had produced on how the parish roads infrastructure bears upon the viability of additional housing, regardless of whether this might ultimately be duplicated elsewhere in the final Plan. RB noted that the draft text did not deal with second homes and it was agreed that MC should give consideration to the possibility of a restriction on new-build holiday homes, as had been done in St Ives, Cornwall. It was also agreed that reference should be made to the situation “at the time of writing” since this could easily change.

The following points were also brought up in the course of discussing MC’s paper:

- Should there be commentary on considering “loss of amenity” for existing parish residents when a housing development is proposed?
- Should there be differing design expectations applied in different parts of the parish?
- Can a policy objective be defined with regard to satisfying need of parish residents who wish to “downsize” yet stay in the parish?
- Can a number of homes that would be appropriate for Ringmore Parish be identified, and
- should the text go as far as outlining some broad idea of what level of housing development should be sanctioned over a given time period, eg four houses over 10 years?

**ACTION:** MC to amend text - outlining policy (or policies) before justifications for these; change wording on heritage assets, review and revise text on house prices; remove asterisk in aims/objectives; and give consideration to other comments received, amending as necessary.

**ACTION:** MC to consider whether policy on new build second homes is needed

**ACTION:** Group to agree, in due course, a standard template format for compiling the various sections of the neighbourhood plan

## 5. Review of “Heritage Assets”

MWP had produced a draft paper in which he outlined the importance of preserving heritage assets within Ringmore Parish and justified the inclusion of this aspect within the overall neighbourhood plan. His paper set out an aim and objective, and included three very succinct draft policies in relation to heritage assets. It was pointed out that, as in the case of the earlier Housing paper, the justifications should follow, rather than precede, the policies. It was agreed that MWP would amend his draft paper in line with comments received.

MWP had also compiled a detailed list of houses, locations, objects and artefacts that he had identified as being of possible interest in the context of being parts of the heritage of Ringmore Parish. He led the Group through the list and each item was discussed. Where entries were deemed to be inappropriate they were removed from the list; others were modified. A number of additional items were suggested and added to the list as appropriate.

**ACTION:** MWP to amend draft text in line with comments received

**ACTION:** MWP to revise the list of heritage assets to include the agreed entries

The meeting had been time-limited and **ended at 21.20.**

A number of Agenda Items were therefore held over to the next meeting. These are:

6. Review of “Employment and Business” discussion paper - DV
7. Review of “Challaborough” discussion paper III - MF
8. “Landscape and views, open spaces and environment” - DMS.
9. New budget and grant application
10. Any Other Business

**No date was set for the next meeting. The Chair undertook to confirm an agreeable date, time and venue by e-mail.**