

Ringmore Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (RNPSG)

Minutes of meeting held on Thursday 18th July 2019, in The Ringmore W.I. Hall, at 7.30 pm

1. Attendance

In attendance: Mr Richard Baker (Chair) (RB), Mr David Vincent (DV), Mr Mike Campbell (MC), Dr Malcolm Findlay (MF), Mr David Milne-Smith DMS).

Apologies were received from Ms Jenny Williams, Mr Mike Wynne-Powell, and Ms Rosemary Piercy

2. Matters Arising from Minutes from the previous meeting, held on 20th June 2019

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

Item 3. RB proposed that it would be useful for Group members to consider whether there were additional topic headings, beyond those already identified, upon which parishioners should be canvassed for their opinions at the upcoming Village Fair.

3. Landscape and Views, Open Spaces & Environment – First Draft

DMS introduced his first draft version of the section on Landscape and Views, Open Spaces & Environment. Group members suggested that the following points might usefully be considered in compiling the next iteration:

- Reduce the length of the introduction and reduce the amount of emotive language used
- Avoid use of arcane terms, such as “rich time-depth”. Revise the wording of the last paragraph before the policies
- Delete points that overlap with other sections of the Plan – can some content be moved to the Plan Introduction (being compiled by RB)?
- Review the general layout and the order in which points are made in the body text of the section. Begin the section at the point where its introduction currently starts
- General revision of the aims and objectives
- Some points made seem to be very subjective and give an anecdotal feel to the text. Points are better made when supported with some form of evidence.
- More focused comment on what actual features constitute the various points made – eg what features preserve dark skies
- Be more direct in wording – eg replace “it is worth protecting” with “it should be protected”
- More specific comment on spaces in the Parish that may warrant some form of protection, eg identification as “green spaces”. (noting that private land can be identified as “green space” if justified through support from local community)
- Can some text be included towards prompting/requiring fully details of impact upon landscape with every planning submission (this is not currently required for single house proposals)

RB thanked DMS for his paper and acknowledged the work that had gone into this.

It was agreed that DMS would consider the comments made by the group and bring a revised paper for consideration at a future meeting.

ACTION: DMS to revise draft section on Landscape, Views and Open Spaces and bring this forward at the earliest possible future meeting

4. Revised Introduction Section

RB gave an overview of the revisions he had made to overall Plan Introduction. It was explained that, as the various sections were being developed, so the Introduction was evolving but by its very nature, this is a 'work in progress'.

MF enquired whether the short, numbered sections of the would ultimately be interspersed with illustrative images. RB indicated that this would probably be the case but that images would be used in support of the text and not included gratuitously.

The group was generally happy with how the Introduction was coming together. RB agreed to continue his work on this section and bring revisions to future meetings for consideration.

ACTION: RB to continue working on introductory section and bring forward a further revised draft at the next meeting.

5. Tourism & Holiday Parks – Revised Draft

MF introduced a revised draft of the section on Tourism & Holiday Parks, amended on the basis of earlier scrutiny by the Group. He noted that a late change had been made to draft Policy B, to include reference to development proposals around changes to opening times. It was explained that the text in this revision had been shortened considerably and that some possibly contentious points made in the original draft and now been removed.

There was brief discussion on the length of this section, with contrary views being expressed on its overall significance to the Plan as a whole. Consensus among the Group was that it was appropriate for the section to retain its current length and substance.

The group suggested the following points for consideration in relation to the present draft:

- Can supporting evidence be provided for comments on noise resulting from holiday park operations? If not, then reference to this should probably be removed.
- The Journey's End pub could usefully be mentioned in section 1.5.2
- Amend Appendix A, removing the statement in bold type.

ACTION: MF to amend draft text in line with comments received and present a revised draft at the next meeting.

6. Housing Policies – Revised Draft

MC introduced a revised draft of the section he had tabled for scrutiny at previous meetings. There was a general discussion among the Group on this, with special consideration given to the subject of roof ridge height. There was also some discussion around the Community Land Trust (CLT) concept and whether this is ultimately the most feasible means of delivering affordable housing in

Ringmore Parish, but evolving policy, both nationally and locally, would need to be taken into account. It was agreed that this idea would be included for discussion at a subsequent RNPSG meeting.

There was discussion around the potential problems emerging from planning submissions which include increased roof ridge heights. RB noted that a height of 6m seems to be a threshold for new developments and wondered whether a specific height should be identified in this vein.

The following points were suggested for consideration by MC in further revising this draft:

- Should the “metro map” be removed? Does it convey useful and relevant information?
- Does warrant coverage in this section, since it may ultimately offer the most viable means of delivering ‘affordable housing’ in Ringmore Parish.
- Can housing policy be devised in a way that accommodates parish residents who wish to “downsize” but continue living in the Parish?
- Exclusion of holiday home developments remains a very important factor
- Can a threshold for roof ridge height be identified for development proposals?
- Include reference to home extensions in housing policies
- Check the current status of Ringmore as a “sustainable village” or otherwise and mention this in the context of scope for housing development

Action: RB to include CLT as an agenda item for a future RNPSG meeting

Action: MC to revise draft section on Housing, taking account of comments made by the Group

7. Any Other Business

MF provided a definition of the term, “Undeveloped Coast”, noting that although not necessarily the case in earlier iterations of the Joint Local Plan, this now seemed to be synonymous with the Heritage Coast.

The meeting ended at 9.05pm

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