## EXBOURNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Minutes of monthly meeting held in the Village Hall on 26<sup>th</sup> April 2018

Present:

Adam Hedley (AH) Sally Kenealy (SK) Gaye Langham (GL) Dorothy Gennard (DG)

Michael Brady (MB)

**Action** 

1 Apologies: Sally Hordern, Kirk England

#### **Public speaking**

Mr Pete O'Connor, the owner of Town Living, read a written statement to the Group: "I am frankly disgusted by the treatment of this committee of the landowners of the proposed local green spaces. We are neighbours to many and members of this community. But I feel that we are being treated as the enemy. We have been given no real information about what is happening in the process. Nobody has come to visit us and hear our concerns, or actually look at the land that has been designated. Nobody has responded to my wife's letter of a year ago by actually physically looking at the land in question.

There are specific criteria that the land must meet to be designated as green open space. My field and private garden do not in any way meet those criteria. It is away from the village centre, it has no public access, it has very limited views into it, it has no special wildlife, infact it has less than most as it is mowed twice a week, it is no more beautiful than every over field in and around this village and is no more tranquil than those other fields.

I thought this committee were meant to be unbiased and open minded. I do not now believe this. The only reason I can see that this process is taking so long is that you are actively searching for reasons to include the nominated land and will use every means to get it included. This is not what this committee is about it should be looking at the land objectively and judging it against the stipulated criteria. I believe this whole process has been blown out of all proportion, yes my land was nominated by a small proportion of villagers, but it wasn't nominated by a majority. So why is the committee taking the views of the minority over the majority?

This committee is meant to represent the village as a whole, that includes the land owners of nominated sites, and should have the courage to make an informed judgement to say, no that land or that hedge or that verge do not meet the criteria as laid down and remove this sword of Damocles that we, the landowners, have hanging over us.

Finally, I find it distressing that two members of this committee have tried to use our open green space nomination as a means to stop a legitimate planning application. When both must have known that until adopted the open green space policy carries no legal weight. They also must know that green open space policy is specifically designed not to be a means to stop building."

AH apologised to Mr O'Connor for the lack of direct communication with himself and other landowners in connection with the Local Green Space ('LGS') assessment. He understood that this may have caused anxiety given the time it was taking to undertake the assessment. MB pointed out that the Steering Group's meetings were open to the public and any landowner was able to attend and ask any questions that they had. Progress was also set out in the publicly available meeting minutes. AH explained to Mr O'Connor that the Group was preparing a report which would assess each of the nominated sites against the

2

#### **EXBOURNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

#### Minutes of monthly meeting held in the Village Hall on 26th April 2018

National Planning Policy Framework criteria. It was based on similar reports prepared by other neighbourhood plan groups. The report would aim to assess the sites in a transparent and objective way and be evidence-backed. It was also explained that any potential designation would need to be agreed with West Devon Borough Council ('WDBC') as the Neighbourhood Plan would eventually become part of their development plan. AH acknowledged it was taking a long time to prepare the report but reminded Mr O'Connor that the Group was made up of a small group of volunteers with a lack of time and resource. It was intended that landowners would be consulted but the Group had felt this would be premature without first preparing a draft report for discussion. Given the apparent anxiety of some landowners reported by Mr O'Connor, AH recognised that it was evidently necessary to begin a dialogue sooner than this and apologised again.

Mr O'Connor left the meeting.

#### **Evidence** base

#### Village Design Statement

AH reported that he had asked the Parish Council whether they had any objection in principal to producing a Village Design Statement ('VDS') in connection with the Neighbourhood Plan. Councillors had raised a number of concerns about how a VDS can limit contemporary design and innovation and questioned whether one would have allowed good, or prevented bad, examples of historic development in the village.

Given these concerns and the amount of work involved in preparing a VDS, the Group agreed the best alternative was to try and deal with the most important matters that the community wanted addressed in a VDS through Neighbourhood Plan policy instead. Such matters could include development density, height, conformity with neighbouring buildings etc.

MB had particular concerns about ensuring high quality building design in the Conservation Area. AH agreed to ask the Group's planning consultant, Stuart Todd, whether design policy in the Conservation Area could take direction from the Conservation Area Appraisal.

#### **Local Green Spaces**

3

GL advised that she still needed to write the "local character and context" section of the LGS assessment report and tidy up some other areas but should have a draft ready for discussion shortly.

#### **Local Visual Landscape Study**

DG advised she was continuing to work on consolidating all the information she had gathered on landscape character into a standalone report.

#### Plan and policy

The Group continued their discussion of the draft "policy intents" Stuart Todd had prepared for the Neighbourhood Plan:

## 4 Community, Facilities & Wellbeing

Protecting existing community buildings and services

It was noted that protecting services is not something that the Neighbourhood Plan can do, but it can protect buildings (or physical assets). A policy can be

AΗ

#### **EXBOURNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

#### Minutes of monthly meeting held in the Village Hall on 26th April 2018

drafted which protects community buildings where evidence demonstrates demand equates to a need to protect. Commercial businesses and premises cannot be protected – for example, post offices, village shops or pubs. Village halls, community hubs, etc. can be protected through planning policy.

AH asked the Group to consider which buildings other than the Village Hall should be protected in this way. The village bus stops were suggested and AH agreed to ask whether the Burrow could be protected given that it is a community hub and a mutual society formed for the benefit of the community.

ALL

#### Playing field facilities and access

Stuart Todd had advised the Group that improvements to the playing field could be supported through a supportive policy but it should itself be protected through other policy, e.g. as LGS if it satisfies the National Planning Policy Framework criteria. The Group had some concerns over whether LGS designation would prevent certain desired development of the playing field in the future, such as the creation of a parking area or changing facilities. AH agreed to ask Stuart Todd.

AΗ

MB also noted the need for a children's play area in the village that was in a safer location than the playing field. If this could not be written into policy then the Group agreed that it should at least be documented as an aspiration.

#### Village hall

The Group agreed that there should be a policy which supports improvements to the hall if evidenced by need and/or demand for improvements. AH agreed to ask Stuart Todd whether the suggested supportive policy could also include a condition concerning need.

AΗ

MB noted that a particular concern over the Village Hall was that larger vehicles had previously hit the roof where it overhangs Hayfield Lane at a narrow point in the highway. He thought a policy should try and prevent HGV access here. AH suggested that this could be mentioned as one of the particular traffic problems in the supportive text of the roads and parking policy that aims to manage the impact of traffic on the village.

### Rights of way and parish links

It was noted that there is a limit to what a planning policy can do as much is governed by Public Rights of Way law. However, the Neighbourhood Plan could have a general supportive policy and identify particular destinations which need to be linked which currently are not. MB mentioned a number of new links and footpath extensions that he felt would improve the footpath network around Exbourne:

- Link the footpath from Court Barton with the footpath beginning at the Mill at Jacobstowe Bridge and move the route off the A3072.
- ii) Link Exbourne village with the footpath running past Solland and Cliston that leads on to the Devonshire Heartland Way. Achieving this and i) above would link the Devonshire Heartland Way with the Tarka Trail.
- iii) Link the Monkokehampton Road with Coxwell through Waterhouse. It was noted that someone had applied for this to be an unrestricted byway but a public footpath or bridleway would be preferable.

# EXBOURNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Minutes of monthly meeting held in the Village Hall on 26<sup>th</sup> April 2018

	iv) Preserve the status of the lane down past the sewage works (or perhaps use it as a route for ii) above). MB agreed to look into the ownership of this lane.	МВ
5	Any other business	
	None	АН
6	Next meeting	A11
	Thursday 31 <sup>st</sup> May 2018, 7:30pm in the Burrow.	ALL

IF YOU ARE READING THESE MINUTES AND INTERESTED IN JOINING THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN GROUP, OR MAKING A CONTRIBUTION TO THE GROUP'S WORK, THEN PLEASE CONTACT ADAM HEDLEY ON 851648