

ST JUST PENDEEN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
NOTE OF TEAM MEETING 10 August 2020, 7 pm
via Zoom

Present: Debbie Shephard (Chairing), Kate Beckly, Jo Forsyth, Sue James, David Osborne-Broad, Adam Sharpe, Dave Stevens, Dot Stevens, Judith Summers (Secretary), Jill Taylor, Neil Taylor, Tim Wotton

Apologies: Steve Hall, Dave Munday, Sarah Tieken

1. Declarations of interest:

- Dot and Dave St recorded a personal friendship with one of the designers to be considered.
- Tim Wotton declared an interest regarding item 5 on the agenda 'Green gaps' responses.

2. Minutes of meeting 3 August

- These were approved.
- Matters arising: (1) JS had written to Warrens and Situ8 regarding their pre-applications. It was suggested that this site might be ideal for a flagship carbon-neutral housing project; it was also pointed out that at this stage agents would simply be seeking to maximise the value of the site and unlikely to engage. (2) CIL (approved text circulated): it was suggested that a statement should be added to say that if the 'shopping list' could not be achieved the TC should decide.

3. Choice of graphic designer

- The team agreed that a new logo would not be commissioned in order to save public money, and the existing logo should be used with improvements.
- It was also noted that:
 - the design must conform to the accessibility required of public access documents
 - the 'plain English' version of the policies would be used in the leaflet, but not in the full Plan text as it might confuse
 - the designer must be aware that there will be textual alterations following public consultation (and submission to CC, statutory consultees and the independent examiner) and we must allow for the cost of this
 - the leaflet was crucial to engaging residents in the consultation phase.
- Following review of the Whittle website and additional portfolio provided by More White Space, both of which had given very similar quotations, the team agreed by a majority that the latter should be commissioned.

4. Feedback from Cornwall Council on draft policies

A document was provided tabulating the feedback against the policies in order.

- Policy AH1, AH2 – feedback accepted.
- AH4: addition accepted, subject to checking which policy it belonged with.
- AD6: the possible redraft quoted had not been received in formal feedback from CC, but had been provided by an officer for information, following the decision of an independent examiner to reword the St Clear 'open spaces' policy in this way. It was agreed to defer consideration to the next meeting to allow AS to review the text and see if the justification in our draft could be strengthened.
- With regard to this redraft, TW suggested that JS had deliberately failed to circulate the email with the aim of concealing its contents and asked for it to be circulated. JS

stated that the email text from the officer had been quoted accurately. A point of order was raised in view of TW's previous declaration of an interest on the policy. It was suggested that TW's behaviour should be considered under the code of conduct. Other team members were of the view that there was no need to circulate the email but JS agreed to do so.

- TW requested the opportunity to outline his concerns regarding his landholding; the Chair decided that this should be deferred to the next meeting.
- AD9/BD6: JT to reword BD6 accordingly, to apply to a development of more than 5 houses.
- Replacement dwellings suggested text: JT to work into an existing policy.
- AD11: agreed, with the proviso that if allotments were on a slope there should be mitigation of possible run-off (JF to reword).
- BD1, BD2: agreed.
- BD4.3: agreed to include an amendment from KB that there should be separate areas for laundry, waste storage and cycle stores.
- RE3: possible redraft to respond to Natural England and Historic England concerns awaited from CC for our consideration.
- JS would seek further information on references to climate change resilience, the Shoreline Management Plan and private water supplies. These had all been noted by CC officers but the implications for drafting were not clear. Updated information on housing demand would be included in the housing statement in the main text.

5. **Principal residence policy**

- Dot and Dave St were researching the evidence over time which would be needed to support such a policy. Otherwise this was a matter for the consultation period. It was suggested that the public might be asked to say how many full-time residents lived in their street.

Sue James left the meeting.

- Differing views were expressed on whether Q93 of the household survey gave a mandate for a principal residence policy or was covered in the rural exception site policy. The TC had not yet discussed the issue; D Sh would ask again for this to be on their agenda.
- JF pointed out that the need to open up land for housing was a much bigger issue that could be deal with through the existing framework.

6. **Open spaces between settlements: written question from Tim Wotton**

- A document was circulated containing this question, which TW had asked to be discussed at this meeting, and a response prepared by JS from the work done by the sub-group. It was noted that in the third bullet-point of paragraph 3 the reference to a planning application being 'under way' was misleading, as the application was in preparation and had not yet been submitted. There was no other comment.

7. **Date of next meetings:** Monday 17 August 7pm and Monday 24 August 7pm, to complete drafting.