

ST JUST PENDEEN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
NOTE OF TEAM MEETING 17 June 2020, 7.30pm
via Zoom

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

Apologies: Marna Blundy, Steve Hall, Dave Munday, Cornelius Olivier, David Osborne-Broad,

1. Declarations of interest

Tim Wotton referred to what he considered to be potential financial interests of team members living adjacent to green spaces which were designated in the NP. Dot Stevens offered to declare an interest as there was open green space in front of her house. It was noted that this did not constitute an interest requiring to be declared, and that no green spaces had been 'designated' in the 'green gaps' policy; the supporting maps were for information and illustration. No interests were declared.

2. Minutes of meetings 22 and 26 May

These were approved. There were no matters arising other than on this agenda.

3. Email from Tim Wotton: 'green gaps' mapping and other concerns

- TW expressed concern that consultation would be limited to the required 6 week period and sought assurances that consultation would be longer and more engaging. It was noted that the Town Council had been kept fully informed and would expect thorough consultation, and that there was significant budget available to achieve this. It was however necessary to get technical advice from Cornwall Council before proceeding with consultation. It was for the team to plan how consultation would take place.
- JF suggested that while affordable housing was the most significant issue for the NP, a principal residence policy was not necessarily the right solution; but the draft Plan would be open to change in the light depending on consultation. It was also suggested that the TC should enable a broader discussion on how best to develop a strategy for affordable housing, including perhaps a citizen's assembly.
- TW said that material had not been posted on the website, thus limiting public awareness of draft policies. JS explained that material could not be posted until authorised by the group, and that she was awaiting decisions on the 'green gaps' maps and the accompanying explanatory note so that they could be posted. They would in any case have to be posted when the draft policies were submitted to CC as they formed part of the evidence base.
- TW was challenged about allegations of secretiveness and asked to be open about what he thought was amiss. He stated that there was a need for absolute transparency and referred to advice circulated from a CC officer which he claimed sought to limit consultation to 6 weeks. JS stated that he had misread the email. The email did not advise limiting the period of consultation. The current delay in consultation with landowners was because the supporting documents had not been signed off.
- TW was asked to be open about what he regarded as wrong. He stated that he had concerns about consultation, and that the importance of topics such as affordable housing was being downplayed.
- The team agreed to authorise publication of the 'green gaps' maps and supporting note, by 10 votes with 1 abstention. It would be made clear that they would be 'for

consultation'. It was also agreed that CC should be asked to advise on whether there was any conflict between the 'green gaps' policy and the policy encouraging rural exception sites. It was suggested that a small group should also look at the maps to see if any adjustments were desirable.

4. Redraft of affordable housing section of policies document

- Dot St introduced a redraft to include reference to open market housing.
- TW queried whether the team had sufficiently grappled with how the plan facilitates a potential 300 additional dwellings over its duration. Members considered that the draft plan provided a framework for meeting needs in a difficult environment for community-led and social housing, and in the context of strong CC policies.
- CC would be asked to advise on how the reference to 'suitable for full-time occupation' in new policy AH5 could be strengthened. It was agreed to delete 'eg Botallack' in AH5.
- The redraft of the AH section was approved.
(Sue James left the meeting.)
- TW suggested that the team should look at the combined impact of the policies and whether they would deliver. In response, it was thought that CC would be able to comment on this. TW agreed to accept that the policies document was a work in progress.

5. Other amendments to the policies document (Dot St)

- The team agreed that sections AD and LE should be merged.
- The team noted that policies AD2 and LE2 needed to be separate because they came under different legislation. Other points of detail in Dot St's notes were accepted.
- Changes to policy BD6 to delete point 2 and move the policy to the AH/LE section were agreed.
- Policy CD3 would be annotated to make clear that it did not refer to holiday lets.
- The team noted that the response to Q6 in the survey (developments should take account of whether local facilities and services were sufficient) could not be accommodated within the plan but should be referred to the TC.
- The team had previously agreed to combine points 7 and 8 of policy BD2; KB to supply redraft to JS.
- It was agreed unanimously that the policy document should now go forward to CC for technical assessment and SEA screening.

6. Principal residence policy: proposal by Cornelius Olivier

- The proposed policy had been supplied by CO earlier in the day and circulated. Members confirmed that they had viewed it.
- Some members considered that the policy would not be effective and pointed out that it had previously been discussed and rejected. It was suggested that it would mainly affect infill. It was suggested that a debate was needed and it was noted that the issue could be expected to come up in the consultation period. It was also suggested that the TC should be asked to discuss the issue.
- It was noted that the proposal as it stood did not provide the supporting evidence which was advised by the CC guidance note. Members were asked to volunteer to research this, so that we could be ready for any consultation results in favour of the policy. This would be on the agenda for the next meeting.

7. Date of next meeting

Monday 29 June 7.30 pm via Zoom