

ST JUST PENDEEN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

STEERING GROUP

Minutes of meeting 8 October 2019 7pm

The Knut, St Just

Attending:

Steve Hall (Chair), Jo Forsyth, Dave Munday, David Osbourne-Broad. Jeremy Redwood, Adam Sharpe, Dave Stevens, Dot Stevens, Judith Summers (Secretary), Jill Taylor, Neil Taylor Sarah Tieken, Tim Wotton

Also present: Rob Chadder, Sue James

Apologies: Kate Beckly, Debbie Shephard

1. Declaration of interests

- Jo Forsyth stated that she was a member of a group looking for land as a housing cooperative. For that reason she had not viewed the maps recording views from the household survey. SG did not consider there to be a conflict of interest at this point.

2. Minutes of meeting 9 September 2019

- These were approved and signed.

3. Matters arising

- Publicity for survey results: Tim had drafted a press release, securing good coverage in the Cornishman. Dave S had given a well-received presentation to the Town Council. There was also an article in Outreach.

4. Decisions on site allocation or use of development boundaries

- SG had been briefed on 30 September by Melissa Burrow of Cornwall Council on the options of allocating sites, set development boundaries, or relying on well-drafted policies regarding development (briefing slides circulated). SG discussed and recorded the pros and cons of each (see appendix to these minutes).
- SG considered that there was insufficient evidence to justify either allocating sites or drawing development boundaries, although noting that several sites were strongly identified within the 334 mapping returns and that Q85 in the survey supported the principle of allocating sites within 'preferred development zones'
- SG unanimously agreed that we would not allocate sites or set development boundaries but would rely on policies.
- SG noted the following points:

- we should prepare a statement explaining and justifying our decision and a draft of this should be sent to CC for comment
- we should write up our analysis of what the survey maps tell us, and have a note, with caveats, to be available in case of any FOI requests for them
- we should have a record of how we defined settlement boundaries and the evidence used
- settlement boundaries will need to be reviewed for accuracy
- policies should include how we will allow for industrial development
- we should clarify with MB whether there was merit in indicating broad areas in which development might be suitable
- it was open to the Town Council / NP team (if still in existence) to review the position mid-plan
- we should mine other plans for relevant policies.

5. Further work

- The policy-writing workshop should be arranged later in the month (and before the next SG meeting). SG meeting on 30 October should focus on draft policies.
- Evidence collection: Dot reported that she would use the template previously provided by Sarah Furley to collate evidence and check gaps. JS would index evidence and upload to the website.
- Debbie S, Jill, Steve and JS had prepared a draft on the contents and style of the NP. SG agreed to use this as a basis.

6. Finance

- ST reported that the TC were now aware that a grant application had not been submitted by the locum clerks and that costs could not be met retrospectively. The TC had agreed to cover spending to date. we had spent about £2500 in the current financial year. ST, JS and the Mayor would now submit an application as soon as possible.

7. Dates of future meetings

- Policy-writing workshop tba
- SG next meeting 28 October 2019.

AGREED ACTION

- Draft statement explaining our decision and pass by CC (JS)
- Analysis of survey maps (AS/DaveS) and note in case of FOI requests (AS/JS)
- Note recording work on settlement boundaries (AS/JS)
- Book policy-writing workshop (JS)

APPENDIX.

Discussion of site allocation / development boundaries / reliance on policies regarding development

Pros	Cons
<i>Allocation of development sites</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can initially limit development site • A very few sites had significant support • Can allocate specific sites for specific purpose eg industrial 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increases land price, thus house prices • Not affordable-led • Any other site can be a rural exception site • How to agree • Need for SEA
<i>Use of development boundaries</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can initially limit development sites • Could steer towards areas and protect others (eg towards the coast) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increases land prices, thus house prices • Not affordable led • Any other site can be a rural exception site • How to agree? • Need for SEA
<i>Policy driven -no defined sites/development boundaries</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher proportion of homes for local people • Affordable led • Protection of areas easier eg green spaces • Policies can be evidenced directly from our survey • Flexible possibilities into the future • Policy to allow for specific areas eg industrial 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any site can be a rural exception site • Policies must be written 'perfectly', with regard to challenges • Beware 'strangulation' in terms of business • Infill within settlement areas may have detrimental effect on historic settlements • Could we be challenged re 'strongly identified' sites?