**Bigbury Parish Council (BPC).**

**Minutes of a Neighbourhood Plan Open Meeting Saturday 12th March 2016**

**Held in the Memorial Hall St Ann’s Chapel from Noon.**

**The Meeting came to order at 12:13 p.m.**

A / Present:

Valerie Scott (VS) Chair Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, Cllr Bryan Carson (BC) Chair BPC,

Cllr Beth Huntley (BH) BPC, Cllr George Rosevear (GR) BPC & Minute taker, plus 13 members of the public.

B / Apologies:

SHDC DC Cllr Lindsay Ward.

C / Quorum:

The meeting was Quarate, in so far a quorum was necessary under BPC rules.

*.*

D / Minutes of the First Meeting.

Not presented as this was an open public information meeting and not a reporting meeting.

E / Matters Arising:

None.

**The Open meeting was convened to discuss**

 **the Vision and Objectives of the Bigbury Parish NeighbourhoodPlan**

1a / Opening Address:

BC briefly addressed the meeting, stating that a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) was fundamental to the future of the Parish as it will carry Statutory force within the SHDC Local Plan. He then introduced VS Chair of the NP Steering Group.

1b / Opening address of VS Chair BPC NP Steering Group [NPSG].

VS made the following statements.

Following support for the project from the BPC, an application was made for a NP to SHDC on 13th December 2015, which was approved by SHDC on 21st January 2016.

An initial meeting of parishioners took place in December 2015, with unanimous support for the NHP with VS invited to chair the NPSG, which has led to today’s meeting.

All meetings of the NPSG and any open or formal Public meetings will be minuted; and those minutes will be published in the Bigbury News and posted on the Community Website and the Parish Notice Boards.

2 / Funding

An application has also been made to SHDC for initial funding of the NPSG in the sum of £500.00 from the Sustainable Communities Locality Fund (SCLF). There are other options to add to this.These will be considered in the new financial year commencing 1st April 2016.

3 / Discussions with SHDC

VS reported that Phil Baker is the officer at SHDC who is responsible for NP’s and he will be the NHPSG link and guide. He will ensure that the development of BPC’s NP conforms to the emerging SHDC Local Plan.

At present the existing South Hams “Local Development Framework (LPF) Core Strategy dates from December 2006; and the Rural Areas Site Allocations Development Plan Document itself was only adopted in February 2011.

It is to be hoped that whatever limited development is permitted and what emerges in the new “Local Plan” is related to expected growth of and in the Parish.

Therefore the following matters all need to be investigated, reviewed and refined to see if and where they can sit within the BPC NP.

1. A need for a project programme for the NP.
2. The matters included in the plan need to be evidence based, perhaps with support from the ONS.
3. The support of SHDC for a Housing Needs Survey. This was approved at the recent BPC meeting of 9th March 2016. It would be promoted by the use of a Post Card to be included with the next available issue of the Bigbury News. The card would provide details of how to provide information/response, either digitally or in writing. VS briefly ran through the form to give an idea of the range of questions it contained.

4a / What are the next Steps?

1. In addition to the Housing Needs Survey, a further questionnaire is proposed and will be worked-up to provide evidence for the NP. There will be further meetings to allow Parishioners to respond with their ideas of the “Visions and Objectives” to be achieved by the plan.
2. There will also be further meetings with SHDC to ensure that the NP is shaping up to be representative of the whole Parish; and that its evidence base is appropriate to be included within, not only the NH, but also the SHDC Local Plan.
3. The Steering Group will be formed to have a core membership of about eight, with opportunities for “Parishioners’’ to join and contribute with their particular expertise(s). There will also be the ability to dip in and dip out of the Steering Group over its likely life of 18 months or so.
4. Currently there are some 13 volunteers from the Parish; but there is room for more, in particular those who bring different skills into play.
5. It is likely that that there will be sub groups to represent the views of the main settlements within the Parish of Bigbury, Bigbury on Sea and St Ann’s Chapel. The sub groups and the main NHPSG will report back to the BPC on a regular basis.
6. Volunteers are asked to let VS know of their interest in being part of the NPSG.

4b / Open Spaces Sports and Recreation (OSSR).

GR informed Parishioners that the SHDC’s Section 106 Legal Agreements that invariably accompanied each and every development, provided for several different types of Statutory required contributions, these included: Education, Highways, Affordable Housing and Open Spaces Sports and Recreation. This latter category is of importance and value to the Parish.

The OSSR requires an audit of all of the Parish’s current such facilities, what is lacking and what is wanted or desired. This is a detailed formal process and unless it is carried out, any additions supported by Central and Local Government funds or initiatives will not be available. Furthermore, this audit “has to” be submitted through, as well as, in parallel to the NP. If it is not part of the NHP, it will not be recognised.

For example, the two new houses in St Ann’s Chapel have OSSR contributions available in the order £5500 to £7500 in total; and the Parish needs to make an expression of interest to access and use it, or it could be lost to another Parish, such as Modbury, (who have their eye on it). At present the expression of interest (EOI) can be made extant the NP as the process is too young; but once in place, any use of the money would have to have been part of the OSSR and posited in it.

4c / Visions and Objectives from the Floor

The following contributions were made from the floor for inclusion in the NHPSG’s considerations.

1. Drainage and Sewage capacity: Concern was expressed as to whether existing developments had or do put undue stress on the current infrastructure, as evidenced by waste matter ending up in the streams and on the beaches.
2. Infrastructure: Evidence of DCC Highways and SWW modelling for existing and future development for the Parish was called for, to be available to the BPC and the NHPSG. It was not sufficient, as in the case of Modbury for the issue of flooding and sewage infrastructure to be dealt with simply because of the imperative to protect the Blue Flag status of beaches; although it was, of itself, excellent.
3. Tourism: Does the Parish wish to encourage a greater influx of tourists or not? And, if so, are the roads and car parking facilities sufficient and of a sufficient standard to allow for such a greater influx?
4. Employment: Whether brought about by tourism or other means, does the Parish look to encourage a higher level of employment within its boundaries, whether that be for Parishioners themselves, or for others from the surrounding area?
5. Community Facilities: Whether falling within the scope of the OSSR or not, there have been significant losses since circa 2008, in terms of shops, public houses, cafes and play areas. How is this halted and reversed?
6. Transport Links: Community/Public transport. One public bus a week and a couple of taxi cars, hardly stimulating movement. Taking into account the Parish has a broad mix of ages; but at each end of the age spectrum, many without their own transport. Is there scope for a Parish Minibus?
7. Recognition and Protection of Buildings of Local Historic or Architectural Interest: Can consideration be given for some form of protection to buildings in the Parish, whether of historic or architectural interest? Could this be through a mix of Environmental (AONB), Community or formal statutory listing?
8. Design Preferences: Can the Parish seek to incorporate its “aspiration” as to the preferred mix of design concepts and finishes in the Parish?
9. Sustainable and Renewable Energy considerations: Does the Parish wish to see any large scale infrastructure project, or prefer to have such an amenity simply restricted to and incorporated within individual developments, and then reflecting Parish design aspirations?
10. Highways: Although touched on in an earlier section of the minutes, nonetheless, does the Parish want to have its highways infrastructure improved, and not be constantly prone to DCC budget restrictions?
11. Light Pollution: Whilst there may not be support for comprehensive road lights, are there areas that are vulnerable and which would benefit from better lighting? In addition, many properties had somewhat inconsiderate security lighting arrangement. Would it be possible to incorporate into the design of future developments a preferred form of security lighting both in design, capability and timing?
12. Wild Life Centre: Is there scope within the Parish, Avon Estuary or elsewhere for such a project, would it be a fee paying or non-fee paying attraction? How would it be financed and how would the Parish deal with the influx of visitors and the requirement for car parking and coach parking?
13. Avon Estuary and the Beaches: How can we successfully preserve these amenities and enhance them where appropriate?
14. The Warren: Linked to (xiii) above; how could this area be improved and preserved? Bearing in mind the Parish is within the AONB.

5/ Volunteers for the NPSG and future Meetings.

Although covered already in 1b and 4a VS reminded those attending, if they had not already volunteered there were still opportunities to do so, either by leaving contact details today, or contacting her direct or through the next issue of the Bigbury News.

There would be cross-referencing with other NP’s on the coastal fringe, in an attempt to both share ideas and overcome difficulties as well as potentially presenting a potential *“united coastal fringe front”!*

.

In addition the Parish and NPSG must consider how to overcome the reservations of those members of the community who have “been here before” and seen the fruits of their labour amount to little. There needs to be a considered and well developed PR case to make to bring everyone including any jaundiced parishioners on board.

VS thanked everyone for attending and she then closed the meeting.

Meeting Closed 13.45.

**………………………………………..**

Valerie Scott – Chair NHPSG