

ST MINVER HIGHLANDS PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Clerk: J. Wilson
106 Foxglove Crescent,
St Merryn,
Padstow.
PL28 8TQ
Tel: 07811 851987
clerk@stminverhighlands-pc.gov.uk

NDP Working Party Meeting – 24th February 2022

Notes of the NDP Working Party meeting held on the above date.
at The Perceval Institute at 19:00hrs.

Ref		Action
24/02/ 22/WP	Persons Present: Lowlands Representatives: Cllr. B. Gisbourne, Cllr. M. Richards, Cllr. A. Medland (Chair) Highlands Representatives: Cllr. H. Mably, Cllr. N. Mably. Cllr. D. Hutley (standing in temporarily for Cllr. C. Jenrick)	
25/02/ 22/WP	Apologies: Cllr. C. Jenrick.	
26/02/ 22/WP	In attendance: J Wilson, Clerk, and minute taker.	
27/02/ 22/WP	Declarations of Interest / Dispensations applied for from Members: None.	
28/02/ 22/WP	Correspondence Received The following two pieces of correspondence have been received: Request from Highlands PC for more details on boundary changes – email received back from Robert Lacey of Cornwall Council and distributed to all	
29/02/ 22/WP	Details from Colleen O’Sullivan at CC on the housing numbers since 2010 – requested by Cllr C Jenrick and distributed to all.	
30/02/ 22/WP	Discussion The correspondence received from Robert Lacey prompted a discussion on the scope of the review. Robert Lacey confirmed that changes could be made to the development boundaries and other aspects of the NDP but there is a detailed lengthy process to be followed if the parishes decide to go down this route when carrying out the review. The process of how the NDP was researched, written, consulted on and finalised was time consuming. It involved lots of detailed work by both parishes: - There were lots of consultations, both parishes were fully involved, meetings were held, parishioners were consulted. - It was not done for the benefit of individuals – the parishes worked on it together to do the best for the whole of the two parishes and the amount of work that went into it was huge. - It actually started in 2012 and took 4 years to complete. - Everyone had the chance to vote on the NDP and it was supported by the majority of parishioners. - However, this is historic, and it is important to look towards the future. - A lot has changed in the last 5 years eg changes to the number of second homes (up to 69% to 71%) and 8 years would be a long time to wait before making any changes to the NDP to cope with changes that are already happening.	

31/02/22/WP	- It was suggested that the way forward is to work through the document make notes of where we can change it and then revisit and see how these ideas can be brought to fruition. All were happy with this. The correspondence on housing numbers confirmed the importance of having affordable housing available for the local community - Originally there was more land in the plan allocated for building but Cornwall Council felt this was too great, so this amount was reduced – but it still means that there is more than enough land for current and future building requirements. - There is a possibility in the area off Rock Road to get 36 houses built – 50% affordable. Must be permanent residences. - One of the problems with the land is the “hope value” as people are not selling the land on the exception sites but holding out for a better price later on. - The local connection is important. But even though affordable are at 60% of market value here they are still not affordable. - Affordable is needed but there should also be a middle/in between value available so there is a mix – must be a range of properties. - Housing numbers – this was useful to have. - Unless local people are in Band A or B then they are unlikely to be allocated the housing -it could go to someone from a different area. - Affordable housing in the parish should be for people from the parish or working in the parish. This is important as it impacts on the school/numbers of children. To continue the review of the NDP section by section	
32/02/22/WP	The Overview – this is now outdated so will need updating. (Covered in the previous meeting) Section 3: St Minver Parishes Vision (continued) 4. Communication - Mobile and Internet – most places pretty well covered here. 5. Amenities and Historic Sites - There are lots of gravestones that are historic - Trewornan Bridge – covered under transport section. - Councillors agreed that Shilla Mill should have been included as a historic site. - It was proposed that Councillors could consider if there are any other historic sites that should be included. Take this back to each Parish Council for their suggestions - any proposals can be brought to next month’s meeting 6. Development Areas - Using the maps – development outside the development boundary is currently always opposed. The position of the boundary is now to be decided as part of the review process ie will this boundary change? But wherever the boundary is, whether it moves or not, this statement ie that the Parishes will oppose anything that falls outside the boundary, will still hold true. Note – Q class falls outside the scope of this as it is governed by separate government policy. - Cllr N Mably had identified a couple of places that could be included within the boundary that could be used for affordable housing. 7. Housing Everyone agreed that they want to facilitate affordable housing but it’s difficult knowing how to do this successfully.	Add to Agenda for 24 th March
33/02/22/WP		
34/02/22/WP		
35/02/22/WP		
36/02/22/WP		

	• Ninety-four have been completed with more in the pipeline • A lot of housing has been replaced, which is not counted in the totals of new housing. And many have much larger footprints than the original dwellings. • Eg Above Town Close is outside the development boundary - but this could be an exception site that both parishes could support fully. You could make something into an exception site then, in 2030, amend the boundary to include it. • The area has got to move forward but it must benefit the whole parish and especially permanent residents - it needs tweaking. Compare the changes from when the plan was first done to today. • Exception sites have also proved problematic on occasion.	
37/02/22/WP	8. Business • Everyone seems happy with this part of the plan. • One problem area is seasonal staff and the need for housing for them.	
38/02/22/WP	Section 4: Principles of the Plan These can basically stay the same. But regarding principles 3 and 5, it should be noted that:	Note: The Community Governance Review is in progress.
39/02/22/WP	No3 – Provide existing and future residents of the parishes with the opportunity to live in suitable homes whilst maintaining an appropriate balance between permanent residences and second homes/holiday homes – BUT we haven't got this balance at the moment – the percentage of second/holiday homes is high at 69-71%.	
40/02/22/WP	No5 – Control road traffic and vehicle parking and reduce the need to drive by car around the parishes. Have we done enough on this? Could a one way system help with this? Linked cycle routes are important. Could make use of the Quaker access route. There are lots of options for cycling but nothing has been done with any of these so far.	
41/02/22/WP	Section 5: Policies 5.1 Protect and Enhance the character and vitality of St Minver Parishes. It was agreed to keep it as it is	
42/02/22/WP	Policy 1 – Protecting and enhancing the character of the parishes. It was agreed to keep this as is. There is quite a lot about cycle routes, but these are along the coast path and therefore will no longer be achievable. Should they be taken out of the NDP – could consider this if there are other changes to make so as to avoid unnecessary costs.	
43/02/22/WP	5.2 Restrict most substantial Development to the specified development areas This sets out the criteria in which you would move the boundary. There are some exceptions with the land, but it is the people that <u>haven't</u> got land that we need to be thinking about. • Again the policies must benefit the many rather than just a few individuals. • Council housing should be built. • It is more about carrying out the development that is actually included in the plan already. • Do we need to extend the cemetery – probably not as the new cemetery is only half full and the next area is ready to go as soon as it is needed so we don't really need anything else.	

44/02/ 22/WP	Policy 2 - Development Areas All development areas are shown. • If there is an exceptional case that came before either council, then development outside the boundary could take place if it was a benefit to local person/people – if it fulfils all the criteria. • Development may be better at Above Town Close rather than having development at St Minver, fulfilling more criteria. • If land could be sold cheaply enough, it would be possible to build Council Housing in the relevant development area. • Needs to be some give and take. • Playing field – where the hub will eventually be built. • It was generally recognised that the areas that have been highlighted are where development would be most suitable. Will provide the right number of houses. • Area for industrial development is behind Camel fish. There are areas on the map to be developed but the problem is getting people interested in developing it. But is it going to sit there not being used due to people holding out for the hope value? It is viable but just not attractive enough for the developers. • It is people that haven't got land that we need to consider – how to bring people back to the area. • Note: So is this rather about trying to achieve the development of what has been identified as important for the parishes and parishioners rather than just a straightforward review?	
45/02/ 22/WP	Actions: The way forward is to go through the NDP first in order to identify the things that work and those that need tweaks or changes. This will provide the structure for recommendations to be made regarding any changes if needed. No recommendations can be made yet as we haven't finished going through the document yet. So no decisions to be made yet. All agreed.	
46/02/ 22/WP	Items for next Agenda 1. Include any listed buildings that anyone has raised 2. Continue review of sections of NDP 3. Agree date and time of next meeting	
47/02/ 22/WP	Reporting back to Parish Councils Cllrs will report back to each Parish Council meeting on the main points raised at this meeting, using these notes as a guide,	
48/02/ 22/WP	Date of next meeting: Thursday 17 th March 2022 at 7pm in the Perceval Institute.	Revised tom24th March
49/02/ 22/WP	There being no further business, the meeting closed at 20:50 hr.	