**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF LYMPSTONE PARISH COUNCIL HELD AT 7.30PM ON MONDAY 18th MARCH 2019 IN THE VILLAGE HALL.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PRESENT: | |
| **Councillors** | Mrs J Clark (Chairman), Mrs K Rogers (Vice Chairman), P Acca, D Atkins, Miss H Dimond, and Mrs C Ducker |
| **Clerk** | Miss L Tyrrell |
| **County Councillors** | R Scott |
| **District Councillors** | R Longhurst |
| **Public** | 15 members |
| **NP Review group** | Mr S Archer, Cllr D Atkins, Mr N Downes, District Cllr R Longhurst, Mr S Parks Cllr K Rogers, Mr I Stratford and Mr D Tyrrell, |

**207 Apologies**

Cllr Carter, Cllr Corcos, Cllr Hill, Cllr Hilton and Cllr Young

District Cllr B Ingham

County Cllr J Trail

NP review group: Mrs V Drinkwater, Mrs S Briggs, Mr D Morrison and District Cllr B Ingham

**208 To receive any Declarations of Interest**

The Chair asked all Councillors if there were any declarations of interest. She reminded all members that a declaration of interest could be called at any time if one arose.

**209 Neighbourhood Plan Review**

The Chair explained that the purpose of the meeting was for District Cllr Longhurst to update all members on the NP review so far, what had been covered and the progress to date.

District Cllr Longhurst explained the NP review had begun in November 2018. There had been a village meeting on the 24th January 2019. He explained the village meeting had been very successful and well received. He added that in the review there were 6 focus groups:

* Planning (housing),
* Environment
* Social
* Economic,
* Getting around (vehicles and pedestrians) and
* Flood resilience (being led by Cllr Corcos and LFRG).

The full responses from the village meeting were still to be discussed in detail and a NP group meeting is planned for tomorrow for this to be done. He added that from the village meeting the environment had many interested comments and this was being tackled. Cllr Longhurst said that the EET cycle way had not been forgotten but was not being worked on at present due to Mrs Carter’s commitments. The EET group was represented at the meeting and would welcome early and full involvement. Cllr Longhurst suggested that they join the focus group.

Focus groups are for the purpose of listening to a wide range of views, thinking ‘outside the box’ and considering all options available.

Social sustainability in the Parish will be a focus with a presentation planned at the next PC meeting on the 1st April, Cllr Longhurst invited the Church to attend and listen.

In regard to housing needs, nothing had significantly changed as historically, we had been asked to provide 40 houses in the Parish and had met this quota in the current neighbourhood plan. Cllr Longhurst added that this did not mean there wouldn’t be more housing in the Parish as there would always be a need. Cllr Longhurst still felt there should be houses for the young and old. As the parish does not have a current housing needs survey, it was agreed that this should be done during 2019.

**210 Parish Councillor Questions**

Cllr Dimond explained that the Housing Survey was discussed at the last PC meeting and edited by Cllrs, she added that EDDC did not require us to provide more housing. The PC wished to amend the survey. Cllr Longhurst said that this would delay the production of a revised plan until the end of the year.

Whilst the Goodmores Farm development is planned, and the PC should receive the CIL money from the houses. However, Cllr Longhurst believed that the residents at Goodmores Farm would feel themselves more aligned with Exmouth than Lympstone.

Cllr Atkins believed that a major problem was people moving and selling on their affordable house for a market price. Cllr Longhurst added that the problem should be thoroughly researched, and options considered.

A public meeting was proposed with speakers covering Community Land Trusts (and how it has worked in Beer), sustainable energy etc. The Chair explained that she felt the housing need survey had to be done first then once we had the results, a public meeting would be held and discuss the outcome with the public. She was concerned that the NP grant applied for included a sum for a site plan, when no site had been identified and it was not clear even if any site were necessary. Cllr Longhurst explained the site plan would not be done now as there was no need. There was concern that the site originally envisaged was in Woodbury and Cllr Rogers added that we could not use Lympstone money to pay for a proposed development in another parish. The Chair added that she could not see where it was agreed in the minutes of the NP group to use grant money for a site plan, but a development plan had still been carried out. Mr Stratford was unaware of this plan. Cllr Longhurst explained that the development brief belonged to him and should not be seen by the public. He had not disclosed the plans and they would probably not be used.Cllr Dimond pointed out that WPC had not allocated land close to Lympstone for development in their NP .

Cllr Longhurst disagreed with councillors as to who was responsible for the grant money – the Chair said that the PC was the qualifying body, but Cllr Longhurst disputed this and explained that the PC was the stakeholder only. He said the grant could be spent on the NP review and was not the PC’s money. Cllr Longhurst asked what the role of the PC was, and added that if the PC continued the way they were behaving then he would stand down as Chair of the NP review group. He added that the plan should be owned by the people of the village.

The grant cannot be used to pay for the Clerks secretarial time. Cllr Dimond added that the PC had agreed to support with Clerks fees. The Chair thanked Cllr Longhurst and his group for all their efforts and time so far but recognised that there had been no formal terms of reference written for which she apologised. These should be drawn up before the project continues.

County Cllr Scott asked who had applied for the grant in the first instance. The Chair read the grant letter of acceptance which was addressed to Cllr Longhurst. Cllr Scott added that an individual could not apply for a grant it had to be applied for as a PC body. The Chair expressed her concern that this grant application could leave the PC vulnerable, she added that the PC would have agreed to most of what had been requested but questioned the architect fees.

Cllr Longhurst explained that he had to compile a report to the grant body and would not be personally responsible for mistakes made by the council. Cllr Dimond had never seen the grant form to decide upon it. Cllr Longhurst explained he wanted to have this grant completed and then the opportunity to apply for another grant in the new financial year.

The Chair explained that everything seemed muddled. Cllr Longhurst added that the housing need survey was being held up and the NP could not move forward until July. Cllr Dimond added that she had always thought it was impossible to get the NP review done within six months regardless - as it still had to go through the same process as a new plan.

The Chair added that it was still not clear what a CLT was and what it entailed, so a question about it in the housing need survey seemed premature. Cllr Longhurst explained it was a standard Housing needs survey. Cllr Dimond disputed this fact as she had spoken with the Housing need officer and they had informed her that this CLT question had been specifically included. Cllr Ducker enquired whether the survey was a standard form for any PC to use and edit. The Chair explained that a housing need survey was important, and the PC was not necessarily against a CLT, but it needed to be discussed after the survey results.

**211 Public Session**

A resident asked why Cllr Longhurst would assume housing was needed when it hadn’t been discussed and before a housing needs survey had been done. She contended that Cllr Longhurst assumed people had been asked for land and assumed houses were needed?

A resident said that it had been discussed by Cllr Longhurst at Woodbury PC with numbers of houses planned. Could Cllr Longhurst explain why he had discussed it with WPC not LPC.

Woodbury PC had also been told about a development - Cllr Longhurst said options had been discussed at WPC because the land was in Woodbury parish. The Chair was surprised that neither Cllr Longhurst nor Cllr Atkins, who had been at the Woodbury meeting, had thought it appropriate to mention the proposed development at Lympstone’ s meetings. There was no reply from Cllr Atkins and Cllr Longhurst explained that this process was started in November and he had spoken with both Chairs of Lympstone and Woodbury PC about this. The chair wished it to be minuted that whilst she has always expressed an interest in a community initiative as an option for safeguarding housing for parishioners, she had never had a meeting with District Cllr Longhurst about providing housing in the NP review.

Cllr Rogers added that Cllr Longhurst had not mentioned land for development in any NP review group meeting or in his presentation at the village meeting on the 24th January. The Chair added that she had been present at the NP review group meeting on the 15th January and it had not been mentioned.

Another member of the public questioned why this had not been in the public domain when it was in the WPC minutes. He quoted from WPC November 18 minutes then read the WPC January 19 minutes. He felt that Cllr Longhurst had not responded in regard to this. The member of the public went on to add that Cllr Longhurst was responsible to both LPC and WPC and wanted to know where the land Cllr Longhurst was referring to. And had the landowner been approached?

Cllr Longhurst asked for the questions to be repeated which the member of the public declined to do. The Chair began to reread the questions from the member of the public:

* Why has this not been in the public domain?

Cllr Longhurst added that it was not in the public domain.

The Chair interjected and added that there seemed to be a lot of confusion as the comments quoted from WPC November 2018 minutes were written before the NP group was set up. Cllr Longhurst added that you could not put things in the public domain when it had not been decided. Cllr Dimond pointed out that Cllr Longhurst had mentioned this in public at WPC. Cllr Longhurst rebutted that there were two plots of land available. Cllr Dimond asked if Cllr Longhurst had designated somewhere else already. Cllr Longhurst answered that he had and if he had more money another development plan would be done. The Chair added that if there was any land proposed for development then a landowner should first come to the PC to discuss a project.

The Chair went on to read the questions previously asked by the member of the public:

* Why no report has been given by the Councillor to LPC?
* Would the councillor identify the proposed site for development and its owner?
* How far have negotiations progressed?
* Has the owner of the proposed land been approached?

Cllr Longhurst responded and added that he did not know how many houses would be needed. Cllr Dimond added that land should be put forward and assessed for suitability before deciding on suitable land for development.

Cllr Scott added that this NP review seemed to be the wrong way around. Land calls are the responsibility of EDDC and not parish councils and are not part of the NP (they are in the Local Plan). He spoke to Cllr Longhurst directly and explained that he had major questions still to answer. He added that he could not understand that Cllr Longhurst, as Chair to the NP, should be involved in land, especially when it was in another Parish. If the land was in Woodbury, then it should be in Woodbury’s NP. He explained to Cllr Longhurst that he could be seen to be creating a false perception whether it was factual or not. He added that no one on LPC knew what Cllr Longhurst seemed to be doing. Cllr Longhurst explained he reported to the Parishioners. Cllr Scott reiterated, with respect, that Cllr Longhurst was still not answering questions directly. Cllr Scott asked who had applied for the grant money? Cllr Longhurst added that he had applied for the grant on behalf of the PC. However, no PC had seen the grant form.

A resident pointed out that the Courtlands development had been opposed by Cllr Longhurst but now he appeared to be supporting another development.

Cllr Dimond explained to Cllr Longhurst that she still did not understand how he had commissioned a development brief without a housing need survey completed. Cllr Longhurst added that he had hoped the housing needs survey would have been done by now.

The Chair also added that we still had to tackle identifying the people who may have moved out the Parish. She wanted it clarified as how these people would be reached by the housing needs survey. She added that on the back of the Herald was an advert for seven empty affordable rental properties available in the village.

A resident appreciated that Cllr Longhurst had given up a lot of time on this. He understood that you presented a plan and the villagers voted on it. There was not a plan in place for development and felt that certain landowners had been favoured when others hadn’t. There were other ways to produce affordable housing. There were too many people with their own interests at heart. The NP had failed with development in the village and EDDC would not listen to the PC. He suggested that the entire review would possibly need to draw back and re-evaluate the buildings available to tackle any housing issues in a different way.

A resident explained that the EET cycle groups were concerned about the bare mention of the EET (from the village meeting 24th Jan) and was concerned that it was not included in the NP when they had successful meetings with DCC, and it was a key issue in the current NP. The EET groups is keen to be involved. Mr Stratford added that there was a ‘getting around’ focus group planned for the 26th March. Another resident added that from 2010 to last year the trail has doubled in use. Mr Stratford reassured residents that the EET had not been swept under the carpet.

The Chair asked Cllrs for any suggestions as to how to proceed.

Cllr Dimond added that the housing needs survey needed to be done. Cllr Ducker added that a further discussion needed to be held about targeting people who had moved from the Parish and how to include their voice in the survey. Cllr Rogers added that a CLT should be discussed separately to the NP and approved the ‘slimmed down’ survey. Cllr Ducker queried if we could just do our own survey, but Cllr Atkins explained that this survey was of a standard form and would be better received by the authorities.

The Chair proposed that the Housing need survey is started as edited and agreed at the last PC meeting. Cllr Ducker seconded. Unan.

*RESOLVED that the Clerk to email the Housing need survey team with agreed amendments from the last PC meeting and commission the survey on behalf of the PC.*

Cllr Rogers added that the grant money could be sent back in part or in whole, and the NP restarted at a later date. She wanted the grant form checked. Cllr Rogers officially announced that she would step down from the NP review group.

The Chair felt that the NP expenditure had to be reviewed. The PC should go back to the grant body, return the architect’s fee and any unspent money. She also felt there was a place for information events to the public to share initiatives. She added as there would be a new Council in May she proposed it seemed sensible to temporarily suspend the NP and redefine terms of reference and objectives. KR seconded. Unan.

*RESOLVED that the NP review would be suspended until terms of reference were decided at the next meeting.*

Cllr Dimond felt the focus groups and housing need survey should continue. Cllr Acca agreed. Cllr Dimond added that as there is only one NP focus group established ‘Getting around’ (in addition the LFRG and EET) who could continue with their tasks set. Mr Stratford asked who the focus group would now report to? The chair added that the NP would only be suspended. Focus groups could continue. Cllr Dimond added that the PC could discuss any upcoming actions and findings.

Cllr Atkins declared an interest.

A resident queried about the parking and its relationship about the housing. He felt it was not necessary to spend money on a survey. The Chair reminded the resident that this was an outcome from a community forum not decided by the PC or individuals.

The chair reiterated that in the interim suspension that focus groups report to the PC.

The Chair proposed to stop the planned NP village meeting on 25th April. Unan

*RESOLVED that the Clerk to cancel the meeting with the VH on 25th April 2019.*

Cllr Longhurst wanted to know who would complete the grant report. Cllr Dimond added that the PC would now submit the grant response. The Chair proposed that an NP EDDC Officer should come to the new PC and talk to us for terms of reference and lead (and amended housing needs survey). Unan

*RESOLVED that an EDDC NP Officer is invited to speak to the PC or circulate guidance for Cllrs to refer to by the next meeting.*

Meeting closed **9.37 pm**

Chairman: Date: