

**SOUTH MILTON PARISH COUNCIL**  
**NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**  
**Internal Meeting No 14**  
**4 January 2016**  
**RECORD OF DISCUSSION**

**Present**

Tim Lewis (TL) – Chairman

Paula Booker (PB)

Graham Collyer (GC)

Nick Bailey (NB)

Paul Davies (PD)

Nick Townsend (NT)

Phil Baker – SHDC - Apologies

**1. Notes of Last meeting**

The notes of meeting No 13 were approved with reference to Hope Cove parish corrected to South Huish

**2. Matters Arising**

All actions from the meeting on 16 November had been completed, apart from those repeated in the notes below.

**3. Liaison Officer**

At meeting on 16 November, Phil Baker had advised that the SHDC planning office was still working on a housing criteria policy for small communities such as South Milton parish and this could be tweaked to suit South Milton's specific needs – he will keep us informed on progress. **Phil Baker action**

**4. Administrative matters**

NT will re-invite PB to Dropbox. **NT action**

**5. Processing completed questionnaires**

NT will add %'s to the lesser/neutral/greater analyses in the summary results. **NT action**

**6. Themes to be covered in the NP**

TL and NT had met Emma Reece from the National Trust to brief her on the responses to the questionnaire on the Beachouse café, the car park and the beach. NT will prepare a summary of the relevant information from the questionnaire and send this to Emma, subject to agreement from

Marion Brice. Emma advised that the plans for the café are being revised; the hut will be replaced at the car park (on the other side of the entrance); and the car parking places by the café will be removed (except three disabled places) and the area reserved for delivery vehicles. TL & NT reiterated that there was strong opposition to any expansion of the café or car park. **NT action**

GC briefed the meeting on his research for the Introduction/Background to the NP. Inter alia, he had found that according to the available census data, the population had fluctuated between 335 (1891) and 424 (1841) but generally it was around 400. GC will prepare a draft of his findings for the next meeting. **GC action**

Refer to sections below on discussions on specific themes. Before the next meeting, responsible members (see table below) were asked to set out objectives, evidence and potential policy areas for discussion. Once these had been agreed, the relevant sections of the NP would be written.

Theme	Responsibility
Housing	<b>NB</b>
Environment	<b>NT</b>
Coastal management	<b>NT</b>
Economy	<b>PB</b>
Infrastructure	<b>TL</b>
Historical environment	<b>GC</b>
Well being	<b>PB</b>

## 7. Housing Policies

Phil Baker is working on a rural exceptions housing policy and also criteria on housing policy criteria for inside and outside development boundaries; he will provide current drafts. **Phil Baker action**

Most of the meeting was taken up with a broad ranging discussion on housing. The main points of discussion and conclusions were as follows:

- a) The numbers of houses required over the plan period was difficult to quantify because of the demand for second homes. It was agreed that the data collected by GC was the most appropriate for projecting the figure and that the Thurlestone Beach House hotel apartments must be excluded from the projections. It was agreed that the demand for housing to meet local needs (ie excluding second homes) was modest and was unlikely to exceed 15 to 20 houses over the plan period.
- b) It was also agreed that there were adequate infill sites to meet the demand for local needs. Furthermore, several sites were identified where there were opportunities for multi-house developments, some of which could be designated affordable housing. It was however agreed that a policy based on infill development only was unlikely to deliver affordable housing to meet the demand expressed by parishioners.
- c) It was agreed that the best option to ensure that affordable housing was provided under the NP was to find a site of suitable size and location for mixed development, similar to Backshay Close. Housing demand over the plan period would thus be met through a mixture of infill development and development of designated site(s), and policies could be written accordingly.
- d) Potential sites for mixed development were identified and discussed and the following were agreed:

- a. The mixed development site would be needed of an adequate size to make it attractive for potential landowners/developers
- b. Sites on the landward side of the village were preferable because they would have less impact on the environment (visual/heritage coast/SSSI/etc)
- c. A rigorous analysis of the sites would be required but many factors favoured development of a site behind the village hall:
  - i. The central core of the village would be reinforced and ribbon development/village sprawl of other potential sites would be avoided;
  - ii. An opportunity would be created to provide a desperately needed car park for the village hall (high demand identified in responses to questionnaire). Designating a site for this car park might act as a catalyst for the development.
  - iii. It would in effect be infill as it lies between the development at the foot of Hillingsdown and the main road to Kingsbridge/Salcombe
  - iv. Visual impact would be minimal.
- e) For the infill sites, it was suggested that a general policy be drafted to cover criteria related to size, density, materials, access and relationship to the wider context.
- f) A consultant might be employed to prepare outline layouts for any proposed development sites, if funding can be secured.

NB will review his draft of the housing policies for discussion at the next meeting. **NB action**

## **8. Environment**

As discussed in previous meetings the land designations/definitions and policies that apply to our parish are designed to protect the environment. If these were applied rigorously we should be able to meet our objective of sustaining a green parish. These matters would be covered in the narrative of the NP but it would assist decision makers if specific issues important to parishioners were covered by policies in our NP, such as:

- a) Retaining our Devon lanes – a distinctive feature and current provision is sufficient to meet the needs of the parish (see discussion on coastal management below)
- b) Retaining important vistas/views – we have a scenic environment and parishioners and visitors should be able to take in the views. Vistas/views discussed included: gates at foot of Kerse Lane for views across to Collacott and at gate adjacent to Collacott for views across to church – both on the frequently used walk around the village, the latter also on a National Cycle route; Preston Lane for views across the village and to the coast – on a frequently used walk; Hillingsdown for views across the village to the coast – on the National Cycle route; others to be identified.
- c) Identifying development limits where there is an existing clear demarcation between the built and the green environment – such as Primrose Cottage on Links Road; Kerse Lane; Collacott on Horswill Lane.

It was suggested that a policy on light pollution should also be included.

## **9. Coastal Management**

It was agreed that the coastal facilities were in a state of dynamic equilibrium, stretched at peak times but perfectly adequate at all other times. Our NP should include policies to maintain this balance. The car parks were an appropriate size for the beach and both should be retained and neither expanded or reduced in size.

## **10. Infrastructure**

TL reported that he had made some progress on the infrastructure theme including:

- a) Bus service – should be retained
- b) Traffic/parking – status quo, except car park required for village hall
- c) Solar/wind farms – should be banned
- d) Internet – must be improved

## **11. Next meeting**

Next meeting will be held at 10:00am on 18 January 2016 in the village hall.