

Neighbourhood Plan Group Meeting 7pm 1st September held at 19 Barnes Meadow

Present: Chris Janes (Chairman), Barbara Kidson, John Duffin, Terry Sweeney, Simon Williams,
Lois Wakeman (minutes)

Minutes

1. **Apologies for absence** were received from Neil Pullinger and Glen Broom. Gary Bilbie did not attend.
2. **Last meeting minutes** – there were no formal minutes, but SW's notes on the meeting on 20th May were taken as read, and approved. The June Council meeting minuted the Council's approval of the plan for regulation 14 consultation, but wording needs to be clarified at a future meeting. "50% of the plan needs to be adopted to approve for consultation, Cllr Ostler suggested that the Lime Kiln Lane area on the plan has to be changed. (Proposed Cllr Duffin, seconded Cllr Kidson)" should read "It was resolved unanimously to approve the Plan for regulation 14 consultation and to change the Lime Kiln Lane site on the proposals map to its correct position (proposed Cllr Duffin, seconded Cllr Kidson). At a later stage, there has to be a majority vote in the referendum for the plan to be adopted." The 50% which was originally referred to related to the referendum which comes later in the process. .
3. **Important responses that should be chased up if not received by 5th Sept** SW to chase up his contact in the EA as only auto-responses were received. Housing associations will also be chased up. DCC has not responded even though they had a printed copy and a reminder by email.
4. **Action on comments received so far.** All the comments received as of the date of the meeting were considered, and any resulting actions noted. (See below and Appendix C of the Consultation Statement.)
5. **Next steps.**
 - a. SW/LW will edit and circulate updated version of the plan to the group by next week. The Consultation Statement and Basic Conditions Report also need to be completed. LW to get all UNP info from clerk's computer to do summary of responses for CS, and also compile a table of policies vs NPPF and EDLP references for BCR.
 - b. Next Group meeting to be arranged late Sept. or early Oct., and updates to plan to be approved at Council meeting in October. To facilitate this, Cllrs will receive a printed b/w copy of the updated Plan, a summary schedule of amendments and an electronic (full colour) copy to approve at October meeting. LW to prepare a draft resolution for this including correction to minutes (see 2 above). LW to send copy of August minutes to CJ.

Regulation 14 comments and responses

As discussed at NP meeting.

1. **WDDC.** Comments do not take into account the use of Uplyme facilities (e.g. filling station, school) by Lyme residents, nor reliance by Uplyme on Axminster facilities, so are somewhat one-sided. They have the same housing constraints in Lyme as we do in Uplyme – in an AONB, available sites are outside the BuAB. All the Uplyme sites that might be suitable for Lyme's use are therefore exception sites and would require SEAs – there are no more considered to be available in the village. LRTC was consulted three times and has not responded, therefore it presumably does not see the importance of using Uplyme to fulfil its housing needs. The stated EDLP policy is for working together, and this is quoted in full in the Uplyme Neighbourhood Plan. It is therefore not the remit of the Uplyme plan to fulfil cross-border working in the absence of any higher-tier initiatives, but is the role of EDDC, including the cross-border allocation of affordable housing.

WDDC's comments were therefore noted, with no changes to the Plan proposed.

2. **School.** The preference of the Trustees is for using the current school site for housing when the new one is built, but following discussion, this did not change the view of the group that the site should be proposed as a business centre, so the policy will remain, but comments are noted.
3. **Betterment Properties, Mr J Loosemore and their agents.** The detailed objections to the proposal that plot 17 be allocated as green space were considered at length. In the objections, green space is wrongly confused with public open space, and the NPPF requirements quoted are for local plans, not Neighbourhood Plans. A detailed response to these representations is included as Appendix C of the Consultation Statement.
4. **Mr D Harris** – the suggestion re. road safety measures emerging from the Glen will be added to the Action Plan.
5. **Mr J Stacey, Mr & Mrs Dix, and Mr T Bradley** all expressed objections to the text regarding market housing at Raymonds’ Hill – a small group of houses not out of character with Raymonds’ Hill. This is only a suggestion and not an exception site in the NP, and would be matter for EDDC if a planning application were to be submitted – LW/SW to draft a response for the consultation report.
6. **Mr D Ostler** was not happy with the expressed wish for road safety measures outside “Stanbury”. SW had already proposed some clarifications and amendments to wording of the Transport Policy UTR1 and UTR2 following correspondence with Andrew Ardley of DCC Highways, and it was agreed also to include the alternative of a short footway on the opposite side of the road. LW/SW to draft.
7. **Mr & Mrs B Pratt** had made a blanket objection to the plan on traffic and flooding grounds. This cannot be actioned without clarification of which sections they refer to and so the comments were just noted.
8. **Anon** – anonymous comments, including those making malicious accusations, will be ignored.
9. **Mr & Mrs Shaw** support the plan and question why the BUAB in the Plan (which was agreed with EDDC officers as part of the NP work) is not reflected in the recent EDDC Villages Plan, which omits their house. It is expected that the two may eventually coincide, but at present there is no action the Group can take as the matter will be considered again by EDDC later in September as part of their District-wide report.
10. **Natural England** was very supportive in its response letter to both the Plan and the Strategic Environmental Assessment, and made some minor suggestions. It was agreed to take in their specific comments. LW/SW to action.
11. **EDDC informal officer comments.** T Spurway’s initial comments, and further remarks, had been circulated to Group members before the meeting for review, as they were so extensive. The Group discussed suggestions, and carefully reviewed the original schedule of 11 possible Exception Housing Sites that the Group had assessed as part of the Plan preparation (plus the 12th that already had outline permission) and which had been subject to public consultation in January 2016.

Following this it was agreed that Pound Lane should still not be considered for inclusion in the Plan, for the reasons set out in the previous summary of sites that was discussed at the meeting.

With regard to EDDC’s comment on the Conservation Area, it was agreed that the Proposals Map legend will be clarified to state that the conservation area boundary is illustrative only and subject to EDDC consideration, and the Village Hall will be taken out of it. The Group considered that the comment that the KGV playing fields should not be included in the CA was mistaken, as it was such an important and historic feature forming the backdrop or foreground to many important buildings. It was reported that the inclusion of such areas were in accordance with Historic England Advice.

Policy UHG3 will be amended to include “while in EDLP, this is felt to be of great importance in the plan and worth reiteration”.

Green space table to be amended to say that the KGV Field is *public* open space.

LW/SW to action these and the other minor comments re presentation, grammar etc. which were all agreed and as detailed above or in Appendix C of the Consultation Statement.

12. Notes:

- Historic England and Environment Agency comments were received too late for the meeting. Both broadly supportive, necessary changes were discussed by SW and LW and applied. Other comments that did not require any changes to text were merely noted.
- On 26th September, the Chairman received a deputation of Limekiln Close residents, who wished to object to the BUAB extension proposals. This was well outside the time limit allowed, and they were advised to write to EDDC explaining their observations. Their late representation has, however, been considered and is included, together with a response in the table in Appendix C of the Consultation Statement.