



NORTHAM TOWN COUNCIL
TOWN HALL
WINDMILL LANE
NORTHAM
DEVON
EX39 1BY

To: All Members of the Neighbourhood Plan
Advisory Group
Cc: All Northam Town Councillors

Town Clerk: Mrs Jane Mills MILCM
Telephone and Fax: 01237 474976
E-mail townclerk@northamtowncouncil.gov.uk

You are hereby summoned to attend a Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Group Meeting on Monday 31st January 2022 at 3.30pm, to be held on Zoom.

Topic: Northam Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
Time: Jan 31, 2022 03:30 PM London

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85012887808?pwd=VDA4eVNkMHdxa1IhaHVMeGNsRHRFZz09>

Meeting ID: 850 1288 7808
Passcode: 218945

The Agenda for the meeting is set out overleaf.

Members of the public will be admitted at the start of the meeting.

M J Mills

Mrs Jane Mills Fd Community Governance MILCM, PSLCC
Town Clerk

Date of issue: 26th January 2022

The following are Members of the Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Group:

Councillors Hames (Vice Chairman), Chalmers, Mrs Hodson, Laws and Sargent
(two vacancies for Northam Ward elected members).

Non-Councillors, Mr G Allen, Ms Bartleman, Ms J Smart.

All Members of the Council are entitled to attend.



Lords of the Manor



The local Council for Appledore, Northam, Orchard Hill and Westward Ho!
Twinned with Mondeville, France and Biddenstedt, Germany
Office open: Monday to Friday mornings



Trustees of the Common Right

AGENDA

- 1 **Apologies**
- 2 **Chairman's announcements**
- 3 **Declarations of interest:**
Members are reminded that all interests should be declared prior to the item being discussed.
- 4 **To agree the agenda as published**
- 5 **To confirm and sign the minutes of the meeting held 21st December 2021**
(herewith)
- 6 **Public Participation**
Members of the public are permitted to make representations, answer questions and give evidence in respect of any item of business included in the agenda. Each member of the public is entitled to speak once only in respect of business itemised on the agenda and shall not speak for more than 4 minutes. The period of time which is designated for public participation in accordance with standing orders shall not exceed 20 minutes.
- 7 **To consider the action points** *(herewith)*
- 8 **To consider the report on the readiness of V2.5 of the Northam Neighbourhood Plan and the recommendations therein, received from Mr G Townsend of planning Partnership Ltd.** *(herewith)*
- 9 **To consider the proposed wording for POLICY: ED2 TOURISM ATTRACTIONS AND ACCOMMODATION** *(herewith)*

Northam Town Council – Minutes of the Northam Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Group Meeting held by Zoom on Tuesday 21st December 2021

Present: Cllrs Hames (Vice-Chairman), Mrs Hodson, Laws and Sargent.
Non-Councillor Members: Mrs J Smart.

In attendance: Mr G Langton – Deputy Town Clerk.
Two members of the public.

2112/952 Apologies
Apologies were received from Mr G Allen.

2112/953 Chairman's announcements
The Chairman had no announcements, other than wishing the members Season's Greetings.

2112/954 Declarations of interest:
Members were reminded that all interests should be declared prior to the item being discussed.

2112/955 To agree the agenda as published
It was **resolved** to agree the agenda as published.
Proposed: Cllr Laws, Seconded Cllr Sargent (all in favour)

2112/956 To confirm and sign the minutes of the meeting held 23rd November 2021
It was **resolved** to confirm the minutes of the meeting held 23rd November 2021.
They would be signed at a later date.
Proposed: Cllr Sargent, Seconded: Cllr Laws (majority in favour)

2112/957 Public Participation
It was announced that members of the public were permitted to make representations, answer questions and give evidence in respect of any item of business included in the agenda. Each member of the public would be entitled to speak once only in respect of business itemised on the agenda and should not speak for more than 4 minutes. The period of time which is designated for public participation in accordance with standing orders shall not exceed 20 minutes.

One member of the public addressed the Committee, thanking the Deputy Town Clerk for his work, though he noted the business policy text had not been updated to reflect the most recently agreed wording. Concern was noted that the Tourism policy might benefit from review and revision. or He also brought the Groups attention to stylistic and typographic issues that could cause confusion for the reader

Cllr Hames thanked him for his contribution.

2112/958 To consider the action points.
The action points were noted.

2112/959 To consider the Key Steps as circulated
The Group discussed the aim would be to have completed steps 6 & 7, meaning the draft Neighbourhood Plan would be ready for pre-submission consultation by the end of March 2022.

- 2112/960 To receive the response from TDC Conservation Officer regarding the rights and responsibilities placed on the owner of a listed building.**
It was **resolved** to suspend standing orders to hear the views of a member of the public.
Proposed Cllr Laws, Seconded Cllr Hames (all in favour)

The member of the public commented that the inclusion of Richmond Dock was not originally intended to strengthen any listed or conservation area status but to determine the possible future uses of the site.

It was **resolved** to reinstate standing orders.
Proposed Cllr Hames, Seconded Cllr Laws (all in favour).

The Group noted that the future use of the Richmond Dock site would impact any development proposals for the site and that this could be included within the Plan.

The Group agreed that the working sub-group would consider the inclusion of a section that considered the development of the areas along Appledore's historic and current working quayside, as far south as Appledore Shipyard, which could include the development of Richmond Dock as a heritage site.

Action point: Working Sub-Group to include this review at its January 2022 meeting.

Mrs J Smart left the meeting at this juncture.

- 2112/961 To consider a draft *Public Parking* policy and associated wording**
The Group agreed that the working sub-group would consider the wording and detail of this section and policy.

- 2112/962 To receive the reviewed and revised Northam Neighbourhood Plan v2.5.**
It was **resolved** to suspend standing orders to hear the views of a member of the public.
Proposed Cllr Laws, Seconded Cllr Hames (all in favour)

The member of the public commented that the wording of the 2nd sub policy in policy ED2 (Tourism Attractions and Accommodation) was unclear and implied to the reader that development could happen in the undeveloped spaces between settlements.

It was **resolved** to reinstate standing orders.
Proposed Cllr Hames, Seconded Cllr Laws (all in favour).

The Group discussed the semantics of the statements and agreed to review at the working sub-group and to receive alternative text from Mr Arnold.

Action point: Working Sub-Group to include this review at its January 2022 meeting.

2112/963 To consider engaging planning consultant to continue his work with this Group to review the emerging draft Neighbourhood Plan, at a cost of £175 over the budgeted figure for his work.

It was **resolved** to make contact with Mr G Townsend to establish his availability to review the Plan and submit a written report by the end of January 2022 and that should he be able to, to engage him for the cost of £375, that being £175 over the budgeted cost for his work this year.

Proposed: Cllr Hodson, Seconded: Cllr Sargent (all in favour).

Action point: Deputy Town Clerk to make contact and engage Mr Townsend's services if he was available.

2112/964 To consider when it would be appropriate to pass the draft, emerging Neighbourhood Plan document to Torridge District Council for review and comment.

This item was deferred to the January 2022 meeting of the Steering Group.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 16:17pm

Signed Dated.....

Northam Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Group

Action Points

Arising from 09 Sept 2021:

18. Deputy Town Clerk to research and present suitable wording for a Public Parking policy to present to a future meeting of the group.	Submitted to December 2021 meeting. The sub-group has been unable to meet.	complete
---	--	----------

Arising from 21 Sept 2021:

23. Deputy Town Clerk to seek clarity regarding the need to comply with the European Union Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive, if it had been taken into to UK law, or had been superseded.	As updated at the December 2021 meeting: In common with other legislation, this has been subsumed into UK law with no amendments.	complete
---	---	----------

Arising from 21 Dec 2021:

28. The working sub-group to consider the inclusion of a section that considered the development of the areas along Appledore's historic and current working quayside, as far south as Appledore Shipyard, which could include the development of Richmond Dock as a heritage site.	The sub-group has been unable to meet, though it is on the group's agenda for discussion.	complete
29. The working sub-group to consider wording submitted by a resident for policy ED2.	Submission received and included on the January 2022 agenda for consideration.	complete
30. Send NNP draft v2.5 to G Townsend for comment and report.	Completed and report on the agenda.	complete

Northam Neighbourhood Plan

Review of draft v2.5 January 2022

COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC TEXT

2.2 Whether 3 or 4, I suggest you refer to main communities, otherwise those in hinterland between feel left out.

2.3 Reflecting the 3 or 4 issue, why not just say "...area, as shown on the plan on p6."

2.6 Suggestion: "The NNDP is based....." adding at the end "If approved at referendum it will become part of the statutory Development Plan alongside the North Devon & Torridge Local Plan 2021-2031 and be used to shape future development in Northam parish."

2.12 Suggestion: "...the Plan will be put before an independent Examiner, who may recommend any amendments they feel are necessary to make the plan meet the basic tests set by government. The final plan will then go to a referendum of local residents. If a majority of those who vote support it then it becomes made (adopted)."

2.14 Suggestion: "The overarching priority must be to ensure that any new development is delivered in a way that protects the environment....."

"Any development should...." I think **must** do so (by the method stated) is too restrictive.

3.1 "...connection **and** a strong..."? Minor grammatic point, but think it reads better.

List of Policies

I know you've not finalised the style yet, but I'd suggest something along the lines of: "Policies are grouped under 4 main headings, with transport related policies split between those headings as appropriate." so then all Housing are HO apart from TR1, all Environment and Heritage are EH apart from TR2 and all Economic Development are ED apart from TR3, otherwise it risks people not being clear where to look for what. Whether Richmond Dock goes in EH or ED depends on the priority of its purpose.

4.8 I'd say, "Protection of community facilities...." rather than all facilities, as the "all" invites the need to define what facilities are referred to.

The impact of seeking designation as an asset of community value shouldn't be over played, as it isn't a complete bar to development. Hart DC have a useful summary which reads:

What is an Asset of Community Value?

An Asset of Community Value (ACV) is land or buildings nominated by a Town or Parish Council or certain local voluntary or community groups and which the Council decides meets the requirements to be listed as an asset of community value. Listing as an ACV gives the local community an opportunity to make a bid for the asset when it comes up for sale.

To qualify as an ACV the actual current (or recent past) use of the nominated land or building must further the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community. It must also be

realistic to think that there can continue to be non-ancillary use of the land or building that will further the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community.

Assets of Community Value might include:

village shops

libraries

public houses

playing fields

community centres

What is the implication of listing as an Asset of Community Value

Once listed as an Asset of Community Value, the local community will be informed if they are put up for sale within the five-year listing period. If they express a wish to do so, local community interest groups then have the chance to 'pause' the sale for a period of 6 months so they can prepare to bid for it, known as the Community Right to Bid.

The property cannot be sold within this 6-month period, but at the end of this time the owner still has the right to sell to whomever they choose.

CF1 Likewise CF1 (i) may need to be altered along similar lines.

"Community Facilities should be protected from loss through the planning process where there is evidence of ongoing demand and community value. The Town Council may seek their listing as Assets of Community Value where necessary and appropriate."

5.3 I think for this to flow it needs ".....people, it is necessary to bring greater...."

5.5 Think the last line needs policies (plural) rather than policy.

HO3 I am concerned that this may be over prescriptive in some of its detail. Separation distances for instance may not be achievable or even appropriate in conversions or brownfield sites in the centres of settlements.

The Local Plan has policies on Amenity (DM 01) and Design (DM 04) that should enable unsatisfactory proposals to be resisted. Is there evidence from research and consultation that these specific requirements command widespread public support or represent areas of particular concern? Does HO3 add anything to the NDTLP?

5.29 Old policy references need replacing.

HO5 1.c Suggestion: refer to orientation of accommodation rather than dwelling. No point insisting on a south facing elevation if the living room's not on it.

TR 1 Again, I have concerns about the prescriptive nature of the policy. An appropriate level of parking in the centre of a settlement close to a regular bus service may differ from a fringe of settlement housing estate with no nearby public transport links. Developments providing green travel plans designed to reduce private car dependency may not meet these standards. Croyde has a particular problem with on-street parking and wanted to prevent any worsening of the situation, but the Georgeham NP opted for the more flexible "it will be a requirement that the property has adequate off-street parking, suitable for the number of people who could occupy the property".

6.9 Green wedge policy is NOR 10

EN2 I'd try saying "refused" rather than strongly resisted, with the caveat "unless it can be shown that the development cannot reasonably be located outside of these areas."

6.13 Suggest: "Where, exceptionally, development....."

EN3 The opening paragraph and point ii repeat one another. Point v could move to EN2 as suggested above.

EN4 opening sentence "...harm the **views** identified..."

TR3 vi replace "resisted" with "unacceptable"

Appledore Shipyard policy – how up to date can this be made?

GENERAL COMMENTS

I have concentrated on the policies and supporting text rather than appendices and supporting documentation.

I think the grouping of policies within themed headings is beneficial. It may help focus minds in any final review of policies and text to set out visions for each section and then challenge policies as to whether they contribute towards that vision.

Where policies list criteria for instance saying when development will be supported it is vital to not just have a list of stand-alone statements – they should either have OR or AND between them, so that those looking to use the plan for the determination of applications are clear whether meeting any one of the criteria will make the policy supportive or whether they all need to be met.

My overall impression is that the structure of the plan is much better now that it has been reviewed and the policies re-grouped. Being completely honest I still think it is too long and could be focussed down rather more. I don't come away from having read it with a clear vision of what is wanted for Northam. I get quite clearly what isn't wanted, but whilst necessary to a degree, that isn't what the document should really be about.

My overarching suggestion is to go through the document being ruthless – asking whether what's there adds anything to what the local plan already says and is useful in assisting the decision maker. Some areas are more aspirational, but don't necessarily link directly to what the planning process can deliver. If you are saying that you want to promote improvements to facilities or environmental assets, then this needs linking directly to having a list of projects that developer contributions will be requested for.

The strongest sections are where local plan policies are referenced and you explain what it is you want to add to those policies to address specific issues. That is where NPs are generally strongest.

I think that discussing the draft with Torrington DC is appropriate in order to see if they think, following the discussions held with them by Guy and myself last year, that you are heading in the right direction with the restructure. The NDTLP is under review at the moment with the target being to have that review concluded and submitted for an Inspector's approval by

October 2023. It may well be that TDC would be happy for any revisions needed in respect of Northam to come forward through the NP rather than the local plan review.

The discussions with TDC will help with getting a document that will deliver what you want when put into the hands of development management officers to use when determining applications. The examiner will only make suggestions for any changes that are necessary to ensure the basic conditions are met, not to help deliver a better plan (or at least that is meant to be the extent of their authority, though some examiners do seem to exceed it). The basic conditions are essentially that the NP contributes towards sustainable development, is compatible with national policy and Sec. Of State guidance and is compatible with the strategic policies of the local plan.

I hope these comments are of assistance in finalising your draft plan. Please do raise any queries that may arise with me.

Graham Townsend

20th January 2022

POLICY: ED2 TOURISM ATTRACTIONS AND ACCOMMODATION

i. Within the defined settlement development boundaries, proposals for sustainable tourism attractions, leisure developments, a diverse range of new tourist accommodation, and associated tourism facilities and services will be supported where they do not detract from the character of the area or affect protected landscapes, residential amenity, **environmental** or heritage assets.

ii. **Within the area defined on Map B2 a-c**, proposals for new or extensions to existing tourism attractions **or tourism accommodation** will be supported provided:

(a) They cannot reasonably be located **outside the area defined on Map B2 a-c**.

(b) **In the case of tourism accommodation**, they are for the reuse or conversion of existing buildings; **and**

(c) **Proposals** comply with **policies EN2, EN3 and ND and T** Local Plan policy DM17.

iii. **Outside the defined settlement development boundaries and** the area defined on Map B2 a-c, proposals for new or extensions to existing tourism attractions **or tourism accommodation** will be supported provided:

(a) **They** cannot reasonably be located within settlement development boundaries; **and**

(b) **Proposals** comply with **NDandT** Local Plan policies DM17 and **DM18**.