

**NOTES OF THE JOINT INFORMAL MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY POLICY  
DEVELOPMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PLANNING STEERING GROUPS HELD AT  
FOLLATON HOUSE, TOTNES ON 6 DECEMBER 2007**

**MEMBERS**

\* Cllr R J Tucker – Chairman

∅ Cllr N A Barnes	* Cllr M J Howarth
∅ Cllr H D Bastone	∅ Cllr C W Jones
∅ Cllr J Brazil	* Cllr L P Jones
* Cllr B F Cane	* Cllr D W May
* Cllr B E Carson	* Cllr M F Saltern
∅ Cllr S E Cooper	* Cllr R C Steer
∅ Cllr J D Hawkins	* Cllr A Ward
* Cllr T J Hewitt	* Cllr J A Westacott
* Cllr P W Hitchins	

\* Denotes attendance

∅ Denotes apology for absence

Also in attendance:

Cllrs J I G Blackler, M J Hicks, R M Lawrence, R Rowe and J W Squire

Officers in attendance:

All Agenda Items: Head of Community Regeneration, Forward Planning Manager,  
Affordable Housing Manager and Planning and Affordable Housing Officer

**1. NOTES OF THE MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT PLANNING  
STEERING GROUP HELD ON 4 SEPTEMBER 2007**

The notes of the meeting of the Development Planning Steering Group held on 4 September 2007 were agreed as a correct record of that meeting.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members and officers were invited to declare any interests in the items of business to be considered during the course of the meeting but none was made.

**3. AFFORDABLE HOUSING DPD – SUBMISSION STAGE**

Members considered a report which set out the content of the South Hams Local Development Framework (LDF) Affordable Housing Policies (Submission Stage) Document and ultimately sought agreement to its publication to the end of January 2008.

Officers advised that the document was being fast tracked for publication and as a consequence, amendments were still being made to attain a level of soundness. It was intended that this joint informal meeting would provide Members with the opportunity to comment and make suggestions on the document, prior to it being presented for consideration by Council at its 20 December 2007 meeting.

Members proceeded to focus on the Affordable Housing Policies element of the document. Since the publication of the agenda papers, the draft policies had been further amended and were tabled for Member comment. Officers summarised and outlined these proposed amendments which included:-

- Policy AH1 (Affordable Housing Provision) now requiring all housing or mixed use development sites, including sites for a single dwelling, to contribute towards meeting the affordable housing needs of the South Hams;
- A revised sliding scale to calculate affordable housing provision for unallocated sites (Policy AH3 refers);
- Removal in AH4 (On-site/Off-Site Provision) to any specific reference to on-site provision; and
- Reference being included in AH5 (Mix, Size, Type and Tenure) to the need to integrate affordable housing with market housing, with its size and type reflecting identified local needs to contribute towards attaining a balanced housing market.

In discussion, the following points were raised:-

- (a) A number of Members stated their support for this bold approach and welcomed the reinforcing of the policies;
- (b) The fine balance between the need to build houses and receiving contributions towards affordable housing;
- (c) Whilst the view was expressed that the content of Policy AH4 should be strengthened to include a presumption that developers would be expected to provide on-site provision, the majority of Members felt that the amended Policy was appropriate as presented;
- (d) Some Members felt that there was a need for greater clarity and definitions in some areas of the Document (e.g. the inclusion of a definition of the Plymouth Urban Fringe);
- (e) To bolster Policy AH2 (Allocated Sites), Members requested that the word '*expected*' be replaced by '*required*';

- (f) A Member questioned the contrasting affordable housing provisions between Policy AH3 (Unallocated Sites) and Policy AH6 (Rural Exception Sites). In response, officers stated that windfall sites fell within development boundaries, whereas rural exception sites were outside of development boundaries. The justification for approving exception sites against policy was due to their 100% affordability provision, and this made them very difficult to deliver;
- (g) Members requested that for Policy AH2, the Local Centres of Chillington / Stokenham, Modbury, Salcombe and Yealmpton should be included in the target of 55% affordable housing provision, along with the four Area Centres. The Group also felt that the proposed 60% target should be retained in the rural areas, which would help to maintain the required variations and spatial distribution within the Policy.

**PROPOSED**

That the views expressed by the Group be incorporated into the Document prior to it being presented to Council at its 20 December 2007 meeting.

#### 4. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – VERBAL UPDATE

Officers advised that whilst it was initially intended at agenda publication stage that the Group would receive a verbal update, papers had subsequently been circulated to Members for their information. It was noted that any revisions to the Local Development Scheme would require submission to the Government Office for the South West before the end of March 2008.

In discussion, particular reference was made to:

- (a) supporting information. Members felt it would be beneficial to provide supporting information alongside the Local Development Scheme to explain why there had been slippages in the progress of certain documents;
- (b) possible revisions to the consultation process. Whilst still in the very early stages, Members were informed that it had been suggested by Government that the Issues and Options and Preferred Options stages of the process might be replaced by an approach which could necessitate only a single stage, providing there was demonstrably a robust evidence base and satisfactory community engagement;
- (c) the feasibility of increasing resources to meet work demands and potentially address some of the highlighted slippages;

- (d) the Pre-Examination Meeting (PEM) on the Rural Areas DPD. Some Members expressed concern that the PEM had been scheduled to take place during the summer period in 2009. In contrast, the majority of Members felt that at this stage, the PEM should remain scheduled as in the current project plan, but be revisited again nearer the time.

(Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and concluded at 3.20 pm)