## NEWQUAY NEIGHBOURHEAD PLAN: WORKING PARTY MEETING

## 11am 21st October 2016 Room 11 Marcus Hill

Present:NTC: Joanna Kenny (notes) John Rainbow, Dave Sleeman,<br/>Margaret North<br/>CRCC: Claire Hurley,<br/>Cornwall Council:<br/>Apologies:Tracy Edwards, Esther Richmond, Colleen O'Sullivan<br/>Ghislaine Gwilliam, Sandy Carter,

ITEM		NOTES	ACTION
1	ADM	IINISTRATION	
	i.	Action points: (long outstanding)	
	•	Working Party Administration, TOR etc : Andy Curtis to progress at Planning Committee.	
	•	Still need Colan refusal letter	
	ii. •	<b>Basecamp</b> Some User Id to new version of Base camp issued – Tracey to check whether all members of Working Party and Steering Group had access and would issue UserIds as necessary.	TE
	•	Colleen had put a first draft policy document for review on basecamp	
	iii.	Budget	
	•	Questionnaire costs looks to be coming out at about $\pounds 8,000$ (Costs to be met out of the $\pounds 10,000$ 'Awards for All' grant leaving the remainder for other events in the formal consultation	
	•	CRCC to produce current spend (including payment of Consultants)	CRCC
	•	CRCC to produce invoice to show how last grant of $\pounds4,600$ spent. Once end of grant report, submitted a new application for the final $\pounds2,400$ available would be submitted to DCLG.	CRCC

	iv Website	
	Link set up to Questionnaire Tracey would set up a meeting with Louise and Joanna and progress updates	TE
2	SCHEDULE FOR PLAN PRODUCTION	
	Local Plan scheduled to be adopted November 22 <sup>nd</sup> . It was agreed that a realistic Plan Production would be:	
	• March/November Landscape Evaluation Phase I, led by consultant Kath Statham. The volunteer teams had reported back to Kath at the September Environment meeting.	
	• View & vistas – suggest photo portfolio, ask public to provide	
	<ul> <li>Landscape Evaluation Phase II – agreed not necessary as no need to find additional areas for development. But we would wish to see development envelopes around Newquay and Tregurrain – maybe Watergate</li> </ul>	C O'S
	<ul> <li>May/November Design Policies – likely to refer existing design documents. Like a post plan project would be the updating of the Shop Front document</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>May/October Economy (plus Tourism and Retail). Individual meetings with interested parties had taken place. Any resulting policies were not seen as headline policies – and may be covered by Cornwall Council's allocation document. Allocation document identifies how targets met but local work, however, indicated we need additional policies for Newquay itself – specifically the old Jewsons site and Prow Park – additionally other sites identified in earlier Restormel documents need to be considered.</li> </ul>	
	• October/December post questionnaire– liaise with statutory bodies – to be identified - and neighbouring parishes on draft policies.	
	• October/December Issue confirmation, analysis of supporting evidence, identify gaps	
	• August/December Policy documentation - CRCC would provide basis and evidence, Cornwall Council to co-ordinate	
	• January/February Formal 6 week public consultation on detailed policies. May need SEA analysis at same time.	

	• As well as events, it had been confirmed that the TIC could house a small exhibition over the winter months	
	<ul> <li>Events and communications funded by 'awards for all' Grant</li> </ul>	
	• March 2017 - submit Plan to Cornwall Council	
	• Statutory consultation end of April	
	Examination May/June	
	• Referendum June /July	
3	SCHOOLS LIAISON	
	A meeting took place in September – topics included encouraging students to complete questionnaire and timing of and arrangements for the Youth referendum.	
4	STEERING GROUP	
	Last meeting took place on 22 June – main topic was a review of the proposed questionnaire. Next meeting to be scheduled after analysis of Questionnaire returns in November.	
5	PUBLIC CONSULTATION	
	• Fish Festival 16 <sup>th</sup> – 18 <sup>th</sup> September: Used to kick off the Questionaire – many thanks to Claire for setting up and the team for manning the stall. Good media coverage.	
	Residents Questionnaire	
	<ul> <li>9 crates of returns so far (about 900 returns) plus around 500 entries online – a large proportion of those being under 18. Estimated to take three or four weeks to enter, any volunteers welcome.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>1300 entries entered so far – largely endorsing the approach discussed</li> </ul>	
	• Final Return date is 21 <sup>st</sup> October but late entries expected	

6	POSSIBLE POLICIES	
	• Feedback from presentations requires each identifiable area (Pentire, Porth, Minor etc) to be covered separately?	
	<ul> <li>Definition of sufficient parking but that would include available street parking – any difference for HMOs? needed written evidence of need</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>HMOs – consider policy being developed in Falmouth – a problem if over 30% (say) in any street –Article 4 direction</li> </ul>	
	• Urban Design – refer to separate guide; can talk about size, sustainable/energy efficiency. Also a section on local climate conditions – salt, wind etc. E.g. Materials, Poor quality gate fixings fail in the wind?	
	• Garden Grabbing – difference between gardens not in the public eye and those which contribute to the open nature of particular areas –or required to protect drainage?	
	<ul> <li>Environment – Clifftop protection a key target (including 1,000 person response to planning questionnaire) – follow up in Local Plan examination on how Neighbourhood Plans could specify coastal management area.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Development Envelopes seem an acceptable approach – need also for Tregurrian and Watergate</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Hotels and their setting – report had been upgraded. Are there any areas where Hotels should not be replaced by housing (eg Narrowcliff?)</li> </ul>	
	• Economy – need for start up business space (conflicts with saved Restormel policies?)	
	<ul> <li>Infrastructure – still the most commonly raised concern by residents. Possibly look at policy once minimum housing numbers reached that future developments prove they don't exacerbate infrastructure problems – discussed with James at Steering Group, no real ideas. This is such a key issue for residents, Plan will have to deal with it – a recent appeal noted that anecdotal concern is not enough, needs hard evidence of under capacity. Kingsley informally confirmed they anticipated a pharmacy and/or surgery as part of their development. Need to limit plan to what it can do – and refer out to other initiatives, particularly in NHS, 'Living Well' 'Starting Well' and other initiatives.</li> </ul>	
7	<b>NEXT MEETING</b> As normal third Thursday of month at 11am	
	17 <sup>th</sup> November	