

## Mylor Neighbourhood Development Plan

### Minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2021 at 7pm by Zoom.

**Present:** Jane Moss (Chair), Pat Willmore, Jonathan Griffin, James Robinson, John Killick, Tim Brighton, John Adams, Michael Brougham, Pat Farrell, Beccy Brougham

**In attendance:** Councillors Myers, Munro-Lott, Perry, Polglase and Mooney  
Jan Robson  
18 other attendees

<b>1</b>	<p><b>Introduction – JA</b> Introduced himself as host and set out some zoom protocols. Meeting will be recorded. Video recordings will be erased after the minutes are approved. Audio recordings will be retained for a longer period. <b>Jane Moss - Chair</b> Welcome to all members of public and representatives of MPC. This will be a working meeting.</p>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Apologies for absence</b> Cllrs Pashley and Vinnicombe</p>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Declarations of Interest.</b> John Adams (NDP SG Communications Group Joint Lead (Advisory)) Saltbox Close resident. Tim Brighton (NDP SG Transport Group Lead) Saltbox Close resident. Pat Farrell (NDP SG Environment Group Lead) lives near Saltbox Close. Nicholas Trefusis (interest in Saltbox Close)</p>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Record of Previous meeting and admin points – Pat Willmore</b> It was <b>Proposed</b> by John Adams, <b>Seconded</b> by Pat Farrell and <b>agreed</b> that the minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2021 be approved as a true record of the meeting and signed by Pat Willmore on behalf of the Chair.</p>
<b>5</b>	<p><b>Progress of Mylor Development Plan – Michael Brougham</b> MB screen shared the updated project plan. Constructed following an agreement on joint working between MPC and SG on the basis of which MB agreed to return as Project Manager. Integrated approach between MPC and SG is essential. SG is currently undertaking work on comments arising from REG14 consultation on behalf of the PC. MPC will make final decision on any changes to be made as a result of the comments. The consultant has written a report on these comments from the perspective of a professional planner but it should not be forgotten that the plan is also an exercise in local democracy. There are 2 further stages after this. Once MPC has submitted the final agreed draft to Cornwall Council for compliance checking, there will be a further 6 week public consultation. Then there is an independent inspection culminating in a referendum. The original authors of the plan's sections have considered the relevant comments. MB will draw their responses into a single document for further scrutiny by the authors (next week). The resulting working document will be presented to MPC for consideration and approval. Currently the group is dealing with non-contentious issues. The 2 meatier issues (see agenda item 6) need further discussion leading to position papers for MPC to consider. The consultation statement concluding with the decision matrix for the REG14 comments and the Basic Conditions Statement are still to be written. Following MPC agreement MB and JG will draft the textual changes to the plan.</p> <p>This work is very detailed and professional calling on the considerable experience of those who have worked on the plan for 3 years and is being carried out on behalf of MPC. There was an agreement for joint working. The SG has adhered to this but MPC has not. There have been 2 meetings of MPC to discuss the REG14 comments. This work should be carried out by SG. MPC</p>

has been wasting its time. MB was debarred from attending the second of these PC meetings which certainly does not suggest co-operation and collaboration. MPC and SG are interdependent when it comes to completing the plan. MPC's current actions are threatening the completion of the plan. MB requires from the Chair of the PC, now, an absolute assurance that MPC will support full co-operation. If that is not forthcoming then MB and the SG will not continue working on it.

**JM** – endorses MB's comments. Accepts it may be a hard message for MPC but we have held off saying it for a long time. SG is aware of ex parish councillors and associated people who are undermining the SG and this will no longer be tolerated. Invites RM to respond.

**RM** – pleased to see MB back as Project Manager. His work is greatly appreciated. Disappointed that SG feels so aggrieved. Cannot speak categorically at this stage for MPC but speaking on his own behalf and on behalf of some fellow councillors he is fully supportive of NDP SG and will endeavour to work in co-operation. MPC wants NDP to succeed. KP's work as liaison with SG is proving hugely beneficial. Distasteful articles in Falmouth Packet and on Facebook were nothing to do with MPC.

**JM** – verbal response is reassuring but SG looks forward to receiving a formal letter of assurance.

**KP** – Endorses what has been said by RM. Feels that the PC meetings so far have been more tailored to educating themselves on the issues.

**PML** – Endorses comments made by RM and KP.

**Beccy Brougham** - Expressed dismay at the negativity of the Facebook comments on the Flushing News site. This is unbelievably upsetting. She is not prepared to carry on in this atmosphere. The posts are often ill-informed, inaccurate and basically unkind and are causing deep concern to some residents.

**James Robinson** - Would like reassurance that MPC's attitude has changed following the disappointing snub to MB. Wishes to reiterate that NDP is fully supportive of TM2 but the timescale/particulars of this development are outside the remit of the NDP and are the responsibility of MPC.

**JM** – grateful to KP for posting onto the FB page a factual statement on TM2 progress.

**RM** – explained that he had not followed protocol so should not have invited MB in the first place. Gave assurances no similar situations will arise. TM2 is a PC project and outside of the remit of the NDP. There was unfortunate confusion at the PC meeting on Tuesday. A letter of support has now gone to Sam Irving from MPC.

**PW** – has seen some of the facebook posts. Could details of NDP website be posted so that any questions or anxieties can be answered accurately by the people who have the information rather than by the ill-informed or those antagonistic to the plan. A sad and unforeseen consequence of all this negativity is the potential fracturing of this community we are working to protect and enhance.

**JM**- responses have been made to people on FB by SG members with the request that they be shared. The fact that they have not been shared is worrying.

**FF** – needs to be an urgent meeting of MPC to agree co-operative working. MPC needs to give people a steer on their position.

**NT** – Flushing anxiety is that TM2 will go ahead before a Mylor Bridge development and therefore Mylor Bridge people will get the Flushing houses.

**JG** - had not been aware of this. Not a matter for NDP. MPC is responsible for developments.

**MB** - a lot of misinformation being put out. Of particular concern is a post saying developments are being held up until the plan is made. There is no connection between the plan and the developments. The notion is utter rubbish.

6  
A

**Special Topics – Michael Brougham**

**To discuss the scope of the 2<sup>nd</sup> homes policy issue.  
(RM left the meeting at 8pm)**

**THE 2<sup>ND</sup> HOMES ISSUE (NDP POLICY H4) - IN A NUTSHELL**

*In the main NDP survey 86% of the community wanted a way of reserving new homes for full time residents.*

*We therefore included a Principal Residence Requirement (PRP) – the ‘St Ives policy’ – for Flushing only in the original draft of the NDP. CC warned us that this would need proof rather than anecdote; without this, the policy would fail at examination. Good evidence would include things like business failures or empty school places. CC also advised that the policy would mean that the parish would drop one house price value Zone to Zone 2 with the result that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on new developments (except affordable homes led Policy 9 developments) would be halved. Future Policy 9 developments would also require only 40% affordable homes, rather than the 50% currently required for Zone 1.*

*In discussions before the Regulation 14 consultation, the Parish Council decided to extend the policy to the whole parish, despite the lack of evidence and the effect on the CIL. This was mainly because it was felt better to reflect the views of parishioners and let the examiner decide.*

*In their Regulation 14 response, Cornwall Council commented along the lines that:*

*In much of the village of Mylor Bridge the proportion of unoccupied households is below the Cornwall average of 11.4% ... In Flushing the majority of the village is slightly above average (16.4%) – and the area along Trefusis Road and out to Lime Kiln Quay has a higher proportion (31.5%), but this is still not comparable to hotspots like The Roseland, central St Ives and St Minver where 50-60% is recorded.*

*The policy will not apply to affordable properties which will be tied by a legal condition, to be occupied by those with a local connection.*

*The proportion of open market houses on a Policy 9 site would be likely to increase, because of a banding change.*

*The Parish Council would reap less income from the very few houses that had to pay CIL (only infill and replacement developments).*

*The policy is not justified by the evidence (not just the figures, but the impact on local shops and services) and, because of the NDP strategy, which is not planning for significant additional open market housing, it will not come into play on many applications.*

*The Consultant’s advice was: ‘I would suggest following the CC advice. They have significant experience with PRP policies, including those in Plans proposed and have been deleted by the Examiner. You could leave it in of course but it seems likely that an Examiner will see exactly the issue described by CC. PRPs tend to be more effective when there is a good supply of market housing coming forward and it would seem that a PRP policy would not apply in many circumstances anyway given your focus on affordable exception sites.*

*If the Plan is to continue to push to include a PRP, further evidence would likely be required.*

*One thoughtful respondent commented:*

*‘I do not see the point of this policy for Mylor Bridge and Flushing – it will only apply to brand new homes – how many rich people want a new home as a second home? They want to buy a quaint cottage in the one of the prettier parts of Flushing, for example, or in a tranquil rural setting. This policy will do nothing to stop them doing that as it does not apply to existing housing stock. The downside is that the parish will be penalized by Cornwall Council if this policy is brought in, because under the CIL rules, Mylor will drop down from Zone 1 to Zone 2 for house price band. So,*

*the Parish Council is gaining little or nothing and potentially losing a lot (plus the examiner will delete it anyway).*

This briefing paper was issued to inform this scoping exercise.

The work now required is to consider whether to retain the principle residence requirement or rethink it. A position paper will be written for the PC setting out all the pros and cons.

**FF** - LSE has produced a recent paper which concludes that the 'St Ives policy' actually deters developers and the net effect is that the price of existing housing stock increases making it even more unattainable for some locals. FF recommends that the SG reads this paper.

**Beccy Bromley** – 2<sup>nd</sup> homes have certainly had an impact in Flushing with people being priced out of the market.

**MB** – stressed that there is nothing to be done about existing properties being bought as 2<sup>nd</sup> homes.

**JA** – confirmed that the response against 2<sup>nd</sup> homes in the surveys was robust and fairly even across Mylor B and Flushing. The NDP has done its best to satisfy the wishes of the community using the St Ives judgement but it now seems that CC and the government have moved the goalposts.

**BB** – does leaving the policy in affect money available to the Parish?

**MB** – as things currently stand, having this policy in the plan, will cause Mylor to be moved down from zone 1 to zone 2 and the CIL from new developments (excluding affordable homes developments) will be reduced by 50%. This is a strategic plan until 2030 and including the policy may result in a reduction of the number of affordable houses built on policy 8 sites further down the line. If the Parish is committed to building affordable homes it would be beneficial to remain in zone 1.

**PP** – agreed that the view of the PC was to follow the will of the community. Pros and cons are needed to make a fully informed decision. Alternative solution might be to try to ensure higher taxation for second homes owners to directly benefit the community.

## **B To discuss the scope of the Mylor Bridge direction of growth issue.**

### ***PREFERRED DIRECTION OF GROWTH (NDP POLICY H1 AND H2) – IN A NUTSHELL***

*The starting point was a substantial consensus that additional open market homes were neither wanted nor needed.*

*We had a choice between Allocating sites (which would automatically become Policy 8 open market led developments inside the settlement boundary with a **target** of 50% affordable homes, or alternatively relying on Policy 9 Exception sites outside the established settlement boundary, with a target of 100% affordable homes and a **minimum** of 50%, so a much higher proportion of affordable homes. However by the rules this meant that we could not dictate where development should take place.*

*We were allowed, however, to give maximum weight to community preferences. As Policy 9 developments could happen even if we allocated sites, we chose to rely on the Exception Sites strategy, drawing up reasons why in the view of the community, some sites should be preserved for environmental reasons such as wildlife, visual appeal, effect on the AONB etc. and some sites were preferred for development to meet the need for affordable homes.*

*Following the Housing Preferences Survey, and exhibitions for the community, we drew up a map showing a summary of the results as sites for preservation in a 'preferred directions of growth' for the two settlements, and sites as priority for preservation. To avoid bias, no information was provided on the suitability or availability of sites from a development standpoint. The unprompted*

overall community preference was for a logical extension of the recently built affordable homes developments at Tregew Meadow and Robert Rundle Way. These maps, showing the preferred direction of growth, have since been quite widely interpreted as attempting to allocate specific sites for development, which was never the intention, since the NDP cannot allocate such sites as they are Policy 9 exceptions to the Plan. Hence clarification is needed in the final submitted NDP.

Cornwall Council's comment on the NDP, in summary, was:

*'The policy wording suggests that exceptions sites would only be considered within the preferred direction of growth. Local Plan Policy 9 sets out the criteria against which an exceptions site proposal would be considered. This is a strategic policy which NDP policy cannot override, so if there is established housing need, Cornwall Council must consider proposals against Policy 9 and if the criteria are met, any suitably located site could be approved.*

*It's fine for the NDP to report evidence of community consultation and preference – but be careful not to raise expectations of control beyond the remit of the NDP. I suggest the reference to the preferred direction of growth is moved to the supporting text.'*

*The Consultant (Stuart Todd) has also produced advice on the approach we should have adopted if we had intended to allocate sites in any specific direction as below: (but we had no such intention) .*

- *We should have started with the sites mentioned in CC's SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) which had all been through a technical assessment.*
- *All the possible sites on the edge of the settlements should have been subject to a feasibility & technical assessments before being put before the community.*

*We did look at the 2012-2015 SHLAA sites (see Housing Preferences Appendix) but noted that they had been derived from a 'call for land' originally in 2009 and had never been put before the public. As the Whites' had not put their land forward, such an approach would have excluded Robert Rundle extension sites altogether. We also noted the caveat that the SHLAA was not intended as a development plan, but as a demonstration to the government of a 5, and a 10-year land supply.*

*Our approach was strategic: to look at where the community wanted the villages to expand and work with this. Our intention was true to the NDP as an exercise in local democracy "allowing the people to have their say", but the NDP is primarily a policy based, rather than a site based document. The NDP needs to more precisely reflect this.*

This briefing document had been issued to inform this scoping exercise.

Discussions on this will lead to a position paper.

**Beccy Bromley** - resident of TM1. There are concerns surrounding sites and that the results came from a restricted survey.

**JA** – responses to the survey question as to whether people were willing to participate in focussed surveys ruled out a large number of people. The responses of those surveyed on sites could however, be extrapolated using set parameters, to ensure a representative and robust result.

**James Robinson** – MPC is the statutory consultee on planning and wished to strengthen its hand with an NDP both strategic and strong on policy. The overriding view of the community when surveyed was that there was no further need for open market housing but that affordable housing was wanted. This plan should be relevant for the next 10-20 years.

**MB** - discussions on this issue should include different types of developer and different types of affordable homes. CC builds using its Housing Revenue Account; community land trusts offer subsidised support; self-build programs can be very successful.

	<p><b>KP</b> – Parish Councillors are still going through the Reg 14 comments and recognise that there is need for affordable housing, protection of the AONB environment and a curb on open market developments and that the plan needs to be strategic.</p> <p><b>FF</b> - has been trying to address the disconnect between policy 9 (exception sites) and policy 23 (preservation of the AONB). This should be taken up with CC.</p> <p><b>Beccy Bromley</b> - Proportionate development is preferable meeting demand sustainably over a period.</p> <p><b>MB</b> – Reminded people that CC conducted a housing needs survey which revealed a hidden need. Also concerned that the Homechoice register has a preponderance of single occupancy applicants when the Parish should focus on providing family accommodation. This will all be reflected in the position paper which should include a recommendation. Feels this recommendation should be run past consultant and Cornwall Council.</p>
<b>7</b>	<b>Date of next meeting – tba (15 -21 February - before MPC’s next meeting).</b>
<b>8</b>	<p><b>Closing Remarks – Jane Moss</b></p> <p>Thanked everybody for attending. Good to engage with everybody in a full working meeting. Hopefully this will reassure people that collaborative working is a good thing.</p> <p>Tonight the SG has expressed anger, frustration and emotion at what has been happening since last summer. It is now to be hoped that this can be put behind us. If not, the SG will not feel able to continue. MPC and NDP SG need each other to finish the plan and despite everything we are still committed to delivering the plan for the community.</p>
	The meeting closed at 9pm