

**Agenda NDP Steering Group Meeting**  
**Tavistock Town Council Chamber**  
Time: Wednesday April 10<sup>th</sup> 2024 06:30 PM London

**Steering Group Members**

Ursula Mann, Chair and Cllr, Stuart Honey\*, Secretary, Kit Harbottle, Julu Irvine, Cllr, Dr. Sharon Gedye, Gemma Loving, Trevor Munro, Cllr, Janna Sanders, Sue Spackman, Ian Wright

**Apologies**

Cllr Julu Irvine

Cllr Trevor Munro

Janna Sanders (Provided Written Comments)

Sue Spackman (Commented by Phone)

Ian Wright (Provided Written Comments)

\*SH left the meeting early during the comments review

**Reg 14 Consultation Report (UM)**

This was prepared for DML committee for Town Council, circulated to the steering group for information and comment.

*Correction to dates and description of consultation events at churches by KH. Final report updated. **UM to add to website ahead of next DML meeting.***

**Update regarding Grant and Proposed Contract from STA for further Project Management Services (UM)**

Update with regard to progress through council and proposed contract and services. Already considered and supported by BPC of TTC. (Being considered 23/04/24 by the full council)

Update regarding Grant report: All funds have been spent and no part of the grant will be returned this year. The full amount of grant funding brought in by the Steering Group over the plan period is near £14k. This does not include the technical support which is provided as services, rather than direct funding. The final portion of the NDP support needed to submit the plan to WDBC has been requested from TTC as previously agreed.

*Noted and general agreement with principal of project plan. **UM to update project plan and budget following next Council meeting.***

**Reg 14 Comments review (All Topic Leads)**

- All topic leads have identified comments on which they would like STA to provide advice. *UM to arrange with ST the timeline for him to respond. SG agreed to schedule next meeting at a time when ST can attend in person in order to address any outstanding comments.*
- UM read the comments from IW and JS and reported SS comments to the group. SG, KH, GL, UM also commented on their topic areas. General discussion of various points raised on each topic area were reviewed and the group identified the comments to send to ST. **UM to send comments and questions to ST.**

- Various issues raised during discussion:
  - The JLP enters review this year and it might be that some comments might be more relevant to a JLP strategic policy than the NDP (ST and LPA advice to be sought on this)
  - The merits of making the plan rather than extending time to develop additional policies in order that the NDP is in place for any planning decisions made on existing JLP sites.
  - The problem of consultation fatigue and budget which needs to be managed if changes to the plan now are substantial and require further consultation before the plan can be submitted to LPA.
  - The nature of the plan as a living document that can be reviewed again by the council every five years during the plan period and the need for the Council through its DML committee to monitor and ensure the plan is utilised in planning decisions and to suggest changes.
  - Some of the generic comments provided by statutory consultees were more like NDP guidance than commentary and therefore not relevant to the current preferred plan
  - Some comments appeared not to consider evidence base documents posted on the NDP website throughout the consultation and whether these were considered needs to be discovered. It may be that some additional appendix documents should be included. (LGS and Views)
  - Some comments called for policy changes that are not supported with evidence and therefore would need further evidence gathering and review if they are to be acted on, which may delay the plan.
  - Policies that received multiple comments (ie flooding/SUDS) should be given careful consideration again.
  - Particular concern was expressed about the community facility section and ensuring that the approach was robust and clear in the final version of the plan as it had generated many questions. IW has submitted questions to be sent to ST.
  - SG discussed seeking ST advice regarding redacting some personal or irrelevant information from comments in order to protect identifiable individuals and prevent confusion about the scope of an NDP.
- Agreed – while awaiting guidance from ST on comments identified above, each topic lead will initially sort the remaining comments into groups of:
  - Comments that do not address either the Policies or the Design Guide and do not present a suggestion that can be addressed through NDP.
  - Comments that are of a personal nature or include GDPR information that needs to be redacted.
  - Comments suggesting changes to the plan's Vision, Aims, Objectives which were finalised following 2022/2023 consultations.
  - Comments that are merely administrative corrections to the plan.
  - Comments suggesting policy changes that have been explored and excluded as part of the neighbourhood planning process in earlier consultation stages.

- Comments requiring additional research, evidence or consultation that support, refine, or provide clarity to the plan. If these would be outside the scope of the current VAO and agreed policies, comments to be considered for a list of potential future policies to be reviewed and tested in future reviews of the plan.
- Comments suggesting policy changes that support, refine or provide clarity to the plan that can be implemented without additional research, evidence or consultation.
- Agreed GL would address any comments made regarding Design Guide.
  - Discussion of difficulty in amending the design guide due to the required facilitation support from Locality, which is currently on hold like the previous year while awaiting support from government (DLUHC).
  - UM/GL to explore options with Aecom project team if facilitation grant was not forthcoming in 2024.
- Agreed that each SG lead would attempt to draft a response to any comment in their topic area and amend the plan or maps as needed. SG leads to use a track changes version of the plan if they are making amendments and to save it as a separate document.
  - SG Topic Lead should copy the relevant policy from the plan document and amends that in a new word document rather than create an entire new copy of the plan.
  - **SG Topic Leads to email UM/SH when this has been completed.**

The meeting closed at 9pm.

#### **Next SG Meeting**

TBD. Meeting to be agreed once ST had given his initial advice on those comments identified by each SG lead and any others that ST identifies as requiring planning advice and all comments have had a proposed response written. **UM to circulate meeting date as soon as possible.**