



## Joint Planning for Credition and District Meeting held on Wednesday 11 January 2023 at 14.30 at The Bungalow, 8a North Street, Credition

**Present:** Liz Brookes-Hocking (Credition Town Council Mayor and Chairman - LBH), John Downes (Credition Town Councillor/Mid Devon District Council - JD), Dee Ross (Credition Town Council - DR), Richard Marsh (Director of Place - Mid Devon District Council - RM), Margaret Squires (Devon County Councillor - MS), Elizabeth Lloyd (Mid Devon District Councillor – EL), Rachel Avery (Town Clerk – Credition Town Council - RA), Graeme Barnell (Mid Devon District Councillor - GB), Georgina Ford (Sandford Parish Councillor - GF), Elizabeth Dolton (Sandford Parish Councillor - ED)

### 1. Welcomes and Introductions

The Mayor and Chairman of Credition Town Council Liz Brookes-Hocking opened the meeting. All in attendance introduced themselves.

Apologies had been received from Frank Letch (Devon County Councillor/Mid Devon District Councillor/Credition Town Councillor), Jim Enright (Newton St Cyres Town Councillor) and Steve Huxtable (Credition Town Councillor).

### 2. Scoping of the following infrastructure issues and means of addressing them:

The following concerns were raised by GB:

- no joined-up approach to infrastructure planning with different agencies and statutory bodies - who is responsible for this approach?
- recognition that Credition is important to all, especially the rural villages
- some issues on this agenda are not within the remit of those in attendance
- whether MDDC could be umbrella for issues and taking forward these conversations.

ED asked if the town and parishes could approach scenario from a different angle, coming up with ideas and plans to achieve desired outcomes.

RM provided an overview of MDDC responsibility in terms of infrastructure:

- S106 agreements are the only tool to formalise/secure funding to support delivery
- S106 agreement formation is a tool kit (perspective of what is contained in local plan, statutory or legislative requirements (S122 of the Town and Planning Act) and local priorities including a Neighbourhood Plan).

RM explained that trust is put in officers within Development Management to manage and monitor S106 allocation and associated functions to ensure they are followed through to delivery. However, MDDC is not legally responsible for delivery but must ensure that S106 funds are attributable to appropriate projects.

GF raised concerns around large blocks of housing developments of similar stock with no community, no infrastructure and little consideration to provision of green space.

EL stated that not enough consultation is undertaken with communities.

GB highlighted that the issue being discussed today is that people are not talking. There are no overall plans. He highlighted the importance of round the table discussions to ensure conversations are not purely reactive. MDDC must support town and parishes to engage with other statutory bodies. How do we get dialogue going and continue?

DR asked for a bottom-up approach; local people are the last to get a say and have no real influence to make changes.

MS raised concerns around developments in Cullompton and Tiverton, which have a lack of infrastructure which was part of masterplans that were never realised.

GF asked if the planning department keep an eye on what is built.

RM advised that MDDC monitor development in various ways and if not progressing in line with permissive design. However, with 20 planning officers for the district there is not enough staff to undertake checks.

- a. Education including pupil/student places and buildings**
- b. Health – capacity and facilities**
- c. Highways, footways (including crossing points), cycle ways**
- d. Community facilities**
- e. Public transport**

General discussions took place within the five areas listed.

LBH reported on vacancies at Landscore, but that Haywards is nearly full. She suggested it was unlikely that a school would be built at Pedlars Pool whilst there are spaces in the town's schools.

She went on to report on plans to create a viable single site at Barnfield for QE:

- CTC have held discussions around access, but QE think the existing would be suitable. She felt this wouldn't be appropriate given existing traffic concerns in residential areas and additional ancillary vehicle movement
- major development site earmarked to south of Barnfield
- any plans to bring a road to the south part of site would mean anyone approaching the north side of town would undertake a circle to access school; access is the biggest issue relating to the site.

GB explained the importance of communication and how piecemeal development was unacceptable. Highlighting strengths and weakness would be a useful planning exercise if locally undertaken and forthcoming planning developments would be likely to be more positively received if the community is engaged already. LBH agreed, suggesting a coherent business plan for housing types as the same of what we have now is not future proofing nor sufficiently flexible to manage housing development.

JD highlighted that QE is now an independent developer. They have every right to release the other site, make a case to DCC that a new school would not change traffic and community concerns would not be considered.

RM advised that proactive work should be undertaken by a landowner and it would not be possible for such work to be undertaken by MDDC.

LBH said that the Local Plan should be more local, with MDDC supporting communities to be more involved in the process.

RM highlighted elements of proactivity, with the early call for site being reviewed soon.

GB asked who is on a HELAA panel considering the call of sites. How do people get to talk about development?

LBH suggested a breakdown of all stages would be useful so that it is transparent and to ensure that town and parish councils can be involved.

RM advised that MDDC will always hold officer to officer liaison with education (DCC as LEA), but GB stated there is no opportunity for community dialogue or to identify key players/officers and enable conversation, with the community accepting developments and plans without meaningful consultation.

LBH expressed concern around visioning for the town that hasn't taken place as part of the Local Plan.

RM stated that MDDC responds to what it is told by the LEA and/or academy. MDDC's job is to facilitate their requirements through the Local Plan. This is the same with the NHS regarding local provision.

GB stated that with the new Local Plan emerging over next two years, it is important to have had dialogue regarding key issues. This starts with the planning process, and communities should be involved proactively. He reminded those present of the persistence and pressure to have meetings regarding Boniface cycle way. An initial conversation is only the beginning.

*Action: RM to advise on suitable officers to start meaningful conversations.*

### 3. S106 agreements

#### a. Pedlarspool - allocations and viability of implementation

RM provided an overview of the agreement:

- 22% affordable housing
- Open space
- Rugby club provision
- 5 traveller pitches off site
- Contribution to healthcare hub
- Education contributions
- Highways works, including public rights or way or cycle links
- Public transport contribution.

#### b. Tarka View - £243,000 implementation at Newcombes Meadow

RM suggested that a wet play facility had been investigated, but ongoing maintenance costs had prohibited it from progressing. He suggested that the play area had been refurbished recently and there is additional funding for a trim trail. There has been discussion around diverting these funds to the skate park at Lords Meadow.

LBH was shocked by the suggestion of diverting the funds for an area in desperate need of renovation. The allocation and spending of S106 money was unclear and further transparency was urgently needed.

#### c. Air Quality allocation to Crediton

#### d. Process for local council participation in determining S106 agreement

GB asked how town and parish councils (and residents) can influence their formulation, which is entirely an officer led process. Members, including those on the cabinet, are not involved.

*Action: RM to arrange a meeting to discuss:*

- *Current S106 allocations*
- *How agreements can be allocated appropriately in the future.*

### 4. Crediton town centre improvement

#### - How existing and proposed plans can work in conjunction:

##### a. Crediton Neighbourhood Plan

Concerns were raised that without arrangements for Crediton, funding will go to Cullompton and Tiverton. Social rental family housing is needed for Crediton and surrounding villages.

A district Housing Needs Survey had recently been undertaken and details are awaited.

##### b. Crediton Urban Realm and Traffic Study

##### c. Crediton Masterplan

RM stated that a second tender process had commenced.

## 5. Future meetings

The next meeting date would be agreed by email.