

FULL COUNCIL

14 JANUARY 2019

Present:

Councillors Austen, Barker, Bromell, Bullivant, Christophers, Clarence, Clemens, Colclough, Connett, Cook, Cox, Dennis, Dewhurst, Eden, Evans, Fusco, Golder, Goodey, Gribble, Haines, Hayes, Hocking, Hockin, J Hook (was Brodie), G Hook, Jeffery, Jones, Keeling (Vice-Chairman), Kerswell (Chairman), Lake, Mayne, Morgan, Nutley, Parker, Peart, Prowse, Rollason, Russell, Smith, Thorne and Wrigley

Apologies:

Councillors Matthews, Orme, Pilkington and Winsor

Officers in Attendance:

Phil Shears, Managing Director
Martin Flitcroft, Chief Finance Officer
Karen Trickey, Solicitor to the Council and Monitoring Officer
David Eaton, Environmental Protection Manager
Martin Flitcroft, Chief Finance Officer
Tracey Hooper, Revenue, Benefits & Fraud Manager
Fergus Pate, Principal Delivery Officer
Sarah Selway, Democratic Services Manager (Exeter City Council)
Simon Thornley, Business Manager - Spatial Planning

r

1. MINUTES

It was proposed by Councillor Jones seconded by Councillor Dennis that the minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

2. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman offered condolences to Councillor Colclough on the death of her husband and wished Councillor Pilkington a speedy recovery.

She brought Members' attention to the Council's Civic Service which would take place on 19 February 2019 at 3pm at the Church of St Peter, St Paul and St Thomas of Canterbury in Bovey Tracey.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS SESSION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 4.5(J) (IF ANY)

The Public Questions and Responses are attached to the minutes.

Members of the Public asked the following supplementary questions, the answer to which would be provided in writing later in the week. [*For ease of reference the answers are set out in square brackets below*]:-

Members of the Public asked the following supplementary questions:-

Question 1:

In response to the supplementary question regarding the evidence that this restriction will do anything other than penalise responsible dog owners? Especially as the introduction of this PSPO's will apply to any dog walker regardless of whether they are walking 1 or 10 dogs? The following reply from Portfolio Holder for Health and Wellbeing was circulated:-

[The evidence for the restriction is based on the public consultation and the views of Councillors that controlling the number of dogs one individual can walk will reduce dog fouling. The impact of the control will be monitoring through the implementation of the PSPO by the working group which is scheduled to have its first meeting on the 4th March 2019.]

Question 2:

In response to the supplementary question regarding the implementation of a full Environmental Impact Report and what measures are being taken to reduce the current levels of pollution on Wolborough Road together with how these will not increase when there is further development and the real need for further housing in Devon. The following reply from Portfolio Holder for Planning & Housing was circulated:-

[On 14 January Council resolved to prepare a new Development Plan Document for Wolborough. This will involve new ecological surveys and sustainability appraisal work. The development allocation at Wolborough includes a new main street, which will have the effect of diverting some existing town centre through traffic away from Wolborough Street.]

Housing need in Teignbridge is explained and evidenced here:
www.teignbridge.gov.uk/wolboroughfacts

Question 3:

In response to the supplementary question regarding indicating to Government that if it funded the Kingskerswell by-pass it would open up the opportunity to build thousands of houses? The following reply from Portfolio Holder for Planning & Housing was circulated:-

[Torbay and Devon led the engagement with Government and statements were made about the capacity of the existing highway network constraining development growth. The South Devon Highway and Kingskerswell Road improvements will help to support development at Wolborough. However, the main focus of the South Devon Highway project was on addressing the limitations of the old A380 (Torquay Road).]

Question 4:

In response to the supplementary question regarding putting a Devon Covenant on 80 per cent of the new builds? The following reply from Portfolio Holder for Planning & Housing was circulated:-

[Office of National Statistics data shows that in 2016/17 80 per cent of people moving to Teignbridge moved from Devon, Cornwall and the South West. This data covers both new and existing homes and reflects Teignbridge's own data on new home occupants, which is available at the following links:

2018 survey, page 4 - 75% from Devon

2017 survey, page 6 – 83% from Devon

2016 survey, page 5 – 82% from Devon

2015 survey, page 5 – 80% from Devon

Our local economy would not function effectively without people being able to move across Devon's border for a variety of reasons that include access to jobs and education. Whilst affordable housing is almost entirely occupied by families and individuals who have moved from within Teignbridge and Devon, the Council is required to plan for overall housing needs.]

**5. COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 4.5(K)
(IF ANY)**

Questions submitted by Councillor Dewhirst.

Question 1

Will the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing please explain why the Community Infrastructure Levy Monitoring Report for 2017/18 was published by Teignbridge Council almost nine months after the report period ended in April last year.

Answer from Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing

The CIL regulations require Community Infrastructure Levy Monitoring Reports to be published by the end of December following the financial year to be reported. The Teignbridge CIL Monitoring Report for 2017/18 was published within this timescale on 19 December 2018.

Question 2

Will the Portfolio Holder for Planning & Housing also confirm if all CIL payments arising from planning applications have been (1) made and (2) also spent on the relevant requirements stipulated in the planning consents?

Answer from Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing

There are currently five housing developments with overdue CIL payments totalling £185,504.76. One of these is for just 20 pence and therefore is likely to be written off, subject to the usual procedures. Three others, totalling £10,272.99 are subject to discussions on repayment and we expect to receive all of the outstanding amounts in due course. The remaining £175,231.77 relates to a single site where a technical commencement was made (contrary to our advice) but none of the houses have been started and are unlikely to be built. Instead, the applicant has submitted a new application on the site with 100% affordable homes, which has been approved subject to a Section 106 agreement. We are currently considering how to resolve the CIL situation in a way that does not prevent the much-needed affordable homes being built.

Planning permissions do not determine how CIL should be spent. This is the domain of the Council's Regulation 123 list of infrastructure to be funded through CIL, as well as the Capital Programme.

Supplementary question

In response to Cllr Dewhirst's supplementary question regarding interest paid on late payments of CIL. The following reply was received:-

Answer

Yes. The CIL regulations require that 'late payment interest' is paid at an annual rate of 2.5% above the Bank of England base rate starting on the day after the day that payment was due.

Question 3

Will the Portfolio Holder also provide the value figure (in £) for CIL of planning applications that attract CIL (Item 2 of the Report) but have not been implemented within the time limit identified within the Planning consent?

Answer from Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing

The current calculated position is that planning permissions with a CIL liability value of £655,506 have not been implemented within the relevant time limit.

Government is consulting on the introduction of additional CIL reporting requirements. We will need to respond to new regulations when they are introduced.

Supplementary question

In response to the Cllr Dewhirst supplementary question regarding payments to Parish and Town Councils, the following reply was received:-

Answer

Teignbridge do not (and are not required to) pass CIL income to Town and Parish Councils until it has been received. As unpaid CIL has not

been passed to Town and Parish Councils, it will not be necessary to ask them to return it.

Question 4

Will the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing commit to circulating a copy of the report by email link to all members and bringing this report to Scrutiny before the end of March 2019?

Answer from Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing

The 2017/18 CIL report is available at

<https://www.teignbridge.gov.uk/media/7694/cil-monitoring-report-17-18.pdf>

It will be reported to Scrutiny before the end of March 2019.

The following question had been submitted by Cllr Connett

What evidence does Teignbridge Council hold that confirms the view expressed during a recent Planning Committee meeting that the Council of Mortgage Lenders along with banks and building societies will not provide mortgages if a property is on a development which also has allocated pitches for Gypsies and Travellers; and,

What steps has Teignbridge Council taken, or intends to take, to clarify the view of the Council of Mortgage Lenders with regard to this issue?"

Answer from the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing

The predecessor of Teignbridge's current Business Manager for Strategic Place, attended a meeting in early 2017 with various mortgage company representatives also present as well were developers and local authority colleagues.

Having looked into this, the officer doesn't believe any notes of the meeting were produced. However, the informal reporting they received was that mortgage companies were very reluctant to provide mortgages for new homes particularly in close proximity to Gypsy and Traveller pitches as a consequence of the lack of information about effects this could have on market value – particularly resale value – and this was considered to be a whole market position, hence reference to overarching organisations.

The officer would like to apologise for any misspeakings of the bodies involved and any confusion caused.

The difficulties in following this through are highlighted by the fact that colleagues in Mid Devon are currently commissioning a piece of Local Government Association funded research to investigate in a more concrete way the extent to which lenders are unwilling to get involved in sites of this nature. Officers will assist with this research where necessary.

6. CALL-IN OF EXECUTIVE DECISION PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER FOR DOG CONTROL IN TEIGNBRIDGE

Councillor Dewhirst, in presenting the call-in, stated that the decision to limit the number to four dogs was disproportionate and that six would be a fair number as recommended by Overview & Scrutiny Committee. He said that professional dog walkers have increased and this limit would have an adverse effect on their businesses and clients. He reported there had been no complaints about professional dog walkers, the limit should be six, the same as East Devon District Council, and then this should be monitored over the coming year.

The Portfolio Holder for Health & Wellbeing commented that the Scrutiny Review Group would support the better understanding of the impact of the number of dogs that could be walked. A consultation had been undertaken on the Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) and for the number of dogs that an individual should walk the results showed that 50% of responses stated three, 23% stated four and only 2% stated six.

During discussion some Members raised concerns regarding the negative effect the limit would have on viability of the businesses of professional dog walkers; there was no evidence to support that six dogs could not be walked; dog walkers and owners were responsible; the difficulties this would cause for older and working residents with dogs who rely on the professional dog walkers; and issue of budget for Dog Wardens and how the PSPO would be enforced.

Other Members felt that a limit of four dogs was supported by the consultation response and that the PSPO would ensure that the District was cleaner and safer without dog fouling or dog attacks and set one standard across the District.

It was proposed by Councillor Dewhirst, seconded by Councillor Eden and

RESOLVED that in relation to the Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) for Responsible Dog Ownership under ss59 to 75 of the Anti-Social Crime and Policing Act 2014 the number of dogs that any one individual can walk at any one time be a maximum of six.

In accordance with Procedural Rule 4 (O) (v) a recorded vote was called for:-

Voting for:-

Councillors

Colclough, Connett, Cook, Cox, Dewhirst, Eden, Evans, Haines, Hayes, Hocking, (G) Hook, (J) Hook, Jones, Morgan, Nutley, Parker, Rollason, Wrigley and Keeling

(19 Members)

Voting against:-

Councillors Austen, Peart and Thorne
(3 Members)

Abstentions:-

Councillors Barker, Bromwell, Bullivant, Christophers, Clarence, Clemens, Dennis, Fusco, Golder, Goodey, Gribble, Hockin, Jefferey, the Chairman, Lake, Mayne, Prowse, Russell and Smith

(19 Members)

Absent:-

Councillors Matthews, Orme, Pilkington and Winsor

(4 Members)

7. WOLBOROUGH DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

The Principal Delivery Officer summarised an email from Abbotskerwell and Wolborough Residents Association that supported preparation of the Development Plan Document (DPD). He also reported that he had received a letter on behalf of Abbotskerwell Parish Council and Wolborough Residents' Association. Concerns were raised regarding the ecological reasons for a legal challenge. Members were advised that Officers considered that the DPD would be fundamental in addressing the ecological aspects of the development of the site.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing stated that the Local Plan was approved in 2014 which agreed the principle of development at Wolborough NA3. This Development Plan Document (DPD) would control the planning process and support quality housing development across the site.

During discussion, Members raised the following points:-

- Concern that the plan would still not mitigate the impact of development in Wolborough and on the listed buildings
- Concerns that the Developers would still have the upper hand despite the DPD
- The need to protect the natural landscape of the area including the Fen, and Greater Horseshoe bats habitat
- Whether £210,000 as a good use of Council monies given the current budget constraints
- Whether the development would provide the Social Housing that the District required
- The plan would help support the development to help to protect the Grade I Listed Church and the Wolborough Fen SSSI
- The development would provide much needed Housing for the District
- The proposed DPD would support a cohesive approach to the development of the area

Full Council (14.1.2019)

- The DPD would help to support the refusal of planning applications if the brief was not met
- The DPD would help to effectively control and protect the development of the area

Officers advised that whilst it was recognised that development of the site was contentious, the housing target of which the site was key for the District was set by Central Government. The DPD had the support of the Council for Protection of Rural England (C.P.R.E) and it would help to ensure that any development was led by the Council.

In response to further questions raised, the Principal Delivery Officer advised that the Draft Masterplan did include provision for primary and secondary school facilities, additional surveys would be undertaken to understand any impact that development would have on the Fen and Greater Horseshoe Bats. A planning application for balance of the site (where an application had not already been received) was anticipated to be submitted shortly.

Proposed by Councillor Lake, seconded by Councillor Clemens and

RESOLVED that the following be approved:-

- (1) The preparation of a Wolborough Development Plan Document; and
- (2) A budget of up to £210,000 for preparation of the Development Plan Document

In accordance with Procedural Rule 4 (O) (v) a recorded vote was called for:-

Voting for:-

Councillors Austen, Barker, Bullivant, Christophers, Clarence, Clemens, Colclough, Dennis, Golder, Goodey, Gribble, Haines, Hocking, Jefferey, Jones, the Chairman, Lake, Mayne, Peart, Prowse, Russell, Smith and Thorne

(23 Members)

Voting against:-

Councillors Cook, Eden and Winsor

(3 Members)

Abstentions:-

Councillors Bromwell, Connett, Cox, Dewhirst, Evans, Hayes, (G) Hook, (J) Hook, Morgan, Nutley, Parker, Rollason and Keeling

(13 Members)

Absent:-

Councillors Fusco, Matthews, Orme, Pilkington and Winsor

(5 Members)

8. HEART OF THE SOUTH WEST JOINT COMMITTEE

The Managing Director presented the report on the Heart of the South West Joint Committee. Members were informed that this report was to be considered by all the authorities that make up the Heart of South West Joint Committee. The Council was asked to support the work programme of the Joint Committee with the sum of £1,400, all authorities would be contributing.

During discussion, some Members raised concerns regarding the funding requirements including the administration costs, the Joint Committees work programme and the unknown work of the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)

The Managing Director clarified that the work programme of the Joint Committee, whilst unknown at this stage, was vital to ensure that Central Government and LEP funding was accessed for Teignbridge.

The Leader stated that Overview and Scrutiny Committee could invite the LEP to address them to find out more about their work. It was important that the Council was part of the Joint Committee to help secure funding for the District and wider region to access funding streams from Central Government.

It was proposed by the Councillor Gribble and seconded by the Leader, Councillor Christophers. The proposal was carried by 26 votes for, 15 against with 3 abstentions.

RESOLVED to:-

- (1) Note the progress report setting out the work of the Heart of the South West (HotSW) Joint Committee since its establishment in March 2018;
- (2) Agree to delegate the development and endorsement of the HotSW Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) to the HotSW Joint Committee (noting that final approval of the HotSW LIS rests with the HotSW Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and the Government);
- (3) Note the Budget statement for 2018/19 set out in Appendix B and that in accordance with the decisions taken at the time the Committee was established the Council will be asked to make an annual budgetary provision to meet the support costs of the Joint Committee in line with the 2018/19 contribution. Final clarification on any additional 2019/20 budget requirement will be provided following the completion of the review of the Joint Committee's role, function and management support arrangements and development of its work programme for 2019/20; and
- (4) To agree the Budget and Cost-sharing Agreement set out in Appendix B to this report.

9. COUNCIL TAX BASE 2019/20

The Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services presented the report detailing the proposed council tax base 2019/20 as recommended by the Executive at its meeting on the 8 January 2019.

It was proposed by Councillor Barker and seconded by Councillor Prowse and unanimously:-

RESOLVED that the council tax base of 49,219 for 2019/20 at Appendix A of the circulated report be approved.

10. COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION SCHEME FOR 2019/20

The Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services presented the report which sought approval of the Executive recommendation made on 4 December 2018 for the current Council Tax Scheme (CTR) to be continued unchanged into 2019/20.

In response to a Member's concern regarding the Government change in relation to the Universal Credit two children cap, the Revenue, Benefits and Fraud Manager stated that any impact of this change and central government guidance would be kept under review. The scheme did have an Exceptional Hardship Policy which provided extra protection for claimants.

The Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services stated that 29 awards had been made in 2017/18 under the Exceptional Hardship Policy.

It was proposed by Councillor Barker and seconded by Councillor Prowse and unanimously:-

RESOLVED that the current Council Tax Reduction (CTR) Scheme for the year 2019-20 be adopted.

11. COUNCIL TAX PREMIUM FOR LONG TERM EMPTY

The Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services presented the report seeking approval of the Executive recommendation made on 4 December 2018 for the current long term empty homes council tax premium to be increased from the current 50% levy to the relevant maximums set down in the Rating (Property in Common Occupation) and Council Tax (Empty Dwellings) Act 2018. He advised that this proposal would put direct pressure on people to bring empty homes back into use.

Members welcomed this report and acknowledged the support that was provided from the Council to encourage empty homes back into use.

It was proposed by Councillor Barker and seconded by Councillor Cox and unanimously:-

RESOLVED that in accordance with the Rating (Property in Common Occupation) and Council Tax (Empty Dwellings) Act 2018, to approve an increase in the premiums being charged on long term empty properties as follows:-

- (1) From 1st April 2019 onwards to increase the premium up to the maximum of 100% for properties that have been empty for 2 years or more;
- (2) From 1st April 2020 onwards to increase this to 200% for properties that have been empty for 5 years or more; and
- (3) From 1st April 2021 onwards to increase this to 300% for properties that have been empty for 10 years or more.

12. SCHEME OF MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES AND MEMBERS' IT

The Chief Finance Officer presented the report on Scheme of Members' Allowances and Members' IT. The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 required Councils to establish an Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) and to have regard to the recommendations made in relation to the Members' Allowances scheme. He advised of the IRP recommendations which included an uplift of £500 for the municipal year, the basic allowance to be linked to Local Government Pay Awards, changes to the Special Responsibility multipliers including the reduction of the multiplier for Vice-Chairman of the Council and Deputy Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committee, and the changes to the procedure for the payment of Special Responsibility Allowances (SRA) during maternity or sick leave. The recommendation with regards to the IT was that all Councillors be provided with devices for the purposes of carrying out Council duties and the sum of £400 to be taken from the basic allowance annually to cover support for the devices.

During discussion Members raised the following points:-

- Concerns regarding the effect the increase would have on Councillors national insurance contributions and any benefits impact if they then have to pay £400 from the allowance for IT devices
- Any roll out of IT devices should take place after the local election in May
- Concern that there was no accidental damage of the devices
- The maternity leave should cover shared parental leave
- Whether sick leave - was relevant as the Council already had procedures in place to cover these scenarios
- Councillors already had multi IT devices for work and personal use, and so could their existing devices not be used for Council business?
- Valued the input of the Vice-Chairman of the Council and Deputy Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny and did not think the SRA should be reduced
- Group Leaders should meet to discuss the IT devices options.

It was proposed by Councillor Haines and seconded by Councillor Colclough that the Members Allowance increase be reduced to £100 instead of the increase of £500 and then £400 taken back for IT devices. This was then withdrawn.

It was proposed by Councillor Barker, seconded by Councillor G Hook and unanimously:-

RESOLVED :-

- (1) With effect from 2nd May 2019 that:
 - (a) The Basic Allowance payable to all Councillors increases from £5,489 to £5,589 for the municipal year;
 - (b) As proposed by the IRP report CPI is removed and future increases in the Basic Allowance are linked to Local Government pay awards;
 - (c) The Special Responsibility multipliers remain as they are currently are;
 - (d) The Carers' Allowance is renamed the 'Dependants' Allowance' and updated as detailed in the IRP report;
 - (e) Rates and terms for travel and subsistence claims are updated as detailed in the IRP report;
 - (f) The scheme is amended for the payment of Special Responsibility Allowance during maternity or sick leave as outlined in the IRP report subject to a variation to include share parental leave; and
- (2) The Councillors IT provision be considered by the Group Leaders the associated capital budget for 2019/20 remain to enable the matter to be resolved in 2019/20; and
- (3) That the members of the Independent Remuneration Panel be thanked for their report.

13. THE CHAIRMAN ANNOUNCED

RESOLVED

That the Common Seal of the Council be affixed to any document(s) necessary to give effect to the resolutions passed by the Council at this meeting.

Chairman

Public Questions – 14 January 2019

The following questions have been received and accepted for a response.

Question reference	Questions	Answers
<u>Topic: Public Spaces Protection Order</u>		
A1 →	1 I would like to know why it has been automatically assumed that anyone who owns and walks more than 4 dogs is considered irresponsible?	The Executive does not assume that anyone who owns and walks more than 4 dogs is irresponsible. The results of the public consultation and the subsequent response by members of the public to the Executive’s decision demonstrate the range of views about the suitable number of dogs that one individual can walk at any one time whilst remaining in full control. The Executive’s responsibility is to consider the evidence and make a decision, which is that four is a suitable number. We have agreed to set up a review group and I am sure that this will be one of the areas that it considers and we would welcome evidence around the number of dogs walked by an individual.
<u>Topic: Wolborough Development Plan Document</u>		
<p>The Council has noted that many of the points raised as part of questions submitted (or as questions themselves), are comments. Therefore they have not been addressed or listed below. Instead where appropriate such comments will be included in the statutory consultation responses which will form part of Development Plan Document (“DPD”) process, if the Council decides to proceed with the DPD.</p> <p>However, as a general point in relation to all of the questions and many of the comments made, the following information is pertinent:</p>		

<p>(a) The decision before the Council at its meeting on 14th January 2019 is not, and cannot be, about whether proposed development at Wolborough is appropriate. The adopted Local Plan which was subject to statutory and independent scrutiny by a Planning Inspector, confirms that the site is appropriate for the allocated development. The report before the Council is not a review of that adopted local plan policy. Neither is it making a decision about any planning application which would be made taking account of relevant local and national planning policies and other material planning considerations. The determination of planning applications is a matter for the planning committee, prior to which people may submit representations via the website www.teignbridge.gov.uk</p> <p>(b) The decision before the Council on the proposed DPD today is about whether to prepare more detailed guidance for the site as a formal document or to rely purely on the existing local plan policies and an informal masterplan when dealing with planning applications on the site.</p>		
B1	1	<p>What additional infrastructure is being planned?</p>
2		<p>The Council agrees that infrastructure planning is a very important part of planning for new development.</p> <p>The adopted Teignbridge Local Plan provides a strategy and policies for the distribution and level of development and supporting infrastructure including transport and roads.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan accompanies the Local Plan and includes more detail on infrastructure priorities, including new schools and transport facilities (like the new main street across the Wolborough development allocation).</p> <p>Over the past 5 years, around £180 million has been invested in local infrastructure across Teignbridge. That includes new open spaces and new roads.</p> <p>Schools in Newton Abbot have recently been expanded and a new one is being built in Kingsteignton. The Wolborough development allocation in the adopted local plan includes a requirement for new primary and secondary education facilities.</p>

C1 – C3 3	1	Why despite the overwhelming objections shown on the planning application and through petitions is the plan still going ahead?	<p>To date, the Council has not received any petition but is aware of a petition to Devon County Council.</p> <p>The Local Plan (including the Wolborough allocation) was adopted in May 2014 following extensive public consultation and examination by an independent Planning Inspector. Consequently, the principle of development at Wolborough has already been determined.</p> <p>The Council will continue to take account of valid comments made on the remaining development process, including for example, a DPD process and any planning applications.</p> <p>The Council’s Planning Committee will consider all of the comments received in relation to relevant planning applications for development on the site. There are current planning applications for Wolborough, see www.teignbridge.gov.uk/wolboroughnextsteps. See www.teignbridge.gov.uk/wolboroughfacts for more information.</p>
	2	Why are we being ignored?	<p>Relevant comments are taken into account at the appropriate stage of the development process. The Council continues to listen to relevant planning comments received. See www.teignbridge.gov.uk/wolboroughfacts for more information.</p> <p>The public has had opportunities to get involved with consultation on planning matters including the proposed Wolborough masterplan and will continue to do so at appropriate stages.</p> <p>At today’s meeting, the Council is considering whether to prepare a Wolborough DPD. If this is agreed, there will be two further rounds of public consultation about how development at Wolborough should take shape.</p>

4			<p>The public are also still able to comment on planning applications for development at Wolborough. Please see www.teignbridge.gov.uk/wolboroughnextsteps</p>
	3	<p>Where are the extra jobs coming from anyway for people to live in these houses? And healthcare?</p>	<p>The public have had opportunities to get involved with consultation at the appropriate stages (whether the development of policy or planning applications) and this will continue in accordance with statutory requirements. Please see www.teignbridge.gov.uk/wolboroughfacts for more information.</p> <p>The Wolborough allocation includes 10 hectares of employment land and a new community building. Depending on the nature of employment development that occurs, this could support around 1,000 jobs. Unemployment in Teignbridge is significantly lower than the national average.</p> <p>We are in discussion with the Primary Care Trust about whether any of that building might be needed to accommodate healthcare services.</p>

D1		<p>What can the council do to solve the gridlock problems in the town centre?</p>	<p>Teignbridge DC works closely with Devon County Council, the highways authority, to tackle traffic congestion and encourage more sustainable travel options. Teignbridge provided £500,000 towards the new South Devon Highway and has helped provide 46km of cycle-paths since 2011/12.</p> <p>The Local Plan allocates a new street from Totnes Road to Kingskerswell Road. This road will be important to connecting people and places within the community, as well as connecting them with the wider Newton Abbot area. It will provide a route for new public transport and help to address town centre through-traffic.</p> <p>Preparation of a Wolborough DPD will enable planning policy relating to traffic issues to be considered in more detail. Please see www.teignbridge.gov.uk/wolboroughfacts for more information.</p>
E1 - 3	5	<p>1 What (if any) arrangements have been made to update water supplies - new reservoir and sewage treatment works?</p> <p>2 What (if any) arrangements have been made to ensure free-flowing traffic into and out of Newton Abbot town centre.</p>	<p>The Council works with South West Water through the Local Plan making process and continue to do so. South West Water have commented that, with some network upgrades, the water and sewage system is able to accommodate the impact of the Wolborough community (as well as other Local Plan development sites).</p> <p>They have not proposed new reservoirs or sewage treatment works in relation to any proposed Wolborough development.</p> <p>The adopted Teignbridge <u>Local Plan</u> provides a strategy and policies for the distribution and level of development and supporting infrastructure including transport and roads.</p>

		<p>The Local Plan allocates a new street from Totnes Road to Kingskerswell Road. This road will be important to connecting people and places within the community, as well as with the wider Newton Abbot area. It will provide a route for new public transport and will help to address town centre through-traffic.</p>
6	<p>3 Can you deny that this is purely an exercise in increasing revenues from Council Tax?</p>	<p>Yes. It is not true.</p> <p>Planning authorities across the country are required to meet the housing needs of their area. The Government provides a formula for calculating this need.</p> <p>The availability of homes, including affordable, for people who want to live here is a key issue for the district. The Local Plan's housing allocations respond to a pressing need to tackle the inadequate supply of homes that people can afford.</p> <p>The average house price in Teignbridge is around 11 times the average wage, which is about the same as the figure for South East. Increasing the supply of new homes is a crucial response to this affordability challenge and putting appropriate housing within the reach of more people, including future generations who currently find it almost impossible to live in their own home here.</p>

F1	1	<p>Given all the greenbelt land surrounding Newton Abbot, why is the Wolborough Hill and Decoy area, the most iconic and widely used and appreciated countryside immediately surrounding Newton Abbot, the site for these destructive plans?</p>	<p>Green Belt is a specific national designation. The nearest Green Belts to the Wolborough allocation are around 65 miles away to the south of Bristol and west of Poole.</p> <p>The Wolborough allocation was made through the Teignbridge Local Plan following extensive public consultation and an independent examination. The allocation includes a large amount of green space and policies that require a careful response to the area's environmental and ecological features.</p>
G1 7	1	<p>Why are these costs [to proceed with the DPD] not being covered by those proposing the development?</p>	<p>The Council as local planning is by statute, responsible for this work which will help ensure the Council is able to direct the type and nature of the development. This is work which is undertaken in the public interest.</p>

<p>11</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>How can you justify building new houses when there are hundreds of available properties already?</p>	<p>Teignbridge has 338 empty homes, which is less than 0.6% of the total number of existing homes in the district. We are one of the best in the country for reducing the amount of empty homes and bringing them back into use. This complex work is ongoing and involves lots of agencies including landlords.</p> <p>Housing targets are set by government. They are set to rise. Current data suggests 777 dwellings per year.</p> <p>Whilst we prioritise the reuse of empty homes, empty homes alone cannot meet out housing needs and we cannot assume that those which are empty are available or suitable.</p>
-----------	----------	---	---

11	2 How many more reasons do you need to reject this plan?	The proposed plan will complement the adopted Local Plan which allocated this site for development. The Local Plan provides a strategy for the distribution and level of development and supporting infrastructure. Teignbridge also has an Air Quality Action Plan – a plan required by law – which sets out a process for assessing and reviewing air quality within the district. Visit www.teignbridge.gov.uk/airquality for more information.
----	--	---

12	K1- 3	1	<p>Where is the huge increase in traffic going to be directed to?</p>	<p>The adopted Local Plan provides a strategy for the distribution and level of development and supporting infrastructure including roads.</p> <p>The Local Plan allocates a new street from Totnes Road to Kingskerswell Road. This road will be important to connecting people and places within the community, as well as connecting them to the wider Newton Abbot area. The main street will also help to address town centre through-traffic.</p> <p>A Wolborough DPD could introduce other policies relating to walking, cycling and sustainable travel. The Council encourages people to get involved through the consultation process if preparation of the document is approved by full Council on 14 January.</p>
		2	<p>Is there a plan to build a road from Ogwell Cross to the A38 dual carriageway?</p>	<p>No. There is no current plan to create this route.</p>

M1	1	<p>What evidence do TDC have to demonstrate with very high levels of certainty that there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of the South Hams SAC as a result of the NA3 development?</p> <p><u>Supplementary question:</u></p> <p>What evidence do TDC have to prove beyond all 'reasonable scientific doubt' that migration of GHBs is successful?</p>	<p>The Wolborough Development Plan Document would involve undertaking new Greater Horseshoe Bat surveys in consultation with Natural England. Please see /www.teignbridge.gov.uk/wolboroughfacts. This also addresses the supplementary question.</p>
----	---	--	---

15	N1 - 2	1	<p>Why, in preparing the Local Plan, [did the Council] completely ignore its own Statement of Community Involvement and the Government Guidance for planning Policies for England outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)?</p>	<p>The existing Local Plan, adopted in May 2014, was prepared through extensive stakeholder engagement. This included extensive public consultation and public exhibitions.</p> <p>The Local Plan was subject to independent examination. During that process it was confirmed that the Statement of Community Involvement and consultation requirements met relevant planning regulations.</p> <p>In the case of the Wolborough allocation, we have engaged with a range of relevant stakeholders (including town and parish council representatives) and undertaken an 8 week consultation on a masterplan for the site.</p> <p>Preparation of a Development Plan Document for Wolborough would see two further rounds of public consultation and an opportunity to influence more detailed planning policies for the site if approved by Full Council.</p>
		2	<p>Does the Council have evidence to 'prove beyond all reasonable scientific doubt' a) that mitigation for Greater Horseshoe Bats can be successful b) that the viability of the South Hams SAC or any part of it will not be prejudiced?</p>	<p>The Wolborough Development Plan Document would involve undertaking new Greater Horseshoe Bat surveys in consultation with Natural England Visit www.teignbridge.gov.uk/wolboroughfacts for more information</p>

M1	1	How [is] all this planning getting permission granted?	Please see www.teignbridge.gov.uk/wolboroughfacts . Planning applications are determined in accordance with a statutory process – please see https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/plain-english-guide-to-the-planning-system
16 O1 - 3	1	What are the specific measures that will be put in place to ensure that no wildlife is affected by the NA3 development? Especially with the development around Decoy when you will cut that off from the countryside.	Ecology is an important consideration at Wolborough. Development proposals need to be supported by appropriate ecological evidence and this is stipulated through policy NA3 of the 2014 Teignbridge Local Plan . See www.teignbridge.gov.uk/wolboroughfacts Preparation of the Wolborough Development Plan Document will involve new Greater Horseshoe Bat surveys in consultation with Natural England.
	2	How do you propose to ensure that congestion will not increase?	The Local Plan allocates a new main street through the Wolborough community. This will be a route for local public transport, pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles. It will also provide an alternative to town centre traffic. The Wolborough Development Plan Document could introduce new transport related planning policies.

17	3	<p>Why is only 20% of the housing going to be affordable housing?</p>	<p>Through the Teignbridge Local Plan we have sought to maximise the amount of affordable housing whilst ensuring that development is supported by the necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>National planning guidance is clear that Local Plan allocations must be financially viable. Financial viability evidence was tested through an independent examination and it was found that 20% affordable housing was the maximum that could be required.</p> <p><u>The Local Plan Review</u> and <u>Greater Exeter Strategic Plan</u> will allow future affordable housing requirements on other development sites to be assessed.</p> <p>Annual housing targets are ongoing, not a one-off. We have met housing targets over each of the past four years but we have not met the overall target for 12,400 new homes in Teignbridge between 2013 and 2033.</p> <p>The Wolborough allocation includes a new community building. We are in discussion with the Primary Care Trust about whether any of that building might be needed to accommodate healthcare services</p>
P1	1	<p>How does the council expect to sell 1500 new-build houses, particularly if they offer the poor value and construction standards of Hele Park?’</p>	<p>Teignbridge’s Local Plan was adopted in May 2014. It identified housing needs and a housing target. The number of new homes occupied in Teignbridge (and in Newton Abbot) since the Local Plan period began has almost doubled. Annual housing targets have been met each year.</p> <p>Government provides a formula for calculating housing need. The latest figures for Teignbridge indicate that the <u>Greater Exeter Strategic Plan</u> and <u>Local Plan Review</u> must respond to a need for 777 new homes per year in Teignbridge.</p> <p>The measures used to calculate housing need in line with the Government’s formula, are revised annually and the Council will continue to keep this information under review to ensure that Teignbridge’s housing targets are appropriate.</p>

		<p>In response to the questioner's introductory remarks about immigration, Office of National Statistics data for 2016/17 shows that more than 80 per cent of the people moving into Teignbridge were from Devon, Cornwall or the rest of the South West.</p>
--	--	---