

PEASMARSH PARISH COUNCIL



Extraordinary Minutes of the Council meeting held Wednesday 14th June 2023 at 7.30pm at Peasmarsh Memorial Hall.

Present: Councillors: David Pankhurst (Chair) (DP), Mick Coleman (MC), Peter Lamont (PL) – arrived at 8.40pm with prior agreement, Hilary Pankhurst (HP), Gina Sanderson (GS) and Georgina Dunham (GD).

Also present: Clerk and RFO, Amy Head (AH).

39. Apologies for absence – Cllrs Ray Hollman and Robert Barham (both on holiday).

40. Disclosure of interests under the Council's Code of Conduct – GS for being a member of the PNDP.

Break for questions from members of the public on matters on the agenda.

To be limited to 15 minutes unless a time extension is agreed by the PC. Members of the public are invited to stay for the rest of the meeting but may only observe and may not take part in the discussions.

Two members of the public attended the meeting (one arrived at 7.35pm and the other at 8.05pm). They requested to speak on matters that were not on the agenda. They were advised by the Clerk that this was not possible and only comments pertaining to the agenda could be made during the first 15 minutes of the meeting. All other comments would have to be discussed outside of the meeting, either at the next monthly meeting at 7.30pm, 5th July 2023 or via email/telephone to the Clerk.

41. To approve the response to the initial comments of the Independent Examiner for the Peasmarsh Neighbourhood Development Plan (PNDP).

GS explained the current situation for the benefit of newly co-opted Councillor Georgina Dunham and that the initial comments of the Independent Examiner of the PNDP are a good way for the PNDP and the PC to make changes prior to the final comments. If the final comments by the Independent Examiner are not accepted by the PNDP, it would result in the PNDP having to start the whole process again. The Independent Examiner has given an extension to the deadline for responses until Friday 23rd June 2023. The Independent Examiner has said that some of the policies aren't policies, rather they are community aspirations. GS said that Ian Bailey had lots of experience with DEFRA, therefore he has been responsible for responding to all the comments on 'L' policies.

GS went through each section of the comments and the draft responses by the PDNP so far.

Policies L1, L2, L3, L4, L5 and L6 – The PC agreed with the PNDP's responses so far.

Signed:



date:

5-July-23

Policy L7 – GD raised the fact that she had spoken with a driver from Flexibus and been told that this is only a 3-month trial by ESCC– something that needs confirming by Cllr Paul Redstone.

Policies I1, I2, I3, I4, I5, I6, I7 - The PC agreed with the PNDP's responses so far.

Policies E1, E2, E3 and E4 - The PC agreed with the PNDP's responses so far.

Policies H1, H2 - The PC agreed with the PNDP's responses so far.

Policy S1: Development Size - The PC is supportive of the points made in paragraphs 42, 43 and 45 and believe that they are strong arguments. The PC agreed that while the community wants no more than 10 houses in a development, a maximum size needs to be stated. GS suggested that she had read that 5% of the number of houses in a village would give an ideal estimate of the maximum size of development. For Peasmarsh this would be around 30 houses as a maximum development size. The PC agreed to a maximum suggested size of 25-30 houses, provided that a criterion of affordability and local connection could be applied. It was also raised by PL and agreed by the PC that a glossary definition of 'affordability' needs to be added to the PDNP as affordable is a relative value and with a definition of 80% of market value, in this area, this is not affordable for locals.

Policy S2: Allocated Sites - The PC agreed with the responses to the comments so far. The Clerk pointed out that a response is needed for paragraph 49's comment – "*I am also interested in why it has selected some sites which are remote from village facilities, such as the recreation ground, the Village Hall and the Primary School*" – the land is offered by landowners and there is no choice as to where this land is sited.

The PC confirmed that it could not answer the question in paragraph 51 about affordable only housing as it has not spoken with the landowners. It also refers the Inspector back to the definition of 'affordable'.

It was noted that Cornerways was only included at a very late stage due to being offered up under RDC's 'Call for Sites'.

The PC agreed with the response to increase the size of windfall sites to a threshold of 4 dwellings.

Policy S3: Development Boundary

The PC agreed that paragraph 56 should be left to RDC to respond to.

Policy D3: New Homes - The PC agreed with the PNDP's responses so far.

Policy D4: Energy Efficiency and Sustainability - The PC agreed with the PNDP's responses so far.

Signed:



date:

5-July-23

Regulation 16 Consultation Responses in general – In regard to Lord and Lady Devonport's comments, the PC said that they were opposed to development on both the Tanyard Field and Tanhouse site. The PC said that the Tanyard Field site had been rejected many times in the last twenty or so years and it should be reiterated that RDC itself rejected the site as unsuitable for development in the 2016 DaSA (Appendix 3). The PC said that it should be made clear what Ethical Partnerships are planning to develop on these sites. That their proposals have changed from what they initially proposed to the PC and what they stated to villagers in their (inadequately publicised) 'public' consultation last year. Ethical Partnerships also had an aggressive tone in their Q and A sessions.

In response to whether there could be a technical solution to flooding issues, the PC agreed that the only real solution is to improve the system.

- 42. Dates of Forthcoming Meetings:** Monthly meeting, Wednesday 5th July 2023, Memorial Hall, Peasmarsh at 7.30pm.

The meeting finished at 9.35pm.

NDP Group has also received a copy of these minutes
J.P.

Signed:

J. Park

date:

5 July 23