

15/25-26

PAUNTLEY PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Parish Council Extra Ordinary Meeting held on Thursday 28th August 7.30pm in Pauntley Village Hall, Brand Green

Present: Cllrs P Eastabrook (in the Chair); J Barratt; M Hampton; N Fowke

In attendance: Rachel Freestone – Clerk

Phillip Burford – District Councillor

Clayton Williams – District Councillor

Gill Moseley – County Councillor

Public: 27

1. To receive and accept apologies for absence:

Apologies had been received and accepted from Cllr P Kucharski.

2. To receive any declarations of interest or written applications for dispensation from Councillors on agenda items:

There were none.

Members agreed that the Public Open Session would take place following the explanation of the various options. The Chair explained that the purpose of the Extra Meeting was to raise community awareness of the Local plan and the options.

4. FoDDC Local Plan 2021-2043:

A. Cllr Eastabrook asked if the District Cllrs. present would like to explain the options. Cllr Burford came forward to speak to the public.

The consultation is in place to inform FoDDC how residents would like the new housing targets allocated. Not where they will be allocated, but the principle. The new allocation is equivalent in size to two Newent's. He explained that Pauntley does not have a settlement boundary so option unlikely to receive a (large) allocation.

- Option 1 – Selective planned expansion of existing settlement (s). Build around the current market towns, villages.
- Option 2 – General distribution of housing around all existing settlements (planned sharing of the housing numbers across all settlements). Making current settlements proportionately bigger.
- Option 3 – Maximum incremental change to the extent of absolute constraints. Increase to the full capacity of each settlement.
- Option 4 – Planned new settlement (s). Two sites are currently being promoted - Churcham and Redmarley. However, the public were reminded that decision at the moment is the principle of how FoDDC meet the targets and not where any settlement would be.
- Option 5 – Negotiated agreement that some development will be passed to adjoining authority (ies). This is unlikely.

3. Open Session:

a. To receive a report from District Councillors Philip Burford and Clayton Williams:

The public consultation form is onerous. However, important that everyone responds to the full 10 questions.

16/25-26

District Cllr Williams added that a group had tried to delay the consultation to enable proper debate as want to push back on the target set by government. The figures represent a 35% increase in housing within the FoD to the end of the plan in 2043. Rural areas have been allocated proportionately higher than urban areas with no consideration of where jobs are.

District Cllr Burford commented that affordable homes are an important consideration. FoD resident concerns are primarily the lack of these which include council properties, shared ownership and low cost housing. The target for affordable housing for the FoD is 40% made up of a mixture of these types. A recent report for the District Council states that this target is unachievable and likely to be nearer 30-35%. The same report suggests that new settlements will have zero affordable homes due to developer infrastructure costs. He added that the Green party favour single ‘eco’ settlements. The Local Plan is under a tight timescale which may be too tight as want the draft to be available by the winter 2025. There will then be another consultation for opinion on the sites that have been chosen. Six months has been allocated for the next stage when give to the Inspectorate, the last took 2 years.

- b. To receive a report from Gloucestershire County Councillor for Newent Gill Moseley: She informed members that she sits on the planning committee at FoDDC and wished to expand on what had already been said. She agreed that progress does feel rushed but due to devolution, FoDDC won't exist in two years time and they want to leave a Local Plan to support the residents of the FoD for the new Unitary areas. She added that consultation responses can be made by email as well as the form and paper copies.

Two current towns, Cinderford and Coleford are constrained due to their positions and the way they are set up and will therefore be unable to take many new houses. Lydney and Newent will therefore be the focus but there are also constraints in these areas. Bleachley (ex MoD site) had been considered but may not be available.

Affordable homes are often not built in smaller developments. A new settlement may have more affordable homes. These are what is needed. Investment in jobs is also needed. However, rate of build is slower on new settlements due to infrastructure requirements including schools. Quicker for small sites. If not built enough homes each year to meet the targets then are at the mercy of developers.

She added that can not ignore the number of houses required to be build.

- c. To receive representations from the Public:
- Consultation just about houses – what about the rest of the infrastructure? District Cllr Burford responded that it is presumed that housing figures and infrastructure changes go hand in hand.
 - Why does Pauntley not have a settlement boundary? District Cllr Burford responded that the National Planning Policy Framework comments on sustainability. Areas that aren't classed as sustainable don't have a settlement boundary which makes it more difficult to get permission for a new home.
 - How were the public supposed to know about the consultation as only been informed by the parish council? Why has the District Council not informed the residents themselves? The information is on their website. The FoDDC consults on many items over the course of a year but important ones can sometimes be missed. County Cllr Moseley added that it is on her newsletter. There have been adverts also in Newent. A member of the public commented that the internet in Pauntley is so poor they didn't have enough power to look at the plan.
 - Land supply and housing. How is the target figure found to match current demographics and housing needs? District Cllr Burford explained that the old system looked at population growth over next 15 years, add the amount of people that are going to come into the District

17/25-26

and take away those leaving. FoD figures approx. 6-10%. New Labour Govt. calculations are complicated based on average price of houses as well as other things. We are being asked to provide houses for 35% more people but have to question, where are these people coming from?

- The Consultation is until 11th September, will we hear back and will there be evidence that FoD have listened to residents? Residents need to know they have been listened to. The Chair added that public opinion is important as the more who respond the more FoDDC will need to listen.
 - Targets imposed by central government, what are the penalties if don't achieve them? District Cllr Burford explained that it would open the floodgates for developers to act and fill the housing gaps.
 - What happens when Central Government may not be in position in two years. Can't unbuild houses and once sites identified in the Local Plan are not able to go back on it? New Combined Authorities will in due course have to create their own plans. Targets will eventually come from the Mayoral Authorities and not Central Government and they will likely look at sustainable areas with railway links. Only one railway link in the FoD in Lydney.
4. Members agreed to defer their own discussions to the next ordinary meeting being held on the 8th September.
 5. **Next Meeting:** Members NOTED the next ordinary meeting as being held on Monday 8th September at 7.30pm.

Signed: Date:.....

Chair

The Meeting Closed at 20.47