

VIRTUAL MEETING OF THE MADRON HOUSING GROUP
21ST APRIL 2020

Present: Geoff Brighton Graham Tanner
 Ben Beckerleg Simon Elliott

1. Apologies
 - 1.1 Apologies had been received and accepted from Peter and Michael, both of whom had e-mailed with comments.
2. The minutes of last meeting, held on 25th February 2020 were agreed as an accurate record. The minutes had been put before the subsequent meeting of the steering group.
3. All matters arising had been dealt with.
4. To consider the outcome of the Housing Needs Survey (HNS)
 - 4.1 The group had before them a draft report on the housing needs survey, completed by Cornwall Council in time and on budget.
 - 4.2 Peter had pointed out that Newbridge was not within the Parish but adjacent to the boundary. Geoff would ensure the report was changed accordingly. Peter had also raised the issue that many other settlements existed but these had not been listed. However, the group felt that the most significant settlements had been included, but the wording may need to be changed to reflect this.

ACTION: Geoff
 - 4.3 Michael had questioned if the statistics quoted in the HNS report were robust, reminding the group of the need to avoid a repeat of the previous development in Madron where units proved hard to sell. The group felt that the statistics were as reliable as they could be and that the HNS had usefully identified previously unquantified need.
 - 4.4 The group considered that the response rate of just under 11% was statistically relevant, particularly given that the survey was conducted in the midst of the Covid-19 pandemic.
 - 4.5 The group noted that 15 households had responded that they had a housing need and all had a connection with the Parish. Of these, 57% wanted to live anywhere in the Parish and 21% wanted to live in Madron Village itself. The group accepted that the HNS had identified a clear need for additional social housing within the Parish. It further noted that of those the HomeChoice Register included 36 households with a local connection to the Parish, with 5 in Band A, 3 in Band B and 14 in Band C. The remainder were in Band D or E.
 - 4.6 The group noted that the preferred size of dwelling of respondents was for smaller homes – 43% required one bedroom and 50% required 2. The group concluded that a policy would be needed to reflect this. The group discussed this in some detail, and considered that 2 bedroom units would be preferable to one bedroomed, as a second bedroom also provides opportunities for home working space or a live in carer.

- 4.7 The group noted that paragraphs 4.3.11/12 of the HNS deals with affordable home ownership. However, of the 7 households interested in purchasing a home, house prices would be beyond the reach of most of those interested and only 2 had access to a deposit of over £31k. However, the group noted **that** in Para 2.2.1 of the HNS that Help to Buy South West had identified 4 households seeking to buy in the Parish and in Para 2.2.2 that it was thought this estimate was likely to be an underestimate of need. Accordingly, the group considered that it would be appropriate for the Parish to support development of a limited number of affordable homes for sale.
- 4.8 The group considered that the demand apparent within the HNS for social housing and affordable housing to purchase reflected the socio-economic data identified within the demographics within the area (please refer to the Housing Section of the Local Evidence Base).
- 4.9 The group thought it significant that the majority of respondents were supportive of affordable housing led developments, with 54% saying 'yes' and 14% saying 'maybe', with only 14% saying they would not support affordable housing. The types of developments respondents would support are detailed in Para 4.4.2 of the HNS. The group thought **it** significant that, in addition to support for affordable homes for rent and purchase, 30% also supported both self-build homes and retirement housing.
- 4.10 The group did not understand where the figure of 12 hidden households quoted in Para 5.1.2 **came from** and Geoff would query this.
ACTION: Geoff
- 4.11 The group accepted the conclusion at paragraph 5.1.4 of the HNS, which states: *The surveyed and registered local housing need demonstrates with confidence that there is an identified local housing need and demand for affordable housing in the parish. The survey indicates that the local need profile is greater than the HomeChoice and Help to Buy South West registers indicated alone.*
- 4.12 The group considered the inclusion of accessible accommodation and/or older persons housing should be the subjects of further consultation with the local community.
- 4.13 The group considered it significant that there was urgency for additional accommodation, as outlined in paragraph 5.2.5
- 4.14 The HNS concludes with a number of recommendations listed at Para 5.2.8.
- 4.15 The first related to the allocation/zoning of land for development. The group had already identified a limited number of sites **and has been advised that the Abattoir site has a potential for approximately 65 units, depending on the type and mix.** Of itself, this would appear to satisfy the demand outlined in the HNS. The group was also mindful of the comments that respondents had provided, where a clear preference was stated for development on brownfield sites.

4.16 The group identified a need for additional consultation relative to inclusion of green energy components in any development and on self-build opportunities.

ACTION: Group to consult on green energy measures and self-build opportunities

4.17 Of the sites currently identified, it was agreed that the group could put a preferred sequence on these. This may be addressed following further consultation.

4.18 The group had yet to agree on the policy relating to open/green spaces. Following discussion, it was agreed that this too could be the subject of further consultation.

5. To identify possible housing policies

5.1 The group considered the HNS had been an extremely useful document and enabled it to formulate draft-housing policies, which could be refined following further consultation with the community. These included:

- **Policy 1: The Parish would support development proposals that include a proportion of social housing**
- **Policy 2: The Parish would support development proposals that included smaller social housing units of one and two bedrooms to reflect need**
- **Policy 3: The Parish would support development proposals that provide homes with a mix of tenure**
- **Policy 4: The Parish would support development proposals that include provision of a village shop**
- **Policy 5: The Parish would give preference to development proposals that use brownfield sites**

6. Matters for further consultation

6.1 The following were identified as needing additional consultation:

- **Accessible housing**
- **Retirement housing**
- **Green/open space – specifically whether or not the Trebean fields behind the Parc Abnac allotments should be retained as open space**
- **The drawing of development boundary(s) within the parish**

7. There being no further business, the meeting closed.