

## Campaign to Protect Rural England | Policy Committee Meeting

Minutes of the Policy Committee held at CPRE 5-11 Lavington Street, London, SE1 0NZ on Tuesday 2nd April 2019.

ITEM	ITEMS NOTES	ACTION
1.	<b>ATTENDANCE</b>	
	<b>Apologies</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Su Sayer (Chair of CPRE)</li> <li>John Hobson (Hon Standing Counsel)</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Richard Simmons (Chair of Policy Committee) (referred to below as the Chair)</li> <li>Catherine Le Grice Mack (referred to below as Cate)</li> <li>Sabine Mosner</li> <li>Richard Lloyd</li> <li>Stan Jones</li> <li>John Croxen</li> <li>Anna Hall</li> <li>Kaley Hart</li> <li>Lyndis Cole</li> </ul>	
	<b>Staff Present-</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tom Fyans (Deputy Chief Executive)</li> <li>Matt Thomson (Head of Planning)</li> <li>Crispin Truman (Chief Executive)</li> <li>Daniel Carey-Dawes (Infrastructure Policy Manager)</li> <li>Crewenna Dymond (Director of Volunteering and Partnerships)</li> <li>Felix Beck (Planning Officer)</li> <li>Paul Miner (Head of Strategic Plans and Devolution)</li> <li>Maddy Haughton-Boakes (Campaigns Officer - Litter Programme)</li> <li>Sam Harding (Litter Programme Director)</li> <li>Lois Lane (Research and Policy Advisor)</li> <li>Rebecca Pullinger (Planning Campaigner)</li> </ul>	
	<b>Minutes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Izzy Thomson (Campaigns and Policy Assistant)</li> <li>Tom Stockton (Campaigns and Policy Assistant)</li> </ul>	
2.	<b>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cate highlighted a spelling mistake at bottom of page three.</li> <li>It was raised that the consultation response, as detailed in Item 6 pg.3 had not been disseminated.</li> </ul>	<p>The minutes will be amended before finalisation.</p> <p>Matt T will send copies of the consultation response.</p>
3.	<b>MATTERS ARISING</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Chair offered congratulations on the success of the Glover Review response and coverage.</li> <li>Crewenna gave an update on the work of the Volunteering and Partnership team.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A discussion followed on the devolved nature of a federal charity in reference to the new Ways of Working group and the challenges of implementing the previous memorandum of understanding.</li> </ul>	
<b>4.</b>	<b>CHAIR'S COMMENT</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Chair and Committee expressed thanks to Lyndis Cole for her time and dedication to Policy Committee. He wished her well and looks forward to any possibility of working with her again in the future.</li> </ul>	
<b>5.</b>	<b>REPORT FROM THE TRUSTEE BOARD</b>	
	<p>Crispin reported updates from the Trustee Board due to Su's leave of absence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Board has approved the annual report and accounts for the year.</li> <li>The strategy is currently under a major redrafting process post consultation.</li> <li>The organisational redesign was signed off by trustees allowing for additional investment in staffing.</li> <li>The main aims of the redesign are to align the organisational structure to strategic aims, align the structure with our audiences, decrease the amount of fixed term contracts and provide greater support to the Network.</li> <li>This structure is intended to be future proof, with the ability to be expanded and decreased where needed. It will be in place by the beginning of June.</li> </ul>	
<b>VERBAL UPDATES FOR INFORMATION</b>		
<b>6.</b>	<b>HOUSING TARGETS UPDATE</b>	
	<p>Matt Thomson discussed how the planning team is still coming to terms with last month's changes to the NPPF, with reference to how housing need is calculated.</p> <p>Recent guidance has clarified the 'exceptional circumstances' which local authorities must be in to use a different method for calculating housing need.</p> <p>There are two situations that would allow the methodology to be changed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where data is not available for the area, for example National Parks and local authorities with boundary changes.</li> <li>Where there are demographic issues in the areas causing housing need to be perverse. The Isle of Wight is a good example of this, with an influx of the older generation and outflow of younger people.</li> </ul> <p>Guidance is being produced which will enable individuals to understand the process of moving from a standard method of housing need to a local plan based figure if they are in one of the constrained areas.</p>	
<b>7.</b>	<b>PPAP UPDATE, including design and Scruton Commission</b>	
	<p><b>Richard Simmons - PPAP</b></p> <p>The Chair stated that two meetings of PPAP are currently lined up with more forward planned dates to follow. The current planned meetings are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>April - business meeting to look at the future work programme and potential study visits.</li> <li>May - discussing the reframing of Green Belt with Sir Stuart Lipton.</li> </ul>	

	<p>The Chair will report back with further progress of the group in due course.</p> <p><b>Paul Miner - Scruton Commission</b></p> <p>Paul gave an outline of the Scruton Commission and the submission dates. There will be an initial window to submit written evidence between now and the beginning of May with a further window in September / October.</p> <p>The Commission has broader terms of reference than expected and will recommend changes to the NPPF. Considering this, Paul is keen for the Network and PC to make contributions.</p> <p>Paul updated the committee on the work with UCL on the design quality of new housing and announced that the Design Council and ARUP have now signed up to support with staff and facilities.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lyndis stated that there is a crucial missing bullet under 4.1 referring to the need for more action on climate change mitigation and adaptation, however there was a fear that aspects of classical design alluded to by the Commission may challenge this.</li> <li>• Lyndis also mentioned that developments should fit within and respect the landscape.</li> <li>• John Croxson pointed out that the phrase compact communities should be used to a greater extent, and that one of the issues raised by the paper was unclear; it is not that local authorities have insufficient power but more accurate to say that they have insufficient resources.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair, in a personal capacity, has been asked by Sir Roger Scruton to contribute to the call for evidence.</p>	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Political update, Agriculture Bill, Environment Bill, EU Exit</b>	
	<p>Tom Fyans updated PC on recent political events, however due to the slow movement of both the Agriculture and Environment Bills through the Houses and the focus of the Government on Brexit, this was limited.</p> <p>Tom reported that Liz Truss MP recently cited the planning system as the number one example of a vested interested preventing us getting to grips with the housing crisis. Within this comment she specifically mentioned CPRE as a barrier.</p> <p>It has been decided that we will respond professionally with points on how the Treasury can help to solve the housing crisis and solutions for all to act on.</p> <p>Tom mentioned ongoing work with political communications consultant Emma Burnell who has prepared two reports on how the Civil Service perceive CPRE and how our own external messaging is perceived internally. He promised to address this at the next meeting.</p>	
<b>ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION</b>		
<b>10.</b>	<b>RESOURCES AND WASTE CONSULTATIONS: presentation on CPRE position and advocacy</b>	
	<p>Sam Harding and Maddy Haughton-Boakes gave an update on the DRS consultation, which was released on the 18<sup>th</sup> February, alongside linked consultations on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plastic packaging producer responsibility</li> <li>• Household and business recycling collections</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plastic packaging tax</li> </ul> <p>CPRE will be leading and drafting the Link response for the DRS consultation and helping to prepare responses from groups all around the world.</p> <p>CPRE is pleased with the direction of travel within the consultations, however there is still much to play for while eagerly waiting for the outcome of Scotland's consultation. CPRE hopes to create a positive space for the decisions on this topic to be made, exemplified through work with Damers First School who met with Michael Gove to discuss an 'all in' system.</p> <p>Work going forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPRE is hosting a roundtable of small container producers to understand how a deposit system will work for them with Civil Servants from the Treasury and DEFRA attending</li> <li>• CPRE has had over 15,000 signatories supporting the 'Golden Rules' for a deposit system which will be used in the consultation response.</li> <li>• In order to respond to the consultation with supporters and rural concerns in mind, specific questions from the consultation have been sent out for supporters to answer.</li> <li>• DEFRA have approached the team to organise visits to see evidence of successful systems.</li> <li>• DEFRA and the Treasury have asked to talk to CPRE regarding the consultations on a 1-1 basis.</li> <li>• CPRE's Green Clean will run again this September building on the success of last year and data of materials collected will once again be gathered.</li> </ul> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cate questioned why it is difficult for the government to learn from good practice in DRS systems abroad. Sam noted idiosyncrasies of the English waste collection system with conflict between existing curbside recycling and DRS presented as a key barrier in industry lobbying efforts.</li> <li>• Lyndis noted the need to link this with work on climate change. Sam acknowledged resource efficiency as critical to any work on climate change.</li> <li>• Sabine raised the issue of second homes rented out as cottages in rural areas having fewer responsibilities for recycling as something to include in the consultation responses.</li> </ul> <p>Tom summarised that once the DRS in England is set up that this campaign will be looked back upon as a case study of how to make change happen. He noted that when we think about how CPRE can affect change in future, we have this as one of the strongest case studies.</p> <p>No further input was required from PC at this stage and Sam and Maddy were thanked and congratulated on their successful campaigning.</p>	
11.	<b>RURAL AFFORDABLE HOUSING POSITIONING AND CAMPAIGN</b>	
	<p>Lois Lane gave an overview of the emerging work on rural affordable housing. Tom F noted that this sat within wider work focusing on the rural economy to present a positive vision of the rural economy and countryside.</p> <p><b>Affordable Housing in the Countryside- Network event 15/04-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 21 representatives from 20 local groups attended at national office to discuss their ongoing local work on the issue and consider what work they might want to do in future.</li> <li>• National CPRE have also commissioned Jo Lavis (rural affordable housing expert) to produce a guide specifically for local CPRE volunteers to guide its delivery, this is currently in draft stage.</li> </ul> <p>National Policy Context-</p>	<p>The Chair suggested an hour pre-meet before the next meeting to give PC more information on the fundamentals of planning and the rural affordable housing issue as a knowledge gap was noted in this area.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perception of housing crisis as an urban issue, even by other campaigning organisations working on housing. CPRE is building relationships to shift this focus to include rural.</li> <li>• Gaps in understanding of the issue in a rural context as the small but knowledgeable rural sector have not yet gained traction politically.</li> <li>• 4 Key drivers of unaffordable housing across both rural and urban contexts; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Inflated land value (limited systems of land value capture when planning permission given)</li> <li>○ Lack of investments in social housing (particularly homes for social rent, majority currently delivered by private sector through S106 agreements as a byproduct of large market developments)</li> <li>○ Definition of affordability (the main definition used is pegged to market values rather than local wage levels)</li> <li>○ Problems with the planning system (weighted towards private developers)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Comments-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cate asked whether problems with Right to Buy would feature in this work. Lois agreed and added that Right to Buy would be included in the upcoming One CPRE response to the Affordable Housing Commission call for evidence chaired by Lord Best.</li> <li>• Cate and Sabine commented on how we should frame this work. Cate noted the need to relate this work back to rural economies and Sabine emphasised the need to include a focus on houses as peoples' homes as well as elderly people looking to downsize/live differently. Lois noted that a framing focus on individuals who do key jobs within communities having affordable housing would be a key part of the campaign going forward. She added that concerns of homes not suitable for the ageing population would be included in the planning team's work on design.</li> <li>• Anna commented on developers going to extreme lengths to avoid providing affordable homes as part of their developments. Lois noted that this topic had been covered by CPRE in our <i>Viable Villages</i> report last year. Planning guidance related to this was subsequently tightened but it is too early to tell what effect this had.</li> <li>• The Chair commented on how to involve metro mayors, LEPS and combined authorities to get them to understand rural aspects of affordable housing, an area where knowledge is currently lacking. Lois noted this is important and devolving powers can often help with delivering homes for example in revenue raising powers e.g. the borrowing cap on councils was raised last year but this only applies to 1/3 of rural authorities with the right kind of account to qualify. Lois has discussed with partners the role different providers and local authorities have to play.</li> </ul>	
12.	<b>CLIMATE CHANGE PROVOCATION PAPERS</b>	
	<p><b>Task and Finish Group Roles</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sabine to chair overall process.</li> <li>• Stan to be liaison with County Branch Forum.</li> <li>• Kaley and Anna to chair Forestry, Farming and Rural Land Use group</li> <li>• Will Rivers (trustee) has expressed interest in chairing Energy but awaits more information on time commitments.</li> <li>• Cate also expressed interest in chairing Transport group but awaits more information on commitments and dates for the stages of the process.</li> </ul> <p><b>How to populate the Task and Finish Groups (TFGs)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chair noted that the optimum group size would be about 6 and encouraged PC members to join the TFGs.</li> <li>• Expertise would be the primary criterion for recruitment rather than membership of existing 'issue groups' across the network.</li> </ul>	<p>Any members of PC interested in being involved in the T&amp;F Groups to contact Sabine</p> <p>Any comments on provocation papers or people to involve in the process be sent to Sabine</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was suggested that the proposed statement of intent be tweaked to include knowledge of energy professions, biodiversity and climate change tradeoffs, and water.</li> <li>• Clearer reference to professional experience in the energy sector to be added to the statement of intent.</li> <li>• Experts outside the network will not join the TFGs for ease of process. However, they could be invited to contribute to individual TFG meetings and will feature at the later external roundtable stage of the process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outputs from the Task &amp; Finish group</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overall objective for CPRE's climate vision was briefly discussed. Would this be low carbon; zero carbon or carbon neutral- the Board's preference is low carbon.</li> <li>• Sabine envisaged the output from the TFGs to be presented back to PC would be formed of a 'chapeau' featuring the overall CPRE position atop several pillars relating to specific policy areas and finally a section on linkages and gaps to be rectified. This will be set out more clearly once the TFG chairs have met. In response to several comments on the proposed process, Tom noted that we need to answer the question of why climate change is important to CPRE and therefore to the countryside. The TFGs would help work through the existing climate change related policies, conflicts, tradeoffs, expert positions and network perspectives to knit together a policy on climate change with majority support. This may be challenging for some local CPRE contexts but will widen CPRE's appeal, build support for the policy via the process and include specific policy levers which subsequent campaigning activities could target.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crewenna raised involving the V&amp;P team in the process particularly in terms of network engagement and offered slots at the Conference on 26/27th June for discussions of the issues whilst many of the network are together. She needed this confirmed by 12<sup>th</sup> April. Sabine welcomed this offer with details to be confirmed with Crewenna.</li> <li>• Whether to have a 4<sup>th</sup> group focusing on planning had been raised in the preparation process. It had been suggested that PPAP could take on this role as a pre-existing group. The Chair and Matt felt that as planning was often a means to make things happen rather than an end there was no need for a full TFG akin to the 3 others.</li> <li>• It was decided that the provocation papers would be shared with the relevant TFGs, but not more widely at this stage, in order to enable the TFGs to consider them and decide their processes before extending the debate to the Network.</li> <li>• In response to Cate's question on the role of national office staff assigned to the TFG chairs Tom responded that general administrative support would free up the chairs to focus on policy and that resource needs will be addressed to ensure that the process runs to time.</li> </ul> <p><b>Next Steps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A sense check of the statement of intent will follow before this is sent to the network w/c 8 April.</li> <li>• The provocation papers do not require further edits and will form the starting point for the groups once formed. In addition, a tweaked statement of intent will give more detail on the outputs from the process.</li> <li>• Sabine, Daniel, Lucy and the other TFG chairs will meet over the next few weeks to agree a consistent approach.</li> </ul>	<p>Some changes to be made to the statement of intent.</p>
<p><i>The meeting concluded at 3.52 pm.</i></p>	
<p><b>Dates for Policy Committee in 2019: 4<sup>th</sup> June, 3<sup>rd</sup> September, 5<sup>th</sup> November</b></p>	

