

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 31st October 2017 in the Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz, commencing 19.35 hours.

Present: Katrina Blee (chair), Liz Brierley, Bill Davidson, Peter Dye, Bill Egerton, Sue Elgey, Andy Hohne, Keith Johnson, Huw Llewellyn, Colin Marsh.

1. Apologies

Apologies had been received in advance of the meeting from Tony Ferrari, Keith Hudson, Susan Higham.

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 17th October 2017 were approved as an accurate record and endorsed by the chair.

3. To Agree that an update on actions not otherwise on the agenda be deferred to the November meeting.

At the request of the chair it was agreed to defer a progress report on any actions until the Steering Group meeting to be held on 21st November 2017 except for the following urgent item:-

3.1 BE advised the meeting that he has been unable to progress the grant paperwork as he was waiting for a complete account of expenditure. The new grant application is now urgent as there are two invoices that need to be settled, and BE asked that the account information be expedited.

4. To Consider and identify any further changes to the Place Appraisal document (including clarification of the status and timing of a tree survey).

4.1 Place Appraisal - Copies of the latest draft Place Appraisal document were circulated. PD reported on progress and acknowledged the excellent work that Mike Haine was undertaking in developing the format. He explained that the main elements of the document would form the foundation of the emerging policies within the Neighbourhood Plan and that further refinements would be necessary prior to public consultation. CM urged caution that the Recommendations contained in Section 6 did not develop into policies prior to the public consultation taking place. KB commented that it was important to tie the recommendations back to the results of the first public survey and expressed the view that the text needed strengthening in certain areas. In response to a question from CM on processing changes to the document, PD offered to act as editor, receive comments and work with Mike Haine on further updates taking note of the need to attain a consistency of style. The Steering Group had previously agreed that public communication of the content would be through the December coffee morning and/or a walk-in session with distribution via the web as well as through the availability of some hard copies.

The main focus of the discussion related to Section 6 on Recommendations and the need to both tie these back to the evidence and justify the questions for the second survey. Julie Tanner (consultant) had suggested the need to 'sharpen the so what narrative' in the document. BE stated that the sub-group responses to Section 6

using the template were not what had been expected and this needed to be revisited. PD stressed that this section would shape the public consultation questions and needed to be aligned to the evidence produced by the sub-groups. Discussion took place on restructuring the sub-headings under the Recommendations section and BD suggested combining 'Opportunities' and 'Options' with a preference for the former term as it was more "open". PD stated the importance of avoiding any perception that the outcome had already been determined prior to the consultation exercise and emphasised that it must be made clear that the Place Appraisal is a supporting document to the Neighbourhood Plan. It was confirmed that the Place Appraisal consultation and the public survey would take place in parallel. KJ suggested that there was a need to explain the purpose of Section 6, in terms of how it had been arrived at and how it would be adapted to reflect the feedback during the next public consultation. The benefits of bullet points versus narrative were discussed and the overall feeling was that the former were preferable. It was agreed that the headings would need to be re-ordered, for example by placing 'Challenges' before 'Risks'. PD suggested including within the pre-amble to Section 6 an explanation of why the different topics had been chosen and how the sub-groups had sourced information to arrive at the recommendations. It was agreed that this would require input from the various sub-groups.

It was agreed that sub-groups review their respective contributions to section 6 and present a re-draft which was related to the evolution of policy and questions in the forthcoming public survey.

Action: All sub-groups

4.2 Tree Survey – The chair explained that this item had been requested by PD who had been unable to attend the previous meeting and wished to express the importance of completing a tree survey in support of the Place Appraisal as soon as possible. The chair went on to summarise the discussions that had taken place so far as per the previous minutes and which had led at the meeting on October 17th to a decision to re-consider a tree survey after the public consultation was completed.

PD outlined the importance of a tree survey from a landscape perspective and the value of trees as a community asset and believed there was a need to obtain a third party professional view as to the importance of trees to the village. CM questioned whether a survey as proposed would provide the information sought and believed that it was not necessary to carry this out at this particular time. BE expressed the view that the first priority was to identify whether people in the village really cared about trees and BD commented on the existence of very different views in the community on this issue from his own experience. PD emphasised that trees have defined the whole area and that there was a clear benefit to carrying out a detailed study of those trees and their impact, adding that if left until the spring the survey would not in his opinion take place. This view was challenged by BE who questioned whether going ahead with a survey would make any difference in relation to tree protection and asked what policy would emerge as a result. CM explained that his research in this area on web sites such as those of the Woodland Trust had shown that few neighbourhood plans had addressed the issue of trees and those that had done so had experienced difficulty in developing an acceptable policy.

In the absence of a formal proposal the chair brought the discussion to a close and asked for each member's views as to whether a tree survey should be undertaken now or whether a decision should be deferred until the results of the second public consultation are known. Three members (LB, PD and HL) were in favour of immediate action, the seven others present (KB, CM, BD, BE, SE, KJ and AH)

preferred to wait. It was therefore agreed that a decision on a tree survey be deferred.

5. Public Consultation Survey – to consider and agree sub-group questions and establish a working party to prepare the draft public survey document.

The chair led the process of addressing each set of sub-group draft questions while taking into account the feedback provided by Brian Wilson (consultant) and requesting any comments.

5.1 Biodiversity

Question 1 (Flooding) – Agreed

Question 2 (Green corridor) – Agreed subject to re-wording to reflect the consultant's comment i.e. ask whether people would support the designation of a Biodiversity Corridor and use a text box to ask for comment on its boundaries.

Question 3 (Green Space) – Agreed, subject to the incorporation of the consultants advice to remove the word 'harmful'. BE questioned whether use of the term 'green infrastructure' was more appropriate but others considered 'green space' was the appropriate term in this particular context. The list of green spaces was agreed subject to provision being made for a Yes/No response.

LB queried the number of Biodiversity questions, however it was pointed out that a maximum of 5 from each sub-group was allowable and it was also highlighted that this particular question was cross-themed and may be better placed elsewhere in the survey. This is because green space protection not only relates to biodiversity criteria but also other aspects such as beauty, historic or recreational value.

Question 4 (Biodiversity enhancement) – Agreed subject to feedback from the consultants. Agreed to refer to 'National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)'.

Question 5 (Tree Preservation) – Part a) and b) were agreed. Part c) generated further discussion; LB questioned the value of asking for consultation if it could not be adopted as policy whilst BE considered it was worth retaining in order to ascertain the public view, it being finally agreed to retain this question. BE suggested removal of the words 'Neighbourhood Forum' since it was his view that this would not exist once the neighbourhood planning process was complete. This view was contested by the chair and others who felt that the community may well want the Society to apply for the Forum to continue to exist to help monitor the implementation of the Neighbourhood Plan and review it in the future. It was therefore decided to seek clarification on this matter from the consultants.

Action:KB

BE noted that it is agricultural hedges which are protected and therefore queried whether residential hedges should be included. It was agreed that there was little value in this due to the difficulties in enforcing such a policy but the wording could be amended to clarify this point.

5.2 Housing and Planning

LB explained that a duplicate copy of the 'tracked changes' draft questions had been circulated instead of a 'clean' copy by mistake and distributed copies of the latter for ease of reference. The sub-group had agreed not to include the original question 4 as

proposed by the consultant and to accept the sufficiency of UK Government standards of construction.

AH requested that a context statement be added explaining why a zero option on house building was not appropriate and to remove the option 'none' from question 1.

It was suggested that the word "adjoining" in question 1 could be confusing and should be discarded such that this part of the question read "... be built within the village over ..."

Commenting on the current question 4 BE suggested a third option whereby 'any development in the area is to take account of the building design and materials in the village core' should be considered. This was agreed subject to confirmation with the consultants that it was appropriate.

5.3 Employment Business and Tourism plus Communications and IT

AH reported that the sub-group had incorporated the feedback from the consultants with the exception of the suggested replacement of the volunteer hours option with a simple yes/no response, since they felt that this was a key question in determining the viability of a village shop.

BE raised the issue of holiday homes and felt that this should be included either here or in the housing and planning questions. There was some discussion as to the practical measures that could be taken. PD suggested that given the response in the first survey we 'owed it to the village' to address this question but should differentiate between holiday lets and second homes. AH suggested that the question be worded so as to provide an option of an increase or a decrease in the number of holiday homes. It was agreed to incorporate this topic into question 4.1 with regard to holiday lets only.

5.4 Heritage

BE noted the feedback from the consultants suggesting a shorter question 3. After brief discussion it was agreed to retain Q1 and 2 and it was clarified that the latter will include a list of heritage assets which were to be identified on a map in the final survey. It was further agreed to remove Q3 entirely.

5.5 Sports and Recreation.

PD reported that the focus of the questions was on assets of community value and that the questions had not changed following the consultant feedback but acknowledged their comment that respondents may tick all boxes. It was agreed to remove 'network of footpaths' as these were covered as public rights of way. An overlap with the list of green spaces was noted but was not seen as an issue and could be considered when the survey form was prepared. CM stressed the need for a clear and consistent means of setting priorities and it was agreed that this be adopted for the survey as a whole.

5.6 Transport

Q1 (Traffic Management) – Agreed. The inclusion of areas outside of the neighbourhood zone in relation to vehicle congestion was questioned. It was suggested that this was valid on the basis that these areas were major access routes

and any resulting proposals would need to go through a statutory consultation process involving residents in the immediate area.

Q2 (Residential Parking Space) – BE was concerned that the parking place standards may be duplicating existing guidance resulting from the Bournemouth University study. CM explained that this question sought to strengthen the existing guidance by decreasing the ratio of visitor parking spaces to the number of homes from 1 to 5 to 1 to 4 based upon the 20% greater car ownership in the village compared to Weymouth. LB questioned the inclusion of vehicle charging points on the basis that people would simply remove them after house purchase.

Q3 (Public Car Park) – It was agreed that a qualification be included within the car park question to the effect that a location would be required that was not currently obvious.

Q4 (Pavements and Street Lighting) – It was agreed to split this question into two parts so as to address pavements and street lighting separately.

BE suggested that the latter question could be inverted and asked that consideration be given to the final wording so as not to lead respondents.

It was agreed that all sub-groups would arrange to finalise questions as soon as possible – see 7.1 below.

Volunteers were requested to join a small working party to collate the questions and draft the public consultation survey in readiness for the next Steering Group meeting. KB, AH and CM offered their services and in the absence of any other volunteers it was agreed that this group of three address this requirement.

6. To consider and agree the draft Housing Needs Survey prepared by Brian Wilson and Associates.

It was noted that the inclusion of a question on 100% affordable homes sites had been left out by design. CM suggested that in the interests of considering all options this should be included, a view supported by BD in the interests of keeping the process as open as possible. Following a question from AH a brief discussion took place on the definition of 'affordable' housing. LB reported that RICS are doing work on improving tax efficiency in this area and that her husband might consider a scheme for 100% affordable housing in their own field.

BD suggested that the introductory sentence on the survey form should be amended to reflect the logistical arrangements for distribution of both this survey and the general consultation survey. This will be addressed by the new working party.

BE suggested asking a question about whether people would be moving out of the village in the next five years thus releasing a home for resale.

7. To Review progress against the Neighbourhood Plan timetable

AH suggested that the amended questions from sub-groups would need to be submitted in advance of the November Steering Group meeting. The chair proposed several amendments to the short term timetable as follows:-

7.1 Amended draft questions as agreed at the meeting to be sent to KB/CM by 5th November 2017.

Action: All sub-groups

7.2 Sub-groups to review their part of Section 6 of the draft Place Appraisal by 7th November 2017 and submit to PD. **Action: All sub-groups**

7.3 Revised Housing Needs Survey forwarded to CM/KB by 5th November 2017

Action: KB/BW

7.4 Steering Group members to submit individual comments on the draft Place Appraisal document by 7th November 2017. **Action: All Steering Group members**

7.5 Edit draft Place Appraisal by 14th November 2017

Action: PD

7.6 Public survey sub-group to produce a draft public survey document by 14th November 2017. **Action KB/AH/CM**

7.7 Updated draft Place Appraisal and draft public consultation survey to be sent to Brian Wilson and Associates for feedback comment by Brian Wilson and Julie Tanner by 14th November 2017. **Action respectively: PD and KB/AH/CM**

8. To address any other urgent business.

No items were raised.

9. Date and Time of the next meeting

The next Steering Group meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 21st November 2017 at 7.30pm.