

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 17th July 2018 in the Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz, commencing 19.30 hours.

Present: Peter Dye (Chair), Bill Davidson, Bill Egerton, Keith Hudson, Keith Johnson, Huw Llewellyn, Colin Marsh and Liz Pegrum.

John Crisp (Housing and Planning sub-group) was also in attendance.

1. Apologies

Received in advance of the meeting from Mike Blee, Sue Elgey, Tony Ferrari and Andy Hohne.

2. To Approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 19th June 2018

An amendment on a point of clarity had been requested by Mike Blee

It was agreed to amend the second sentence of the third paragraph under section 6 on page 2 to read "The landowner believed that the site ... aspirational needs" **Action:CM**

It was also agreed to correct the date of the meeting to read '19th June 2018' as opposed to 19th May 2018.

LP asked that an apostrophe be inserted into "Puddings" so as to read "Pudding's".

The minutes as amended were proposed as a true record by BD, seconded by BE, and agreed unanimously by the meeting.

3. To Receive an update on any actions arising from the minutes of the previous meeting (not otherwise on the agenda)

Before continuing with normal business, in view of some recently publicly expressed views the chair stated that he wanted the following comments to be placed on the public record.

- There is no evidence that anyone is trying to slow down the Neighbourhood Plan process and there are some indications that we could be moving too fast.
- We need to keep an open mind as to ideas from other neighbourhood forums and plans. . Insisting that we are different is insular, unproductive and could ultimately undermine the validity of the process
- There have been no conflicts of interest in the Steering Group's deliberations that have not been declared. There are different views and strong opinions, but we need to work together to achieve a consensus rather than marginalising individuals. Owning land in the Neighbourhood Area does not disqualify participation in the Steering Group or invalidate individual views and opinions.
- The Steering Group has a leadership role which involves much more than 'rubber stamping' the majority views of the village but being pro-active and ensuring the implications and potential contradictions of policy decisions arising from public consultations are clearly explained, if necessary, through further consultation.
- We must look to producing a Neighbourhood Plan that can be supported by the vast majority of stakeholders; a 51% to 49% split (either way) will not deliver a happy or contented community.

- Given our stated aim of achieving a better, stronger and more forward looking community it is important to try to achieve a broad consensus through compromise during the policy making process.

The chair went through each of the actions from the minutes of the June meeting.

Numbering of pages of the minutes – action complete.

Grant funding – BE confirmed that the local authority grant of £3.2k had been received and Groundwork had approved the claim for £730 expenditure. LP confirmed that an invoice for £220 for outstanding consultancy work had been received from Brian Wilson and authorised for payment by the chair. The chair confirmed that this would enable further consultancy services to be procured. HL proposed a vote of thanks to Councillor Tony Ferrari for securing the grant funding and this was seconded by BE and fully supported by the meeting. The chair noted that TF had also been responsible for securing finance to undertake work around the village pond on behalf of the Sutton Poyntz Society.

Contact with Wessex Water – the action on LP was now closed. The chair confirmed that he would continue to seek a meeting with Wessex Water over their concerns with some of the draft policies.

Meeting with Terry Pegrum – an agreed record of the meeting had been previously circulated

Meetings with landowners – the chair confirmed that he would continue to engage with landowners and will subsequently report on the meeting with Chris Seal - the minute for which had been pre-circulated with one minor amendment. He had invited Peter Broatch to meet the Steering Group and noted that Punch Taverns had declined a meeting in the absence of a call for sites. LP suggested that the owners (Diment) of the land at the bottom of Old Bincombe Lane should also be consulted. This was agreed. **Action:PD**

Meeting of Place Appraisal sub-group – the chair noted that the sub-group had not met pending guidance from Brian Wilson as to what precisely was required for the update and where the focus should be placed.

Section on Employment, Business and Tourism - this had been incorporated into the draft Neighbourhood Plan although comments by Nick Cardnell (Senior Planning Officer, (Community and Policy Development,) Dorset Councils Partnership) may lead to minor changes.

Biodiversity information – CM confirmed that a map covering these points had been sent to the Crocker family and no response received.

Heritage – progress would be addressed under the sub-group reports

Housing and Planning - progress would be addressed under the sub-group reports

Balance in narrative of Consultation Statement - this was work in progress.

4. Update on Grant Funding.

BE stated that approval of the allocation of £730 had taken us up to the £9k grant limit. This allocation covered 3 consultancy invoices of £220 each and £70 for printing. In response to a question from LP regarding the previously disallowed application the chair was of the opinion that this matter had now been satisfactorily resolved. He further stated that providing we adhere to the schedule of work agreed earlier it will be possible to fund completion of the Neighbourhood Plan from the local authority grant. He also reported that Nick Cardnell will initiate the SEA screening and that, given the Steering Group's stated vision and aims, and the absence of a call for sites, it was felt that this could be completed by September 2018. BE questioned what level of paperwork would be required to administer the council grant, although the chair did not feel this would be too onerous and was expected to be comparable to that previously encountered with Groundwork.

5. To Receive an update on Income and Expenditure

LP reported that £3.2k had been received into the bank with a further £730 awaited and with expenditure of £220 for consultancy this would leave a projected balance of £3710.

6. To Receive an update regarding Consultation with Landowners.

The chair reported on a very useful meeting with Christopher Seal on 6th July. Various proposals had been outlined by the landowner including specific potential development sites such as north of Puddledock Lane along with the use of fields for camping; these were contained in the detailed minutes of the meeting.

Regarding future meetings, Punch Taverns had declined the offer of a meeting and a response was awaited from Wessex Water and Peter Broatch. An action was placed on the chair to contact Hugh Diment with regard to a meeting in relation to his land.

Action:PD

7. To Review and Approve draft Neighbourhood Plan sections for Regulation 14 Consultation.

The chair noted that the Regulation 14 process would provide a major opportunity for consultation with stakeholders. Regarding the section on Sports and Recreation the chair noted the feedback from Wessex Water which stated that the museum was part of an operational site and should not be included as an Asset of Community Value (ACV). It was also considered more appropriate to broaden the potential location for a children's play area from 'near the Springhead' to one 'near the centre of the village'. These two topics formed the policy element of the section and had been highlighted for ease of reference. The chair recommended that the Wessex Water museum remain on the list of ACV's in order to provide an opportunity for wider consultation. The section was unanimously approved for inclusion in the draft Neighbourhood Plan for Regulation 14 consultation having been proposed by CM and seconded by BE.

The chair confirmed that he would now send the various responses to Wessex Water in respect of their recent communication.

Action:PD

8. To Receive sub-group reports

The chair agreed to address the report on Housing and Planning first.

Housing and Planning - LP reported on the meeting held immediately prior to the steering group and which followed circulation of the most recent draft policy and took account of comments made by Nick Cardnell. The following issues were discussed:-

Nick Cardnell was concerned as to the use of the term 'up to 20 homes' and suggested 'at least 20 homes'. The sub-group were not comfortable with this wording and were keen to see a commitment to a specific number of homes so as to better reflect the public view. It was agreed that more evidence was needed to support a figure of 20 and that reference to the historic building rate would be a primary source. The chair felt that, as an analysis had concluded the Defined Development Boundary (DDB) contained sufficient capacity for 20 homes a build rate of one home per year could be achieved over the next 18 years (i.e. up to 2036). As this was equivalent to the build rate over the last thirty years, such a policy could be defended.

LP reported that the sub-group had discussed the implications of not calling for sites and no change to the DDB in terms of the five-year housing supply rule application as opposed to a three-year rule which would be easier to meet.

The chair commented on the suggestion introduced by Nick Cardnell and supported by Brian Wilson that a monitoring function should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan such that if the housing policy was not being met during the life of the plan a review of how to achieve this would be triggered. He was supportive of this idea and felt that the village would want to have such a role in implementation of the plan, for example through the Neighbourhood Forum HL and KJ expressed some concern as to the practicality of such a monitoring role while BD considered it vital for the village to be pro-active in this respect in order to prevent the local authority having to take the lead. LP was concerned as to who exactly would carry out the monitoring role in order to be representative. CM felt that any monitoring function should relate to all policy areas, not just housing. BE noted that by the time the plan was made a Weymouth Parish will exist and perhaps they would manage the plan but could delegate the monitoring role to the Neighbourhood Forum. In summary the chair considered that a monitoring section within the Neighbourhood Plan was sensible and might provide an on-going role for the Neighbourhood Forum. Reference to the rationale for this should be included in the introductory section. **Action:PD**

LP referred to the policy on design and style issues and the need for a consultation process aligned to the conservation area plan. BE agreed to provide the most recent copy of the latter. **Action:BE**

A key challenge for the sub-group was how to get the council to do its job with regard to the conservation area by strengthening the wording around the policy on 'style and design' with the possible addition of a policy on review. JC felt that ultimately it came down to the planning department doing its duty and it would help to talk to the planners about the wording of policies which would assist them in their function. It was agreed that LP and JC meet with the planners in this respect. **Action:LP and JC**

PD suggested that Nick Cardnell and Brian Wilson be consulted as to the precise wording of policies although Nick Cardnell had been generally positive about the draft plan.

The sub-group had discussed the flooding policy and felt that further evidence on the extent of past flooding events was needed. LP suggested that the policy was quite long and could be condensed down. It was suggested that the Biodiversity sub-group as the originators of this policy provide further input following this feedback.

LP asked whether consultation with landowners should be included as a policy. The chair suggested that this would be adequately covered by the Consultation Statement and Regulation 14 consultation process.

It was agreed to remain silent on the issue of 'affordable housing' or rural exceptions.

LP noted the need to refine the policy detail on Key Views.

LP agreed to produce a further draft and circulate this for comment.

Action:LP

HL questioned the importance of the figure of 20 new homes over the period of the plan and the degree of slack that existed given the response in the stage two survey. The chair confirmed that since the figure was based upon firm evidence of one new home per year over the last 20 years it was appropriate and such a policy could not be seen as obstructing development.

KH stated the need to look at the big picture and recognise the economic benefits of development. It was agreed that large scale development was not projected in Sutton Poyntz and BD suggested that the lack of infrastructure was a key limiting factor in this respect.

JC tendered his apologies and left the meeting at this point.

Place Appraisal – The sub-group had not met but would do so pending advice on the content of section 6 from the consultants.

Biodiversity and the Natural Environment – CM referred to the sub-group response to the letter from Wessex Water in relation the threat to the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the preference to underpin this designation with an additional layer of protection of Local Green Space (LGS). Whilst recognising the future constraints that LGS designation may place on operational development plans, it was noted that no proposals currently existed and it was suggested that a possible change in the LGS boundaries may form a basis for compromise, particularly in relation to the water meadow. LP expressed concern that the tendency for Wessex Water to be slow in their response would cause a potential delay in any meeting and this would impact the overall neighbourhood plan timetable. CM did not feel that this would be an issue since the process would simply overflow into the formal Regulation 14 stage. The chair felt it important to try to seek areas of common ground which would be beneficial during formal consultation, however, it was also important not to delay the process unnecessarily and he requested that the Housing and Planning together with the Biodiversity draft Neighbourhood Plan sections be submitted for approval at the August meeting

Action: LP and CM

Resulting from his meeting with Nick Cardnell the chair was able to confirm that as stated in the latest Local Plan Review ‘any new elements of green infrastructure identified within neighbourhood plans (including local green spaces), will form part of the green infrastructure network.’

Employment Business and Tourism – this had been addressed at the last meeting.

Heritage – Following confirmation of receipt of the local authority grant monies BE had unsuccessfully attempted to contact Kim Sankey (consultant) regarding the local heritage asset report and would continue to try to make contact as a matter of urgency.

Action:BE

Sports and Recreation – this had been actioned earlier in the meeting.

Transport (Getting Around) – the draft may require some fine tuning following feedback comments from Nick Cardnell. PD suggested that as with other policy areas assistance from Brian Wilson could now be called upon subject to ensuring that the chair is copied on any communications.

9. To Receive an Update on Progress with the Production of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan

The chair was of the opinion that the draft Neighbourhood Plan would be ready to go out for formal consultation in October, in line with the agreed timetable. Following the meeting with Nick Cardnell it had been suggested that including the community aspirations within the same section of the draft as policies may detract from the impact of the latter and they may be better placed in a separate section. CM noted that a revised draft had been produced reflecting this and was accessible on Drop Box.

10. To Receive an Update on the Draft Consultation Statement

Further amendments had taken place and the revised document was available on Drop Box. This would continue to be updated, for example in relation to the meetings with landowners, prior to a full review.

Action:PD and CM

11. To Review Progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetables

The chair provided a brief overview of the timetable and noted that the decision by the local authority to undertake the SEA screening would enable us to realign with the schedule and begin the Regulation 14 consultation in October.

12. To Address Items of Correspondence

CM reported that there were no items of correspondence other than those which had been addressed earlier in the meeting..

13. Any Other Business

No items of other business were raised by those present.

The chair confirmed that following the meeting with Christopher Seal it had emerged that PJ Seal Estates had been the landowner who had initiated contact with Blue Cedar Homes and subsequently instructed them not to progress the enquiry.

The meeting closed at 21.21 hours.

The date and time of the next meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 21st August 2018 at 19.30 hours.