

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 16th October 2018 in the Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz, commencing 19.34 hours.

Present: Peter Dye (Chair), Bill Davidson, Bill Egerton, Tony Ferrari, Colin Marsh and Liz Pegrum.

The following sub-group members were also present; John Bellis, John Crisp, Tony Heathershaw (Housing and Planning) and Caroline Crisp (Heritage).

A total of six residents were in attendance.

1. Apologies

Received in advance of the meeting from Sue Elgey, Andy Hohne, Keith Johnson and Huw Llewellyn.

The Chair had also been notified by Sue Elgey that for personal reasons she wished to resign as a member of the Steering Group. This was accepted and the Chair asked that a vote of thanks be placed on record for the valuable work that Sue had contributed to both the Steering Group and Sub-groups.

2. To Approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 25th September 2018

Further to a request by BE the following amendment was inserted:

Under item 6d, after the third sentence add "Seven householders (representing Fox Cottage, White Horse Cottage, Rose Cottage, Albert Cottage, Staddles, Wyndings and Bellamy Cottage) had either objected to their inclusion in the list or criticised the methodology and accuracy of the report. After the next sentence add, "There were also two verbal representations from Cob Cottage and Spinneys, welcoming the report." The next sentence to read; "Concern was also expressed that some photographs employed in the report had been intrusive, particularly that taken from a trailer parked outside of a property".

Further to a request from AH the following amendments were inserted.

Under item 6d, amend sentence 12 to read; "Once this meeting had been held, the Steering Group would be in a better position to determine a draft policy."

Under item 10, Any Other Business, the second sentence to be amended to read; "The Chair agreed that the vote of an absent member, expressed in advance of a meeting, should be considered in any decision making."

Subject to these amendments the minutes of the previous meeting were approved as a correct record and subsequently endorsed by the Chair.

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

The Chair confirmed that each of the actions had been addressed and confirmed that the approved minutes were to be placed on the village web-site. **Action: BE**

4. To Address any items of Correspondence

A communication from Christopher Seal was tabled regarding land that he owned adjacent to the Springhead Pub, asking about the intentions of the village in respect of a public car park. The Chair had replied requesting the landowner to put any forward specific proposals; no reply had been received to date. The Chair noted that there was an aspiration for a car park and that Wessex Water at a recent meeting had stated that they had no suitable land for such provision. No further comments were forthcoming from the meeting.

5. To Receive an update on Grant Funding and Income and Expenditure

BE reported that invoices had been received from Brian Wilson Associates and Angel Architecture in respect of consultancy services. He confirmed that these had been paid from the Sutton Poyntz Society account as a temporary measure until sufficient account signatories could be organised following a change in officers of the Society. The Chair requested a detailed account of the current balance and the projected expenditure for outstanding work to be presented at the next meeting.

Action: BE and AH

The Chair noted that some cost savings had been made on the SEA and Heritage Asset Assessment against the original projected expenditure. He concluded that the Neighbourhood Plan was still on budget and that there was enough funding to complete the task.

6. To Receive sub-group reports

In introducing sub-group reports the Chair explained that the Steering Group had been advised that for the Neighbourhood Plan to proceed to a referendum it must be submitted to the Local Authority by the end of February 2019. Regulation 14 consultation would need to begin in early November - to avoid the Christmas holiday period. A start date around the 6th November was therefore suggested. To achieve this aim, it was important to resolve the remaining Housing and Planning and Heritage issues. The Chair reminded the meeting that, although they were working to a tight deadline, the forthcoming consultation offered a further opportunity to refine these policies - based on feedback received.

Item 6e, the Housing and Planning sub-group report was brought forward on the agenda.

e) Housing and Planning – The Chair noted that Tony Heathershaw had agreed to join the Housing and Planning sub-group and welcomed him to the meeting. His membership of the sub-group was confirmed. It was noted that Celeste Osadnik had withdrawn her request to join the sub-group.

The Chair explained that several policy issues needed to be resolved. These had been referred by the sub-group to Brian Wilson (consultant) for advice. The aim was to agree the policies and supporting justification/intent based on his detailed response. LP reported that the most recent draft of the H&P section had been sent to the consultant along with a series of questions to seek guidance prior to a decision being taken by the Steering Group. With reference to the responses received from Brian Wilson, which had been pre-circulated, LP stepped through each point and asked the meeting for comment before seeking agreement on the way forward. The key decisions in relation to changes to the draft document were as follows.

Strategic Objectives – It was agreed that the proposed word changes offered by Brian Wilson better reflected the intent of the policy and after brief discussion it was agreed that these should be adopted.

Action: LP

Introduction – The recommendation to place some of the introductory text under the respective policies and adopt a more balanced and positive tone with key points being highlighted, was agreed. It was suggested that a statement be inserted to the effect that a review of the Defined Development Boundary (DDB) would be undertaken if the rate of housing production fell behind the projected rate. BE suggested that it would be better to refer to a review of the Neighbourhood Plan rather than the DDB and this was agreed. He also noted that with regard to Local Plan policy HOUS 2 the issue of sustainability needed to be addressed, for example in relation to the bus service which was unsuitable for travel to work. It was agreed to incorporate a reference to HOUS 2 and the issue of sustainability in this respect. **Action: LP**

Policy H&P 1 – The main concern was inconsistency in wording between the supporting text and that shown in the Place Appraisal with respect to the five Character Areas. After some discussion, it was agreed to base the wording on that contained in the Place Appraisal - subject to the correction of inaccuracies (such as ‘South Dorset Ridgeway’) – since the latter document had already undergone public consultation. **Action: LP, BE, TH & PD**

The consultant had recommended that the design guidance be shortened and had made several suggestions in terms of revised text. TH considered that clear design guidance was important and noted that Nick Cardnell had steered the sub-group towards the Lodgers, Fontmell Magna and other neighbourhood plans which contained detailed sections in this respect. He emphasised the importance of the community identifying preferred materials of construction rather than leaving this decision to the developer. It was agreed to retain this guidance but to re-write the current text to make it more concise. **Action: TH**

TF suggested removal of the final paragraph as recommended by the consultant and insertion under policy H&P2. Several other minor changes to the justification section were agreed. **Action: LP**

Policy H&P 2 – Wording related to the number of homes to be built during the life of the plan had been subject to extensive debate. The consultant recommended that reference to ‘around 20’ be inserted into the supporting narrative rather than the policy itself. This was considered to be a helpful approach. TF suggested inserting a sentence into the policy along the lines of ‘development will take place at a rate similar to that which has taken place over the last 20 years’. This was agreed. **Action: LP**

The consultant had recommended removal of reference to the DDB with a more concise supporting text. It was agreed to remove reference to the DDB and affordable homes, amend the narrative and make reference to monitoring the rate of development. **Action: LP**

JB expressed concern at the quality of the downsize options which were being provided. After brief discussion it was agreed to leave reference to ‘downsizing’ and consider inclusion of a sentence to address the concerns raised by JB. **Action: LP and JB**

Policy H&P 3 – The consultant had recommended inclusion of the photographs of key views in an appendix, however LP considered that as they related directly to the policy a better option was the inclusion of smaller sized photographs within the policy section itself and this received the support of the meeting. It was agreed to amend the title of the following key views; ‘The mill pond’, ‘Towards White Horse Hill’ and ‘From Margaret’s seat’. A larger map would also be provided. Finally, BD noted the need to amend an error where ‘eight’ views should read ‘seven’. **Action: LP**

Policy H&P 4 – The consultant had recommended that the policy on flooding was suitable for inclusion in the H&P section. It was agreed to replace the word ‘impervious’ with ‘porous’ in the policy, to use the term ‘will’ rather than ‘must’ and to remove the duplication of the narrative on

justification. JC requested that the supporting narrative relating to sewer overflow also be included in the justification. **Action: CM**

In summary it was agreed that LP would amend the draft H&P section prior to circulation to the sub-group for endorsement and this would then be forwarded to PD and CM for inclusion in the draft Neighbourhood Plan ready for final endorsement at the November meeting. **Action: LP, PD and CM**

JC noted that the references were now mis-aligned with the text and agreed to contact Celeste Osadnik who had previously agreed to address this. **Action: JC**

TH asked about updates to the Place Appraisal. The Chair stated that we had been advised not to continually change this document and to limit any future amendments to corrections of the existing text.

d) Heritage – In opening his report, BE apologised for the short notice given for the recent open meeting with the heritage consultant, however, he felt that it had been extremely useful in addressing residents' concerns. As a result, Kim Sankey (consultant) had amended her report and this had resulted in the removal of two properties and the addition of one other - following the review requested at the meeting. A prior meeting of the sub-group had addressed the issue of the houses on Silver Street and recommended changes to the report that recognised the unique character of the street as a whole, with consideration being given to the overall setting rather than the individual houses. A revised wording had been circulated to the Steering Group and affected residents. Liz Crocker (resident) sought assurances that the intent of the policy was to confine the scope of the listing to the character of the street and would not encroach beyond any property boundaries. The meeting agreed that this was the intent of the policy and would be made clear in the narrative supporting the policy statement. It was also agreed to provide an alternative photograph which focussed on the street rather than individual properties. **Action: BE**

The Chair noted that the owners of Staddles, Littlecot and the Springhead pub remained opposed to inclusion of their properties in the report. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, there was no justification for removing these properties. If further evidence was received, however, the consultant would be asked to reconsider. In the meantime, some further clarification about the implications of listing, including maintenance obligations, would be helpful.

Discussion took place as to the policy options of whether a list of non-designated properties should be included within the Neighbourhood Plan or the report (together with the concerns raised by affected householders) passed to the Local Authority for their consideration in preparing such a list. It was acknowledged that the wording of the policy would require careful consideration. It was agreed that the preferred option was to provide the consultant's report to the Local Authority – with details of the consultation (including feedback) and a recommendation that this form the basis of a non-designated heritage asset list. A redraft of the policy and supporting justification and intent would be provided by the Heritage sub-group for review by Brian Wilson, prior to inclusion within the draft Neighbourhood Plan in readiness for the November Steering Group meeting.

Action; Heritage sub-group

a) Place Appraisal – The revised document was to be finalised before being passed to Mike Haine for formatting with the intention of the finished document appearing on the village web site by the 6th November. **Action: PD and BE**

b) Biodiversity – CM confirmed that the draft section had been amended to take into account feedback from Nick Cardnell (Weymouth and Portland Borough Council) and Brian Wilson (consultant) and was now in its final draft form.

- c) Employment, Business and Tourism – nothing to report.
- f) Sports and Recreation – some minor changes had been made following feedback from the consultant.
- g) Transport – CM confirmed that the draft section was in its final form.

7. To Agree arrangements including timescales for the Regulation 14 consultation of the draft Neighbourhood Plan

It was proposed to undertake the consultation during the period 6th November to 17th December 2018, to ensure completion before the Christmas and New Year holiday period. The Chair summarised the key points from his discussion note which had been circulated with the agenda along with an example public notice and response form. He emphasised the need to consult all stakeholders by as many methods as possible and outlined who those stakeholders were, noting that the local authority would assist with contact details for the statutory bodies. E-mail and hard copy along with availability of copies in the Springhead and Mission Hall would form the primary means of public access to the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Drop-in sessions were also being considered.

Discussion took place as to the value of using a structured response form and the level of detail needed to encourage a response and assist the analysis of feedback. Some concern was expressed as to whether the need for names to be included by respondents would inhibit feedback and BE noted the data protection implications. Other contributors questioned how a response could be provided in the absence of a name whilst others pointed out that due to the formal legal status of the consultation process names may be a mandatory requirement. It was agreed to address these questions to Nick Cardnell (Weymouth and Portland Borough Council) and Brian Wilson (consultant)

Action: PD

The Chair noted that it would be important to ensure that stakeholders understood the plan and what actions had been undertaken in the period since the stage two survey as well as how their feedback would be used. In response to a question from Louise Rookes (resident) the Chair confirmed that all stakeholders, not just residents, would be contacted and asked for any feedback on the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

Action: PD and CM

The Chair confirmed that he would be updating the Sutton Poyntz Society committee on the draft Neighbourhood Plan and the next steps at a meeting on 17th October.

Action: PD

8. To Receive an Update on the Draft Consultation Statement

The Chair reported that updates were on-going and the document would continue to be refined in preparation for consideration by the independent inspector. It was noted that this document was not available on the village web site and it was agreed to determine whether this document should be made more widely publicly accessible.

Action: PD

9. To Review Progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetable

The Chair noted that the target of submission of the Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority of February 2019 following Regulation 14 consultation remained viable.

10. Any Other Business

BE asked whether the sub-groups had identified monitoring criteria. CM commented that the Transport sub-group had undertaken some work on this but had experienced difficulty in defining specific criteria beyond ensuring that the Local Authority planners were making decisions aligned to the Neighbourhood Plan policies. The Chair noted that most sub-groups had not identified any monitoring criteria (other than H&P) and that although such criteria were desirable they were not essential. There was some discussion as to how and by whom the monitoring would be undertaken and JC suggested that this would require extremely careful thought. The Chair explained that due to the formation of a Unitary Authority it was not possible to retain a Neighbourhood Forum and consequently any monitoring duty would revert to the Weymouth Town Council. BD suggested contacting other Neighbourhood Forums to ascertain their experience regarding monitoring. CM noted that since monitoring formed part of the draft Neighbourhood Plan it would also form part of the Regulation 14 consultation process.

Liz Crocker (resident) asked whether supporting documents would be referenced within the draft Neighbourhood Plan and made publicly accessible. CM confirmed that this would be done and a URL provided to assist access wherever possible. **Action: CM**

11. Date and Time of the next meeting

The Chair requested an additional meeting on Tuesday 6th November at 19.30 hours in the Blue Duck Bar to approve the final draft Neighbourhood Plan and to confirm the arrangements for the Regulation 14 consultation process. This was agreed. **Action: CM**

The date and time of the next scheduled meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 20th November 2018 at 19.30 hours.

The meeting closed at 21.43 hours.