

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Agenda for the meeting to be held on 19th February 2019 in the Blue Duck Bar of the Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz commencing at 7.30pm.

- 1. To Receive Apologies (Apologies in advance from Keith Johnson)**
- 2. To Approve the Minutes of the previous meeting held on 22nd January 2019.**
- 3. To Receive an update on actions arising from the previous meeting; not otherwise on the agenda.**
- 4. To Address any items of Correspondence (attached)**
- 5. To Receive an update on Grant Funding and Income and Expenditure.**
- 6. To Receive Sub-Group reports (Housing and Planning and Heritage attached)**
- 7. To Review and Approve the draft Submission Version of the Neighbourhood Plan.**
- 8. To Approve the draft Basic Conditions Statement.**
- 9. To Approve the draft Consultation Statement.**
- 10. To Review any outstanding responses and approve the draft replies to the Regulation 14 Consultees.**
- 11. To review the Timetable for the Neighbourhood Plan and confirm the next steps.**
- 12. Any Other Business.**

To confirm the date and time of the next meeting (Tuesday 19th March 2019 at 7.30pm?).

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

DRAFT Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 22nd January 2019 in the Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz, commencing 19.30 hours.

Present: Peter Dye (Chair), Bill Davidson, Bill Egerton, Tony Ferrari, Keith Johnson and Liz Pegrum together with three Subgroup members (John Bellis, John Crisp and Tony Heathershaw) and two villagers.

1. Apologies

Apologies had been received in advance from Colin Marsh and Andy Hohne.

2. To Approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 18 December 2018

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 18 December 2018 were approved as a correct record.

Proposed BE, seconded BD.

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 all actions had either been completed or were to be dealt with elsewhere on the agenda.

4. To Address any items of Correspondence

The Chair noted that the correspondence received since the last meeting all related to the Regulation 14 process and would be addressed at Item 7.

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

The Chair confirmed that the remaining funding was sufficient to cover the drafting of the Basic Conditions Statement by the Consultant (Brian Wilson) and to enable him to answer any questions and proposed changes arising from the Regulation 14 process.

BE reported that the Groundworks Account had been reconciled and closed. He also confirmed that the cheque paid to Kim Sankey for consultancy work had been received.

6. To Receive any Sub-Group reports (Heritage)

BE reported on the recent meeting of the Heritage Sub-Group. The issues arising would be dealt with under Item 7.

7. To Agree changes to the draft Neighbourhood Plan resulting from the Regulation 14 Consultation process (draft redacted list of responses/replies and actions summary table attached)

The Chair proposed that the Steering Group (SG) review each section of the draft Neighbourhood Plan in turn, identifying where changes in the policies or supporting narrative might be required. The individual responses (from No 14 onwards) would then be reviewed. This would enable the key policy questions to be addressed and relevant guidance provided to the Sub-Groups. In response to a question from JC, the Chair explained that the Sub-Groups, under the leadership of the relevant SG member, would be engaged directly in reviewing the draft Neighbourhood Plan, once the SG had been given an opportunity to consider the Regulation 14 feedback and determine any policy implications. The Chair further confirmed that, while the Neighbourhood Plan should reflect the views of the village, it was important to accommodate the views of the statutory consultees, such as the Local Authority, who had to implement the plan. Their professional opinion on the practicability and scope of the proposed policies should be carefully considered.

General Formatting: The individual policy sections would be reformatted to address 'Intent' before, rather than after, 'Policy'. Additional paragraph numbering would be introduced where this improved readability. References to the latest NPFF would be incorporated. **Action: CM**

Section 1:

- Para 1.1 The reference to the Place Appraisal would make clear that the document had been closed in November 2018. **Action: PD**
- Para 1.7 would be redrafted to reflect feedback on the monitoring role and the meeting held with the shadow Town Clerk.

Action: PD

Section 4.1 Biodiversity & The Natural Environment:

- BNE 1 to be amended to read: "All development proposals within the area defined as the Green Corridor, with the exception of existing residential or business premises but including any size rural barn, will be expected to include a Biodiversity Appraisal and Biodiversity Mitigation Plan." **Action: CM**
- BNE 1 second paragraph to be amended to read: "This policy aims ... improvement of wildlife habitat as part of the green infrastructure through co-operation with developers, landowners and others in liaison ... Bird Watch (16) project.

Action: CM

- BNE 3 text to include: "Enforcement of these provisions shall be through the inclusion of a condition to the planning consent."

Action: CM

Section 4.2 Employment, Business & Tourism:

- The recent closure of the child-minding business should be reflected in the narrative. **Action:AH**

Section 4.3 Getting Around:

- GA 1 first sentence to be amended to read: "Any development that generates additional traffic flow should:"

Action: CM

- GA 1.3 to be amended to read: "Ensure that where included as part of the development, street lighting is of a suitable type and footways are

so designed as to retain the character of the immediate surrounding area.” **Action: CM**

- GA 1.4 to be amended to read: “Provide suitable access links to existing pedestrian and cycle routes where such opportunities exist.”

Action: CM

- GA 2.1 To be amended to read: “Development proposals that do not comply as a minimum with the off-street parking criteria contained within the Bournemouth Poole and Dorset Car Parking Study will not be supported.”

Action: CM

- GA 2.2 to be retained.

Action:CM

- GA 3.1 to be amended to read: “A proportion of the Community Infrastructure Levy raised from new development shall be directed towards traffic calming and control measures .“

Action: CM

- GA 3.2 to be amended to read: “Proposals for new or improved transport infrastructure will be supported.”

Action:CM

- GA 4 to be retained. Wording reviewed with Brian Wilson. **Action:CM**

Section 4.4 Heritage:

- HE1 ‘Intent’ would be revised to make clear that it did not apply to existing properties. The word ‘previously’ would be removed. **Action: BE**
- HE2 would be moved to Aspirations (AP 5.4) with the aim of encouraging the Local Authority to create a Local Heritage Listing, possibly as part of a full Conservation Area Appraisal. All paperwork, including the consultancy report and responses from stakeholders, would be provided to the Local Authority. Section 4.4 would be revised accordingly. **Action:BE**

- A meeting would be organised with the Springhead Licensee.

Action: BE & PD

Section 4.5 Housing & Planning:

- Reference to Rural Exception sites in the Introduction had been supported by some respondents and opposed by others. The consultant’s advice would be sought before proposing any changes.

Action: LP

- HP 1 supporting narrative would be revised to provide additional information clarifying the extent of the Conservation Area. **Action:LP**

- HP 1 was inconsistent and too prescriptive in the way it addressed building design. A revision to the Introduction and ‘Intent’ was required to reflect the village’s views and make clear that innovative design was not opposed.

- HP 3 Key Views Nos 4,5,6 & 7, would be reviewed to ensure that the specific elements to be protected were better described.

- HP 2 alludes to ENV15 and smaller scale housing at higher density. This should be considered for converting into a policy objective.

Action: LP

- HP 4 Flooding to be revised to read: “ Development proposals will be required to make use of sustainable drainage design features including porous (permeable) surfaces and demonstrate that the volume of surface water run-off onto adjacent land and traffic routes is either at a lower or equal level to that prior to the development.” The existing text from 4.2 to become the final paragraph of the supporting text under ‘Summary of Intent of the Policy’. Include reference to Dorset County Council document ‘Neighbourhood Planning Advice for Managing Surface Water’. All proposed changes to be forwarded for action by the Sub-Group. **Action: CM & LP**

Section 4.6 Sports & Recreation: No changes were required to the policies, which properly reflected the views of the community. However, ‘Sports’ would be removed from the title to SR2 as would the final line “unless they conflict with other Local Area Plan or Neighbourhood Plan policies’, since this was superfluous. **Action: PD**

Respondent 14: The draft response and proposed actions were agreed. The reference to Aspen as (opposed to Black Poplar) would be replaced by the generic term ‘Populus sp.’ All references to the financial benefits or disbenefits of LGS listing would be removed (pages 15 & 45 refer). It was confirmed that BNE3 only applied to new development. It was agreed that while there was no further evidence to be provided on the proposed LGS designation, the failure to agree with the landowner would be highlighted in the Consultation Statement. The need to provide a reference to the exceptions contained in para 89 of the NPFF would be reconsidered. **Action: CM**

Respondent 17: The draft response and proposed actions were agreed. **Action: CM**

8. To Review the Timetable for the Neighbourhood Plan and confirm the next steps.

The subsequent steps were proposed by the Chair as follows:

- Revise the draft Neighbourhood Plan as agreed by the SG and incorporating feedback from the Sub-Groups. **Action PD & CM**
- Housing & Planning Sub-Group to discuss proposed changes to H&P section and recommend changes to the SG. **Action:LP**
- Finalise & Circulate Consultation Statement. **Action:CM**
- Prepare & Circulate Basic Conditions Statement **Action:BW**
- Review the outstanding responses (Ser Nos 15, 16 & 18-37) at the next Steering Group Meeting. **Action: PD & CM**

9. Any Other Business

No items were raised.

The meeting closed at 21:45 hours.

Time and Date of the Next Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for 19th February 2019. It was hoped that there would not be a need to hold a meeting in March but for diary purposes, this was scheduled for 19 March 2019.

Action: CM

ITEM 4 – CORRESPONDENCE

Communication from Nick Cardnell (WPBC)

Peter / Colin

I am happy to review your Plan after the 22nd February and if helpful check that your supporting documents (Basic Conditions Statement and Consultation Statement) comply with the rules for submission.

The SEA Screening opinion must also be included within your submission material.

I would also like to draw your attention to the attached Chief Planner Officer letter, which advises of a recent change to the regulations introducing a new 'basic condition' in relation to appropriate assessment.

My colleague Olly Rendle will be drafting a document covering this point and will be able to advise further having previously assisted other neighbourhood Plans on the same point. I have made him aware of your timescales.

Nick Cardnell

Senior Planning Officer – Planning (Community & Policy Development)

Dorset Councils Partnership serving:

North Dorset District Council, West Dorset District Council and Weymouth & Portland Borough Council

Tel. 01305 838263

Email NCardnell@dorset.gov.uk

www.dorsetforyou.com/contactus

By email only

The Chief Planning Officer

Habitats Regulations Assessments

In April 2018, in the case *People Over Wind & Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta* (“People over Wind”), the Court of Justice of the European Union clarified that it is not appropriate to take account of mitigation measures when screening plans and projects for their effects on European protected habitats under the Habitats Directive. In practice this means if a likely significant effect is identified at the screening stage of a habitats assessment, an 'Appropriate Assessment' of those effects must be

undertaken.

The judgment led to uncertainty for those working on neighbourhood plans and rendered a range of other planning tools inoperable where a case is determined likely to have significant effects on a protected habitats site. This included Local Development Orders and Permission in Principle. In response, we have made consequential changes to relevant regulations through the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018. These came into force on 28 December 2018. The regulations allow neighbourhood plans and development orders in areas where there could be likely significant effects on a European protected site to be subject to an 'Appropriate Assessment' to demonstrate how impacts will be mitigated, in the same way as would happen for a draft Local Plan or planning application.

We will be updating our guidance in due course to reflect the changes.

STEVE QUARTERMAIN CBE
Chief Planner

Brian Wilson brian@brianwilsonassociates.co.uk [Hide](#)

To **safcol** safcol@aol.com

CC **peter.dye** peter.dye@outlook.com

Colin,

It should not have any material impact, as your plan does not include any specific development or site allocation policies. Hence, it does not seek to mitigate for any impacts on European protected habitats.

However, it may be that an additional paragraph should be added to the Basic Conditions Statement to acknowledge the MHCLG letter and clarify why it doesn't alter anything in relation to the screening of your NP. Probably as an insert in the section on compatibility with EU obligations. Can I suggest you check whether Nick thinks that appropriate when you meet him and we then make the amendment.

Kind regards,

Brian

Brian Wilson Associates
07505 139 068

On 08/02/2019 16:32, safcol@aol.com wrote:

Brian,

Reference the attached. Are you aware of this? Is it likely to have any significant impact?

Brian Wilson (brian@brianwilsonassociates.co.uk) To: you + 1 more Details

Colin, Peter,

Probably worth adding that there are no European protected habitats within the Sutton Poyntz NP area. I think it's possible that one or two sites a few miles away are so designated, as either SACs or SPAs e.g. the RSPB reserve. It is usual to reference any within a few miles.

Finally, I am hearing that Weymouth & Portland BC may abandon their Local Plan update and leave it all to the new Dorset Council, which of course will put things on a slower timescale.

Kind regards,

Brian

Brian Wilson Associates
07505 139 068

It was agreed to revise the wording taking these key points into account.

Action:LP

AH led the discussion regarding proposed rewording of the text on 'Design Guidance' with a view to the use of less prescriptive terminology. A number of minor changes were agreed in relation to paragraphs 5 and 6 for example with reference to the types of brick and stone to be used

Action:LP.

It was agreed that all aspects of new build, both traditional and contemporary should "enhance the character" and "resonate with but not necessarily copy" existing buildings and that changes to the section on Design Guidance should result in wording of a less prescriptive wording and remove any contradictions. Suitable re-wording would be drafted taking account these various points.

Action:LP

Feedback from WPBC suggested that the third criterion regarding the impact on the AONB was of limited value. It was agreed that given the importance of the AONB this should remain.

Action:LP

- H&P 2

WPBC had suggested that a policy should be developed based around paragraph 4 of the supporting text. Some discussion took place as to the intent of the terms 'higher density' and 'higher specification' and their incorporation into the policy.

It was agreed to reword the first criterion of the policy to explain that 'normally supported' will mean "higher density and smaller homes".

TF asked whether contact would be made with Nick Cardnell (WPBC) to verify that feedback received from WPBC during the Regulation 14 consultation had been satisfactorily addressed. CM explained that the Chair intended to meet with Nick Cardnell on 1st March to address this issue prior to final submission of the Neighbourhood Plan.

- H&P 3

WPBC feedback expressed concern at the extensive nature of key views 4,5,6 and 7 and the lack of a clear description of the view as being 'from point A to point B' .

LP noted that the vistas would not be protected 'per se' but would be used as a guide. TF suggested that the use of point to point lines as opposed to splays on the map would help address these concerns. LP considered that the use of dotted lines would be most suitable but emphasised that the vista was important in the context of the AONB and this aspect should not be lost..

In summary LP proposed that dotted lines be used to show the views and that these be related to the respective photographs whilst emphasising the importance of vista, particularly in relation to Margarets' Seat ,which would require a further photograph. This was agreed.

Action LP

- H&P 4

CM explained the main changes to this policy and how this was based upon other examples from 'made' neighbourhood plans and feedback from Dorset County Council. He believed that the amendments would strengthen the policy without changing the general intent whilst addressing the feedback from WPBC.

JC suggested that the rate as well as the volume of run-off was important. It was agreed to incorporate this addition.**Action:LP and CM**

Introduction to the H&P section – Inclusion or removal of reference to Rural Exception Sites in the penultimate paragraph was discussed. LP read out the response from Brian Wilson which suggested retention of this paragraph on the grounds of it being neutral (since it replicated government policy) and that it would be beneficial for presentational reasons. LP also noted that a majority of respondents (10 to 3) in the Regulation 14 consultation process had indicated support for rural exception sites.

Some members of the sub-group felt that it could be included subject to adding qualifying words of it 'identifying a community need', although TF felt that this would be portrayed as anti-development.

JC considered that the paragraph should be removed as it did not reflect local need, had not been voted for in the Stage Two survey and the 13 responses in the Regulation 14 process were too small a sample to be considered representative. TF noted that other statements which had duplicated national policy had been removed so this action would be consistent with that approach. JC commented that to remove the paragraph at this stage having already exposed it to the planning authority would have the opposite presentational effect to that suggested by the consultant. It was agreed not to make a specific recommendation and to leave the final decision to the Steering Group.

Action: Steering Group

- Replies to Regulation 14 Consultees (Housing and Planning issues) – It was confirmed that there had been a total of 37 responses which CM considered good relative to other larger neighbourhood areas. CM confirmed that individual responses would be provided to the respondents by the Chair on behalf of the Steering Group.

LP went through each consultee response in turn and read out the proposed replies. The following recommendations were agreed in relation to all replies to which they were applicable:-

Not to 'weight' the level of feedback by indicating the number of replies or referring to similar expressed views, such as 'we have received a number of similar comments'. Also not to put any value judgements in like 'there is community support'.

Delete "significant" from "significant feedback".

Delete the word "preliminary" in relation to "preliminary discussions" in order not to understate the level of input that took place with regard to dealing with possible allocation of sites.

Do not offer opinion beyond offering thanks for comments.

Response 18 and similar delete the last sentence of the reply of the first paragraph - *"The statement on affordable housing is an important indicator of the community's wish to play its part in meeting local and national housing needs"*.

It was confirmed that reference would be made to the Housing Need Survey in the Consultation Statement. **Action:CM**

Replace reference to "supports" rural exception sites with "acknowledges".

Any replies in relation to innovative design issues to note that these have been addressed through amendments to the supporting text for policy H&P1 .

It was acknowledged that respondent opinions were not necessarily based upon fact. JC suggested that where there were misleading responses about the numbers of young families the reply should include "there are at least 40 young people currently in the village"

All actions LP unless otherwise stated.

Any Other Business

No matters of other business were raised.

The meeting closed at 20.58 hours.

HERITAGE

SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP RECORD OF SUB-GROUP MEETING

Topic sub-group Heritage

Dates of Meeting 08/02/2019

Time of meeting from

Location of Meeting Conducted by email

Present: Bill Egerton, Caroline Crisp, Jill Kelsey

Key Discussion Points

BE had distributed revisions of the Regulation 14 responses and the Heritage Policy and Community Aspirations sections of the Neighbourhood Plan, for review.

These were agreed by the Subgroup, with one minor amendment (to say “partly paved” rather than “paved” in the description of Silver Street.

ITEM 11 REVIEW OF TIMETABLE

SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN TIMETABLE

TARGET ACTION	MONTH & YEAR																											
	2017			2018												2019												20
	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J
Produce final draft Place Appraisal	█	█																										
Consultant to produce draft Housing Needs Survey .	█	█																										
Draft and agree questions for next public consultation	█	█																										
Begin first draft NP including draft policies	█	█																										
Sub-groups to continue to build evidence base	█	█																										
Steering group endorse PA, HNA and public survey docs.		█																										
Distribution/access of each of the above documents			█																									
Response to each of the above consultation received by 5/1/18				█																								
Summary and analysis of responses by Steering Group				█	█																							
Landowner consultation				█	█	█	█	█																				
Production of draft NP by SG				█	█	█	█	█	█																			
May/June SG considers and agrees areas for NP re-draft								█	█																			
SG agree draft NP and send to LPA for SEA screening										█																		
Draft NP sent to all stakeholders											█																	
Feedback from LPA on SEA – expect no full SEA required												█																
Proceed to formal Reg 14 six week consultation													█	█														
SG responds to consultation feedback /records response														█														
Redraft and finalise NP/other docs./consultation statement															█													
SG endorse NP and submit to LPA																█												
LPA six week consultation period																	█	█										
LPA considers responses and reviews																		█										
LPA appoints examiner																			█									
Examination period																					█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
LPA modifies plan based on Examiner recommendations																								█	█	█	█	█
Public Referendum																												?

Biodiversity, Heritage and Housing & Planning sub-groups to meet to consider revised approach to green space, local heritage assets and key views respectively in view of the decision at the December Steering Group meeting on questions 4,5,13.	January 2018	RESPECTIVE SUB-GROUPS
Further return visit to remind residents of the survey return deadline and attempt collection of completed surveys	1/1/18 – 5/1/18	Survey distributor
Collate public consultation feedback (Surveys and Housing Needs Survey plus Distributor Returns Summary)	06/01/2018	KB/CM
All feedback surveys to be passed to AH by KB/CM along with a data analysis spreadsheet.	06/01/2018	KB/CM/AH
Data entry volunteers to be divided into two teams each of whom will enter half of the data from the surveys and then exchange with the other team to cross-check the entry.	01/2018	AH to co-ordinate volunteers from 19/12/2017 SG meeting.
External audit of public survey results to be completed	01/2018	External auditor
Consider arrangements for consultation with landowners	16/01/2018	Steering Group
Distribute consultation letter to all landowners identified on the list.	01/2018	BE/CM
Sub-groups to collate evidence and prepare a draft introduction for the respective neighbourhood plan section and begin to draft policy once the stage two survey results are published	01 to 03/2018	All sub-groups
Consider public consultation feedback results and analysis and agree next steps	20/02/2018	Steering Group/Sub-groups
Consider feedback from landowners and how this will be incorporated into neighbourhood plan policy.	20/02/2018	Steering Group
External audit report on stage two survey and housing needs survey published ready for March Steering Group meeting.	28/02/2018	Survey Sub-Group
Draft newsletter no 4 presented by Survey Sub-Group for endorsement by Steering Group	20/03/2018	Survey Sub-group/Steering Group
Responses to survey comments passed to Sub-groups	03/2018	Survey Sub-group
Consultants site visit re designation of Key Views and Local Green Spaces	21/03/2018	BW/TG plus EP,BE, CM,JW
Request for comments from SG members on each of the draft Neighbourhood Plan sections and Vision/objectives	21/03/2018 to 04/03/2018	SG Members
Consultation meetings with landowners facilitated by Chair	04/2018	Steering Group
Distribution of Neighbourhood Plan Newsletter No 5. to all stakeholders.	29/03/2018 to 03/04/2018	Survey Sub-group/Steering Group
Responses from SG members on Neighbourhood Plan draft sections and	05/04/2018	CM

Vision/objectives collated by CM and sent to respective sub-groups.		
Sub-groups to meet and agree response/re-draft of NP sections	05/04/2018 to 17/04/2018	Sub-groups as appropriate
Steering Group to agree core content for draft Neighbourhood Plan and agree arrangements for drafting of full plan.	17/04/2018	Steering Group
Steering Group to receive Independent Assessment of Key Views and Local Green Space.	17/04/2018	Steering Group
Steering Group to agree plan for completion of the Neighbourhood Plan following changes to grant funding arrangements.	17/04/2018	Steering Group
Draft Place Appraisal to be updated based upon feedback including that from the Stage Two Survey	April/May	PD/BE/CM
First draft structure of Neighbourhood Plan to be produced	Prior to 15/05/18	PD/CM
Landowner responses to LGS and Key View consultation to be considered.	Prior to 15/05/18	H and P and Biodiversity sub-group
Consultation meetings with landowners. 19 th June (Terry Pegrum) and 6 th July (Christopher Seal). Proposed meeting with Wessex Water plc.	June/July	PD/Steering Group
Approval of draft Neighbourhood Plan sections on Employment and Getting Around	19 June 2018	Steering Group
Approval of draft Neighbourhood Plan section on Sports and Recreation	17 July 2018	Steering Group
Proposed meeting with Wessex Water on LGS	August 2018	PD/ Biodiversity sub-group
Heritage subgroup walk around with Kim Sankey (consultant) regarding list of Local Heritage sites.	23/08/2018	Heritage sub-group/KS
Distribution of consultants report on list of non-designated heritage assets to affected property owners and SG with a covering note incorporating research on impact on property values.	07/09/2018	PD/Heritage sub-group
Meeting with Wessex Water to discuss Local Green Space policy proposal	13/09/2018	PD/CM
Further amendments to draft policy sections for the NP on Heritage, Biodiversity and Housing & Planning	29/08/2018 to 25/09/2018	Relevant sub-groups
Approval of draft Neighbourhood Plan sections on Biodiversity, Housing and Planning and Heritage.	16/10/2018	Steering Group
Revised Draft Neighbourhood Plan to Brian Wilson for Review	1 st Week of October	PD/CM
Open meeting on Heritage Assets list with Angel Architecture for consultation and representations from the public.?	4 th October 2018	PD/BE/CM
Approval of H & P section of draft Neighbourhood Plan.	16/10/2018	Steering Group
Approval of Heritage section of draft Neighbourhood Plan	06/11/2018	Steering Group
Approval of final draft Neighbourhood Plan and agreement on arrangements for Regulation 14 consultation process.	06/11/2018	Steering Group

Regulation 14 process commences	08/11/2018	Steering Group
Recording of responses to Regulation 14 process	08/11/2018 to 24/12/2018	Steering Group
Formal Regulation 14 process ends.	24/12/2018	Steering Group
Progress report on Regulation 14 consultation	18/12/2018	Steering Group
Consideration of amendments to the draft Neighbourhood Plan following consultee feedback.	January and February 2019	Steering Group and Sub-Groups.
Review Regulation 14 responses and agree policy revisions to draft Neighbourhood Plan based upon Sub-Group review.	22/01/2019	Steering Group
Sub-groups to meet and address agree changes to policies and supporting text	22/01 to 19/02	Sub-Groups
Agree final submission version of Neighbourhood Plan, Consultation Statement and Basic Conditions Statement.	19/02/2019	Steering Group
Submit the above documents to the Local Authority in accordance with the Regulation 15 requirements of the Localism Act.	March 2019	Chair/Secretary
Await response of Local Authority. Chair /Secretary to arrange Steering Group meetings as needed..	2019	Chair/Secretary