

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 19th February 2019 in the Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz, commencing 19.30 hours.

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

The following Sub-Group members were in attendance: John Bellis, John Crisp and Tony Heathershaw. Jez Cunningham (resident) also attended.

1. Apologies

Apologies had been received in advance from Keith Johnson.

2. To Approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 22nd January 2019

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as a correct record.

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 been completed with the exception of that which referred to a meeting with the licensee of the Springhead Pub. **Action:PD and BE**

The Chair took the opportunity to place on record his thanks to the Springhead Pub for their support in allowing complementary use of the Blue Duck Bar throughout the Neighbourhood Plan process and for accommodating changes to meeting dates. Their efforts were greatly appreciated by the entire Steering Group.

4. To Address Items of Correspondence

With reference to the one item of correspondence distributed with the agenda, the Chair noted that as a result of changes to the Habitats Directive under European legislation further checks would be needed. Following advice received from Weymouth and Portland Borough Council (WPBC) and a letter from Natural England confirming that no further assessment was necessary, the Basic Conditions Statement had been amended by Brian Wilson (consultant) to reflect that the draft Neighbourhood Plan accorded with the Habitats Directive.

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

The Chair concluded that there were sufficient resources to complete the Neighbourhood Plan process including payment of a final invoice to be submitted by Brian Wilson Associates. It was noted that all funding will therefore have been spent upon conclusion of the process. AH requested that the final invoice be received for payment by the end of March.

6. To Receive Sub-Group Reports (Housing & Planning and Heritage)

The Chair noted that all policy issues had been agreed at the previous meeting subject to final amendments of the Housing & Planning and Heritage policy sections. Once these had been agreed,

and any further changes incorporated, the final draft Neighbourhood Plan would be circulated to the Steering Group for endorsement ex-committee and copied to Nick Cardnell for his advice prior to formal submission.

Housing & Planning report –

LP outlined each of the actions recommended following the meeting of the sub-group (minutes circulated in advance).

Conservation Area map – included in the revised Neighbourhood Plan as recommended by WPBC.

Policy H&P 1 – Amended the supporting text to be more representative of innovative as well as traditional design.

Policy H&P 2 – Amended the policy and supporting text to clarify the intent regarding ‘higher density’ and ‘smaller homes’.

Policy H&P 3 – Following feedback from WPBC regarding views 4,5,6,7 being too expansive an explanation had been provided as to the context for these key views. It was suggested that the Chair discuss the changes with Nick Cardnell at his forthcoming meeting in order to ensure that the views were retained within the policy. **Action:PD**

The Chair expressed the view that it was important to challenge the Local Authority feedback when a strong case could be made - as in this instance.

Policy H&P 4 – The policy on flooding had been amended to take account of Regulation 14 feedback.

Reference in the introduction to Rural Exception Sites (RES) – This had been the cause of much debate. The e-mail advice given by Brian Wilson (consultant) was read out by LP. As the majority feedback during the Regulation 14 process had favoured the inclusion of the statement on RES, which was considered neutral, it would be more inclusive to retain it. The Chair noted that although it referred to existing Government policy this was consistent with other policy sections of the Neighbourhood Plan. After some discussion it was agreed that on balance the relevant sentence should be retained subject to an amendment proposed by BE – “The possibility of small-scale ... policy HOUS 2 (on rural exception sites to meet identified local need), subject to sustainability.” This was consistent with national legislation and was agreed. **Action:CM**

Replies to Regulation 14 consultees – LP explained the key amendments; these related to ensuring that responses were neutral and did not express opinion or refer to the extent of other responses received. JC felt it important that where information was factually incorrect this should be corrected with an evidenced based reply. These actions were agreed. **Action:PD and CM**

Heritage report –

BE explained that two changes had been recommended since the January Steering Group Meeting. Policy HE 2 had been deleted and had become an aspiration. Some additions had been made to the supporting text explaining the reasons for this.

Policy HE 1 had been discussed with Nick Cardnell and points of misunderstanding addressed. In the absence of suitable alternative wording it had been agreed to retain the original and add a further explanation in the section on the intent of the policy.

7. To Review and Approve the Draft Submission Version of the Neighbourhood Plan.

The chair explained that the latest draft of the Neighbourhood Plan which had been circulated in advance of the meeting included those changes proposed by the sub-groups and the actions agreed at the previous Steering Group meeting.

BE was concerned at the inclusion of 'Area of Land in front of 97 Sutton Road' as an Asset of Community Value, particularly since it was land associated with a residential property and as such may not be permissible for inclusion. It was noted by the Chair that this was an aspiration not a policy and that the area had been identified in feedback during the Stage Two survey. CM explained the implications of designation as an Asset of Community Value in terms of delaying the sale by a maximum of 6 months but not affecting the right to sell to a preferred buyer at whatever price they chose. Following brief discussion the Chair suggested that this area of land be removed from the list under AP 5.6.1. This was agreed.

Action:CM

There were no other proposed changes. If further changes were required, following the meeting with Nick Cardnell in early March, the revised draft would be circulated again to the SG for final approval. There was also the opportunity of a 'backstop' meeting on 19th March 2019 if deemed necessary.

Action: PD and CM

8. To Approve the draft Basic Conditions Statement (BCS)

The Chair explained that this key document had been prepared by Brian Wilson Associates and underpinned the authenticity and legal status of the Neighbourhood Plan documentation. Revisions had been undertaken following feedback from WPBC as discussed under item 4 (correspondence) above. BE acknowledged the excellent work done on this by Brian Wilson.

It was confirmed that policy HE 2 was referred to in the Equality statement since the BCS was based upon the pre-submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan.

9. To Approve the draft Consultation Statement.

The Chair explained that this document outlined the way in which stakeholders had been consulted during the entire Neighbourhood Planning process. He suggested that some amendments were needed in order to demonstrate with greater clarity the consultation process in relation to Heritage and in particular how changes had occurred in response to concerns raised by stakeholders.

Action:BE and CM

TF suggested that the document should also include reference to the consultative approach of the Steering Group at its monthly meetings and the way in which this had been open and inclusive.

Action:CM

BE suggested that reference should be also made to the way in which the Steering Group had addressed items of correspondence and should highlight that this information was publicly accessible through the Steering Group agendas on the village web site and the neighbourhood@ e-mail archive (which currently stands at around 3000 e-mails; later confirmed as 2974 at 21/02/19).

Action:CM

10. To Review any outstanding responses and approve the draft replies to the Regulation 14 Consultees.

The Chair noted that as responses 1 to 14 and 17 had been addressed at previous meetings the remaining 22 responses of the original 37 should be considered in terms of the suitability of the reply while ensuring that there were no implications for draft policies.

Respondent 15: Innovative design concerns had been addressed with changes to policy H&P 1 and the protection of trees had been addressed under aspirations. Reply agreed.

Respondent 16: Key views had been adequately addressed following the independent report. Reply agreed.

Respondent 18 to 21: These issues had been addressed in the policy review resulting in some changes to policy and the supporting narrative. Replies agreed.

Respondent 22: The comments were noted. Reply agreed.

Respondent 23: These issues have been addressed in the policy review and included some changes to policy and the supporting narrative. Reply agreed.

Respondent 24: Reply agreed.

Respondent 25: These issues have been addressed in the policy review and included some changes to policy and the supporting narrative. Reply agreed.

Respondent 26: These issues have been addressed in the policy review and included some changes to policy and the supporting narrative. Reply agreed.

Respondent 27: The comments had been noted and incorporated into revised policy H&P 4. Reply agreed.

Respondent 28: These concerns were addressed in the Consultation Statement. Reply agreed.

Respondent 29: Local Green Space concerns have been addressed through amendments to the policy and supporting text. Reply agreed.

Respondent 30: The Heritage policy had now become an aspiration. Reply agreed.

Respondent 31: Issues of affordable housing and capacity for 20 houses within the DDB had been addressed within the supporting text to the H&P policy. Reply agreed.

Respondent 32 and 33: These issues had been considered and addressed in the review of the H&P policy. Reply agreed.

Respondent 34: Noted that a conscious decision had been taken to leave the matter of the DDB to the Local Authority under the Local Plan. Reply agreed.

Respondent 35: These general comments were noted. Reply agreed.

Respondents 36 and 37: Although the response was detailed it was considered to be a useful basis for discussion at the proposed Springhead meeting. Replies agreed.

Individual replies would be sent to respondees when the draft plan was formally submitted to the WPBC. At the same time, the redacted summary of all (37) Regulation 14 responses would be placed on the website.

Action:PD

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

The Chair explained that following his meeting with Nick Cardnell in March, to complete a pre-submission review of the Neighbourhood Plan, the intention (subject to confirmation of any changes by the Steering Group) was to submit all of the documentation required under Regulation 15 of the Localism Act to the WPBC before the end of March. At this point all of the documentation including the Regulation 14 summary (redacted) would be placed on the village web site.

Action:PD, CM and BE

The proposed Plan would subsequently go through a six-week consultation by the Local Authority followed by a thorough review by an Independent Planning Inspector prior to a public referendum, probably in the spring of 2020.

It was agreed not to schedule any further Steering Group meetings unless a specific need arose but to provisionally hold the date of 19th March as a contingency. Subsequently it could be necessary to meet in order to address any issues raised by the Local Authority or the Planning Inspector.

Action:CM

Based upon a note from Brian Wilson, CM suggested that delays to the timetable might occur as a result of the WPBC Local Plan review being undertaken by the new Unitary Authority, although TF did not feel that there would be any significant impact on the overall process.

12. Any Other Business.

No items of other business were raised.

The Chair expressed his thanks to all members of the Steering Group and Sub-Groups, both past and present, in getting the Neighbourhood Plan to this stage. He recognised that it had not been an easy process and acknowledged the fears of some members of the community regarding conflict and division that might be created. However, he believed that a better and stronger community had emerged as result and had delivered a good Neighbourhood Plan, based on engagement, discussion and compromise. He expressed the hope that, beyond the proposed policies, the village's aspirations could be progressed by a representative forum once the plan was made. He concluded by again thanking all of those present as well as all those other stakeholders who had taken part in the process.

BE believed that the Sutton Poyntz Society would also wish to express its thanks in due course.

BD expressed his personal thanks to several colleagues on the Steering Group for their hard work.

The meeting closed at 20.53 hours.

Further meetings to be advised as necessary or held by e-mail round.

Action:CM