

SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

RECORD OF SUB-GROUP MEETING

Topic sub-group – Housing and Planning

Date of Meeting: 07/02/2019 **Time of meeting from:** 19.00 to 20.58.

Location of Meeting: Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz

Present: John Bellis, John Crisp, Tony Ferrari, Tony Heathershaw and Liz Pegrum (Chair).

Colin Marsh attended in order to record the minutes.

Key Discussion Points

- The Chair referred to the agenda that had been circulated in advance and explained that the purpose of the meeting was to consider changes to the policies and review the draft replies to individual consultees following feedback received during the recent (Regulation 14) consultation process.

The main focus for policy changes related to the feedback from Weymouth and Portland Borough Council (WPBC).

- H&P1

Criterion 1: Need to define the Conservation Area - Two versions of a map of the Sutton Poyntz Conservation Area had been circulated in advance of the meeting. It was agreed to incorporate the map (Map 5 Planning designations) and to amend the text so as to make reference to it.

Action: LP

Criterion 2: Inadequate representation of 'Innovative' design in the text on Design Guidance - AH suggested possible wording under the 'Summary of Intent' to provide a better balance between traditional and innovative design. LP suggested that wording proposed by Resident 12 in the redacted list of Regulation 14 feedback should be considered. JC noted that the rewording would need careful consideration since the village was split evenly on this issue; he also considered it important to make reference to 'good design quality'. AH proposed that paragraph 3 be replaced with wording based upon 'design that enhances the area and does not mimic the historic core ... consists of a combination of traditional and contemporary design using materials compatible with the historic core.'

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.