

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Agenda for meeting on 31st October 2017 to be held in the Blue Duck Bar of the Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz commencing at 7.30pm.

- 1. To Receive apologies (Apologies in advance from Keith Hudson)**
- 2. To Approve minutes of the previous meeting held on 17th October 2017.**
- 3. To Agree that an update on actions not otherwise on the agenda be deferred to the November meeting.**
- 4. To Consider and identify any further changes to the Place Appraisal document (including clarification of the status and timing of a tree survey).**
- 5. Public Consultation Survey - to consider and agree sub-group questions and establish a working party to prepare the draft public survey document (including location map?)**
- 6. To consider and agree the draft Housing Needs Survey prepared by Brian Wilson and Associates.**
- 7. To Review progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetable.**
- 8. To Address any other urgent business**
- 9. Date and Time of the Next Meeting**

To confirm the date and time of the next meeting as Tuesday 21st November 2017 at 7.30pm.

**SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
DETAILED TIMETABLE FOR 2017**

ACTION	COMPLETION DEADLINE	BY WHOM
PRODUCE FINAL DRAFT PLACE APPRAISAL HARD COPIES (15)	31/10/2017	PD/BE
PRODUCE DRAFT HOUSING NEEDS SURVEY	31/10/2017	B WILSON
AGREE AND PRODUCE DRAFT QUESTIONS FOR NEXT PUBLIC CONSULTATION	31/10/2017	SUB-GROUPS
CONSIDER AND AGREE DRAFT PLACE APPRAISAL AND QUESTIONS FOR NEXT PUBLIC SURVEY (OR IDENTIFY FURTHER WORK NEEDED)	31/10/2017	STEERING GROUP
AGREE COMPOSITION OF PUBLIC SURVEY SUB-GROUP	31/10/2017	STEERING GROUP
PUBLIC SURVEY SUB-GROUP PRODUCE DRAFT SURVEY FOR INCLUSION IN NEXT STEERING GROUP AGENDA	14/11/2017	SURVEY SUB-GROUP
FURTHER WORK UNDERTAKEN WHERE NECESSARY ON DRAFT PA AND SURVEY	21/11/2017	SUB-GROUPS
STEERING GROUP ENDORSE PLACE APPRAISAL (PA) , HOUSING NEEDS SURVEY (HNS) AND PUBLIC SURVEY (PS).	21/11/2017	STEERING GROUP
AGREE ARRANGEMENTS FOR PRINTING, ACCESS AND DISTRIBUTION OF PA,HNS,PS.	21/11/2017	STEERING GROUP
AGREE DATES AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION MEETINGS RE SURVEYS AND PA	21/11/2017	STEERING GROUP
DRAFT PLACE APPRAISAL AND PUBLIC SURVEY LAUNCHED AT COFFEE MORNING	01/12/2017	STEERING GROUP
DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING NEEDS SURVEY AND PUBLIC SURVEY	01/12/2017 TO 05/12/2017	STEERING GROUP
PUBLIC CONSULTATION MEETINGS (OPEN DAYS) RE PA AND SURVEYS	DECEMBER -DATE TO BE AGREED	STEERING GROUP
SUB-GROUPS TO CONTINUE TO BUILD EVIDENCE AND DRAFT POLICIES FOR FIRST DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN AND REPORT ON PROGRESS	19/12/2017	SUB-GROUPS
REVIEW PROGRESS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION	19/12/2017	STEERING GROUP
CONFIRM ARRANGEMENTS FOR ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION FEEDBACK.	19/12/2017	STEERING GROUP
COLLATE PUBLIC CONSULTATION FEEDBACK	05/01/2018	STEERING GROUP
CONSIDER PUBLIC CONSULTATION FEEDBACK RESULTS AND ANALYSIS AND AGREE NEXT STEPS	20/02/2018	STEERING GROUP/SUB-GROUPS

BRIAN WILSON AND ASSOCIATES FEEDBACK COMMENTS IMMEDIATELY PRECEEDING THE FINAL VERSION DRAFT QUESTIONS

HOUSING AND PLANNING

Liz,

Yes, I'm broadly happy with your proposed changes.

I thought that a no change option at what is now Q4 could be interesting (i.e. the third listed statement), but I don't feel strongly if you wish to delete it.

In answer to your specific question, allotments are not considered to be brownfield sites.

If I read the Local Plan interactive map correctly, it looks as if the main waterworks building lies within the defined development boundary, but there may be some semi-developed back land that lies outside. However, you know the site better, so will be able to interpret the map better than I can.

Kind regards,

Brian

BIODIVERSITY AND THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Date: Fri, 13 Oct 2017 12:53:21 +0100
From: Brian Wilson
To: Katrina Blee
CC: Julie Tanner, neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk

Katrina,

Please find below some comments about your biodiversity questions.

General - questions that ask for agree/disagree responses often work well and do seem appropriate for much of what your after. Other question formats might be needed elsewhere in the survey, depending what information is being sought.

General - I agree that some introductory text will help, but recommend it is kept brief. If it's more than 2 or 3 sentences it would be better in a separate document, for those who wish to find out more detail. I realise this means people answering questions without knowing all the ins and outs, but a questionnaire form needs to be quick to assimilate and answer.

Q1. The trick here, ultimately, will be designing a NP policy that adds some local detail to what already exists in Local Plan policy ENV10 (ii and iii). If SP can refer to important trees from their planned tree survey and/or important natural features from the Place Appraisal they could probably add value with a NP policy. Unless stated otherwise, it would apply to house extensions (only) where they require planning consent. As for the survey question, maybe something like: *Do you agree or disagree that future development should only be permitted where it retains certain trees and hedges, which have been assessed as contributing significantly to the character of the village or to local biodiversity?* I'm afraid you would not be able to specify precise arrangements for monitoring or verification - that's too detailed and for the W&PBC development control team.

Q2. Happy with this, though for clarity I'd insert the words "for protection" after the word "designation". Agree, these can be designated for reasons other than biodiversity - see those listed on the template provided. Yes, you could also ask how often people visit or use these spaces, to gather further evidence about their value. There were questions that asked

this on the St Erth questionnaire.

Q3. In this case the issue, ultimately, is what value an NP policy could add to the existing Local Plan policy ENV5, which is pretty helpful. However, certainly no harm asking residents whether they agree/disagree with a policy that requires planning applications to demonstrate they would not result in significant additional run-off water flowing into the [name of stream]. Not much we can do about people tarmac-ing over an area of front garden if it doesn't require planning consent. Maybe a local information campaign run through the Society, to encourage people to think about this and promoting idea to reduce run-off?

Q4. I'm unclear why you would ask people in the survey whether a tree survey should go ahead. Isn't that up to the NP group or SP Society?

Q5. The initial question should, in my view, be kept very simple and ask people whether they agree/disagree that a green corridor should be designated (see map) to provide added protection to an area with local biodiversity value that runs through the village? (Or some such wording.) You could add a box to the question where people can comment on its boundary or you could just invite anyone with such comments to email them in.

I hope that's of some help. Kind regards,
Brian

Brian Wilson Associates

Flood Protection

Colin,

Thanks. I think the first of the three questions could work well. You may be able to construct a policy which says development should not add to flood risk in areas of the village that lie within the (Environment Agency) flood risk zone e.g. by creating any significant additional surface water run-off into that zone.

I would have thought one question on the topic is sufficient. The second question ought to be covered by the first - any policy should include development plans for drives/paving. The third question refers to changes that householders can make without requiring planning permission, so you could not have a policy on that. If a significant concern, perhaps you could find other ways to progress e.g. information campaign through the SP Society?

Kind regards, Brian

Brian Wilson Associates

Green Space (cross sub-group)

These mostly sound appropriate for further consideration to me.

I think there is a general point about the number of possible sites. It's quite a long list for a small-ish NP area, which could raise questions at examination. Are all these area's really special? If you need to take hard choices to trim the list, you could leave out a few that already have some other protective designation (so would probably not benefit from further, overlapping designation).

I would also be careful that the proposed green wedge is not too large an area, which could raise questions. Option - it might be possible to designate a larger area as a 'green gap',

rather than as a Local Green Space.

Although you can designate land that is privately owned, I would not designate gardens that belong to ordinary private houses (nor I suggest the pub). I have never seen that done before and I believe it would be open to challenge as an overuse of the policy, including whether such areas can really be said to bring public benefit under the policy criteria.

Kind regards,

Brian

Brian Wilson Associates

Tree Preservation (cross sub-group)

Colin,

I fear this one slipped through the net and I have missed your deadline, for which I apologise. There has been a question about retaining trees put forward by the Place Appraisal sub-group: I don't know if you have seen this.

My view about the additional question is - in truth - that some of this is getting into rather detailed territory, covering things that would be difficult to turn into an acceptable NP policy. For example, I can't (I'm afraid) see how we could force the local planning authority to consult on tree preservation issues. That is more of an operational than a policy matter. Your question 'd' about orchards might be better covered by proposing one or two locally valued orchards for designation as Local Green Spaces.

At your 'e' one option might be a NP policy that expects a tree survey to be submitted with planning applications that would impact on tree cover.

I hope this is still of some use.

Kind regards,

Brian

Brian Wilson Associates

Katrina,

I am mistaken. Just looked back and it was not from the Place Appraisal group, but with your own questions about biodiversity. We suggested something along the following lines as a question:

Do you agree or disagree that future development should only be permitted where it retains certain trees and hedges, which have been assessed as contributing significantly to the character of the village or to local biodiversity?

Perhaps Colin could use or expand on that a bit?

Brian

Brian Wilson Associates

EMPLOYMENT BUSINESS AND TOURISM + COMMUNICATIONS AND IT

From: Brian Wilson
To: Andy Hohne
CC: Susan Higham

Thanks, Andy. My comments are as follows.

Shop: at this NP stage I'd be tempted to simplify question 1.2 a bit, by making it a straight yes/no on volunteering (rather than giving hours). I'd probably also chop the final sentence in the preamble (about the volunteers doing day-to-day work and back office functions) to shorten it.

Businesses: rather than asking an open question about types of businesses, you could ask whether people would be willing to accept any of the following:

Dedicated work or office space provided within homes
Office and light industrial units
Storage and distribution units

My reason for suggesting this is that these are the 'planning use classes'. So, for example, if your NP allowed B1 uses, that would include all office and light industrial uses. The planners would not be able to pick and choose between different types of office and light industrial.

Telecoms: I'd agree there is still some value collecting this information. The survey respondent's address may well be asked elsewhere on the survey form. I'm thinking that the mobile question should perhaps ask, Please tick the box that best describes mobile phone reception at your home: don't own mobile, no reception, only 2G, up to 3G, up to 4G.

Fixed line internet speeds are tricky to ask about, because people may not take-up superfast access even if it exists as an option. Perhaps the question could therefore ask two things:

- Are you happy with the speed of the (fixed line) internet connection at your home: yes, no, not applicable.
- Are you happy with the reliability of the (fixed line) internet connection at your home: yes, no, not applicable.

We're finding that reliability is almost as important an issue as speed.

Tourism: your call, of course, but I'd question whether you want to ask about giving guided tours in a questionnaire that's essentially about planning issues.

I hope these comments are helpful. Kind regards,
Brian

SPORTS AND RECREATION

Subject: Re: SPORTS & RECREATION SUBGROUP QUESTIONS

Date: Tue, 17 Oct 2017 12:29:03 +0100

From: Brian Wilson

To: Peter Dye

CC: Julie Tanner, Susan Higham

Yes, I agree with Julie, it does read very clearly.

I suppose the first question could be split in two. One question about facilities (pub, mission hall, etc) saying protect them from change of use. Another question about the green spaces (Mill Pond, Veteran's Wood, etc) saying protect them from development, as these are presumably possibilities for Local Green Space designation.

My only comment on the question about additional facilities is whether people will too readily tick yes to a wish list. Arguably a case for strengthening the wording e.g. Is there a particular need in the village for additional facilities ...

Kind regards,
Brian

Brian Wilson Associate

TRANSPORT

Colin,

I'll respond to the survey questions in this email and come back on the rest later, if I may. I note your comment, that we could shorten the question list if the survey form needs trimming.

That said, one option would be to wrap these up as a single block of questions. For example:

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Traffic management restrictions (such as road markings, bollards and signage) should be introduced at key hazard points in the village.

Planning permission for any new housing should seek two off-street car parking places per home (and one visitor parking space for every four homes).

A [small] public car park should be created in the village.

Any areas of new development should, in future, include pavements and street lighting.

and

Colin,

There are some Local Plans which now include a policy requiring electric charging points.

Whilst I'm not actually aware of any such NP policies, I can't claim to have reviewed all NPs and don't see why not.

NPPF paragraph 35 provides a useful hook.

Kind regards,

Brian
Brian Wilson Associates

HERITAGE

Brian Wilson (brian@brianwilsonassociates.co.uk)To:you + 3 more Details

Bill,

This looks about right to me.

The only one I would question is Q3, which looks rather long and complex: I wonder if people will be able to answer it meaningfully.

But Qs 1 and 2 seem helpful. An alternative on Q2 - if you don't have too many assets in mind - would be to ask if people agreed that the following should become listed as locally important heritage assets. Then list them (yes/no for each) and add an 'other' box where people can suggest additions.

You might want to explain that listed heritage assets are given some protection from development or alterations that would damage their heritage features and from development at adjoining properties that would significantly degrade their heritage value.

Kind regards,
Brian

Brian Wilson Associates

HOUSING & PLANNING

Katrina,

I have three versions of the housing questions for the residents' survey (from Liz, John and yourself respectively). Having looked through them, my suggestions are below - very similar to those provided in most cases. I am copying this email to Liz and John.

Overall, I think it makes sense to have questions that test:

- the appetite for accepting new housing development;
- broadly, views as to where such development would be deemed most acceptable;
- perhaps, views about a couple of particular brownfield site options; and
- views about building design and materials (unless the Place Appraisal sub-group pick this up elsewhere).

I would leave out questions about types of housing (size, affordability, etc), as they are best covered in the separate housing needs survey. And there is no need to deal with important views (within and from the village) as this has been covered by the Place Appraisal sub-group.

Your call, but I probably wouldn't ask about specific development sites at this stage (except the specific brownfield ones referred to above), since you would need to test residents' opinion later about available development sites (put forward by landowners), if you decided to move the development boundary or allocate specific sites in the NP.

The introductory words for the survey questions will be important, not least so that people understand any technical/planning terms and implications. They, of course, ought to be worded as neutrally as possible.

Questions and preamble suggested by Brian with minor changes (tracked) from the Housing and planning sub-group:

The Neighbourhood Plan will include policies that shape development at Sutton Poyntz over the (almost) twenty year period to 2036.

Q1. How many new homes do you think should be built within or adjoining the village over the next 20 years?

[None; 1 to 10; 11 to 20; 21 to 50; more than 50]

Sutton Poyntz has a 'defined settlement boundary' (see map) outside of which development is not usually permitted. This is intended to stop development spreading into protected open countryside. However, there are limited places where new development could happen inside that boundary. There are ~~a few~~ previously developed 'brownfield' sites, which could be seen as having development potential for housing - some, like the Waterworks and the Evangelical Church, now underused and some, like the Mission Hall ~~or Evangelical Church~~ are still used.

Q2 A. Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

- The defined development boundary should be expanded ~~in one or two places~~ to create

easier development sites adjoining the village.

- Housing should only be allowed within the existing defined development boundary (which should not be expanded).

- Some existing housing could be ~~redeveloped or even~~ demolished to allow more new homes to be built there at a higher density.

- New house building should generally be allowed in the ~~larger~~ gardens of some existing homes.

- New homes should be developed on brownfield sites (which were previously developed, but are now often underused).

[against each statement: Strongly agree; Agree; No opinion; Disagree; Strongly Disagree]

[I don't know whether there are any infill options other than in back gardens. If so, a statement about that could be added.](Group comment – statement not needed as no such options remaining in village)

Q3Q2B. If you wish to add a comment to explain or qualify your answers at Q2, please do so in the box below. [An open question may be useful with such a complex and contentious issue.]

Two sites that probably qualify as brownfield sites lie outside of the defined development boundary. Your views are sought about them. Please note that any redevelopment at the Waterworks would need to retain the existing listed buildings. (TO CHECK WITH WE, is the Waterworks outside the development boundary?)

Q4Q3. Would you support development at the following sites for housing?

Wessex Water site/the Waterworks

Car park and/or garden at the Springhead Pub

[against each of these a simple: yes; no; no opinion should do]

[I am not actually sure the pub garden would qualify as a brownfield site, unless it has significant existing structures/buildings, but no harm in posing the question at this stage.](Group agreed)

~~Much of~~ The village is already classified as a Conservation Area, ~~which this means that any new building should enhance the Conservation area and also~~ places some limitations on the design of and materials used for new building. The Neighbourhood Plan group has produced a draft Place Appraisal document, circulated along with this survey, which identifies different character areas in the village and the main features which distinguish them. These could be used to inform future development (new buildings and significant alterations/extensions), if they were required to take account of ~~typical~~, nearby building design and construction materials.

Q45. Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

- Future development, wherever it happens in the village, should take greater account of ~~typical nearby~~ building design and materials.

- Future development, where it happens in the village's historic core (but not elsewhere), should take greater account of typical building design and materials.

~~- Existing standards for building design and materials are sufficient and they should not be tightened any further.~~ Modern-Contemporary/innovative building styles should be encouraged, so long as they are of a high design and build quality.

[against each statement: Strongly agree; Agree; No opinion; Disagree; Strongly Disagree]

I hope these suggestions prove helpful when you discuss the survey content.

Kind regards,
Brian

Brian Wilson Associates
07505 139 068

BIODIVERSITY AND THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Draft Questions for Public Survey

Question 1.

Context

The village location in a deep valley with a narrow chalk-bed stream fed by fresh water springs from a large hillside catchment area makes it prone to flooding. Climate change coupled with further residential development means that we will need to be more proactive in flood prevention if we are to minimise the threat to people, property and wildlife habitat.

In order to reduce flood risk do you support a policy where all new developments will be planned so as to minimise surface water run-off from properties?

Question 2.

Context

In terms of biodiversity 'green corridors' can be described as narrow linear routes that provide sufficient habitat to support wildlife and allow its free movement along them.

Do you agree that the area of the proposed green corridor as identified on the map is adequate? Yes/No

If you answer no, please identify below those areas that you feel should be added.

Question 3.

Context.

Green space are areas not proposed or allocated for development, that are designated as special to the community for reasons of recreational, historical, beauty, peacefulness or wildlife habitat importance and are protected from harmful development.

Do you agree that the following proposed sites should be designated for protection as green space within the Neighbourhood Plan?

: PROPOSED GREEN SPACE

Map ref.	Description/nature of green space
To be entered	Wet Woodland
	Veterans Wood
	Area of Fen,
	Water meadow
	Marshy ground between trees along Osmington Brook
	Rough pasture behind The Stables
	Village Pond
	Village Green
	Open grass area by the Pond
	Puddledock allotments
	Pig field and wooded area adjacent to allotments
	Green Wedge
	Field and Copse behind Old Bincombe Lane/Sutton Close
	Mission Hall Orchard,
	Springside Orchard??,
	Margaret's Seat
	Grass verges (to be specified)
	Springhead Pub Garden??

Please identify below any other areas that meet these criteria that you would add to the list.

Question 4

Context

The UK Government planning framework provides for the 'conservation and enhancement' of biodiversity in relation to new development, whereas the Weymouth

and Portland Local Plan excludes 'enhancement'. The Neighbourhood Plan provides an opportunity to strengthen the local policy in this respect.

Do you agree that planning proposals will be required to state appropriate measures for the enhancement of biodiversity as well as its conservation?

Question 5

Context

Trees and hedges add to the character of the landscape, provide important amenity value and essential wildlife habitat and help to mitigate the effects of climate change. However, inappropriately located and unmanaged trees can present problems such as reduced light or visibility, damage from falling or root growth and fouling of overhead service cables.

Mainly as a result of financial pressures the Council has become much less proactive on tree preservation matters. A Neighbourhood Plan tree policy would place certain obligations on the council and help to address this situation.

Do you agree or disagree with the inclusion of the following in a Neighbourhood Plan tree policy.

- a) The Local Authority must notify and consider the views of the community on tree preservation issues?**

- b) The felling or destruction of trees must be avoided. Where unavoidable replacement with species appropriate to the location and general area shall be planted?**

- c) Only under exceptional circumstances will development be permitted that damages or destroys trees of good amenity or biodiversity value?**

- d) Ensure the preservation of established orchards containing traditional fruit varieties?**

Following feedback from consultant suggested Q5.

Context

Trees and hedges add to the character of the landscape, provide important amenity value and essential wildlife habitat and help to mitigate the effects of climate change. However, inappropriately located and unmanaged trees can present problems such as reduced light or visibility, damage from falling or root growth and fouling of overhead service cables.

Mainly as a result of financial pressures the Council has become much less proactive on tree preservation matters. A Neighbourhood Plan tree policy would place certain obligations on the council and help to address this situation.

Do you agree or disagree that the Neighbourhood Plan should aim to strengthen current protections by including a policy which states that:

a) future development should only be permitted where it retains those trees, established orchards and hedges which have been assessed as contributing significantly to the character of the village or to local biodiversity

Agree Disagree

b) if a tree is felled for unavoidable reasons, i.e., it is diseased, dying or dangerous, at least one replacement will be planted in a suitable location and will be of a species appropriate to the local area.

Agree Disagree

c) The Neighbourhood Forum will be directly consulted in all tree applications, notifications and planning applications where trees, orchards and hedges may be adversely affected.

Agree Disagree

SUGGESTED TRANSPORT RELATED QUESTIONS FOR THE 2017 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SURVEY.

CONTEXT - Following our earlier survey resident concerns included speeding traffic, on-street parking congestion and maintaining accessible public footpaths and lanes. Notable features of the area identified in our draft Place Appraisal are the 'green' environment with a lack of excessive street signs and pavements that add to the character of the area.

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements: -

1. Traffic management restrictions (road markings, bollards, signage etc) should be introduced at key hazard points as identified by the red triangles on the map?
(Winslow to Verlands Road, Cartshed/bus stop, Sutton Road between Millhouse and Northdown Farm, east end of Mission Hall Lane above the pond, bend on Plaisters Lane below Valley Cottage).
2. Planning permission for any new housing should require the following:-
 - a) A minimum of two off street parking places per home?
 - b) A minimum of one visitor parking space for every four homes?
 - c) A minimum of one electric vehicle charging point per home?
3. An adequate public car park should be created in the village?
4. All new future development should include pavements and street lighting?

Neighbourhood Plan sub group: Employment, Business, Tourism, IT Communications

Proposed questions for final consultation

Prepared by: Sue Higham and Andy Hohne

We assume that for the smaller non “Housing & Planning” sub groups we should restrict ourselves to a total of 3 to 4 questions.

In order to ensure that we focus the questions on the topics most commonly raised during the first round of consultation, we reviewed the summary of circa 75 responses and counted those that related to our sub group.

Our draft questions for these commonly raised areas are as follows:

1. Shop

The nearest shops (Spar and Coop) are approximately half a mile from the centre of the village.

In the first consultation there was appetite for a shop to be introduced to the village to incorporate a tea shop and be an outlet for selling local arts & crafts and produce.

A location would be required, which is currently not obvious, and it is unlikely that such a shop will be commercially viable. It could, however, perhaps be successfully run by local volunteers.

1.1 Given this, what do you think should be sold in such a shop (please circle):

“General store” items	Yes / No
Locally sourced produce – for example fruit, vegetables	Yes / No
Locally sourced arts and crafts	Yes / No
Should it include a tea / coffee shop	Yes / No

1.2 How many **hours per week** would you be prepared to volunteer (please circle):

None 1 to 4 5 to 10 11 plus

2. Business

In the first consultation there was appetite for job creation from encouraging an increase in the number of businesses in the village with the hope that this also attracts a younger population to live in the village.

Dependant on the type attracted, such an increase in the number of businesses could result in a small increase in motor traffic (from employees, customers and deliveries) and therefore general noise. This could also result in an increase in parking required for the additional staff, customers and deliveries.

Locations would be required, which are currently not obvious.

2.1 To facilitate this increase in the number of businesses, would you accept a small increase in motor traffic and noise and the likely requirement for additional parking. If so would you be willing to accept the following (please circle):

Dedicated work or office space provided within homes Yes / No

Office and light industrial units

Yes / No

Storage and distribution units

Yes / No

3. Communications

Since the first consultation, broadband and mobile communications seem to have improved, with for example many areas of the village now getting 4G. Whilst it is unlikely that the Neighbourhood Plan can materially influence suppliers' strategies, it would be useful to accumulate "real world" details of mobile and internet coverage.

Please provide your address [if not requested elsewhere in the questionnaire]:

Address

3.1 Please circle what best describes mobile phone reception at your home:

don't own mobile

no reception

only 2G

up to 3G

up to 4G

3.2 Are you satisfied with the speed of the internet connection at your home (please circle):

Yes / No / Not Applicable

3.3 Are you satisfied with the reliability of the internet connection at your home (please circle):

Yes / No / Not Applicable

4. Tourism

In the first consultation there was appetite to encourage more tourism. Such an increase in tourism could result in a small increase in motor traffic and therefore general noise. This could also result in a requirement for additional parking.

In order to encourage more tourism, we may have to enhance facilities.

4.1 Given this, would you be willing to (please circle):

Allow more B&Bs and hotels

Yes / No

Allow more campsites

Yes / No

Facilitate / organise guided tours

Yes / No

Other (please describe)

.....

SPORTS & RECREATION - POTENTIAL QUESTIONS

Objective: To sustain and improve community facilities and assets that add to residents' quality of life.

Under the Localism Act, land or property identified as of value to the community can be given additional protection from development.

Do you believe that the following are of significant value to the community? If 'Yes', please prioritise (1,2, 3, etc).

Land/Property	Yes	Priority	No
Mill Pond			
Mission Hall			
Springhead Public House			
Waterworks Museum			
Veterans' Wood			
Network of Footpaths			
Other (please identify)			

Does the village need additional community facilities? If 'Yes', please prioritise (1,2, 3, etc).

Land/Property	Yes	Priority	No
Village Green			
Village Shop			
Larger Meeting Hall			
Children's Play Area			
Sports Field			
Community Allotments			
Other (please identify)			

HERITAGE – POTENTIAL QUESTIONS

Dear Brian,

Here is a possible set of questions for the Heritage section. I would be grateful for any comments you may have.

1. We propose that a list of "locally important heritage assets" should be created for the village, with policies that ensure they are given some planning protection - less stringent than that for Listed Buildings but more than the rest of the village. Do you agree with the principle of creating such a list?
2. Here is a suggested list of "locally important heritage assets" [include whatever assets the subgroup's analysis agrees]. Are there any assets that you think are missing from this list, or assets that you do not think should be included?
3. The Local Plan policy ENV4 requires that for developments affecting heritage assets (including locally listed ones) (1) the Planning Authority must assess the impact on heritage assets against the significance of the asset, and ensure that the development conserves or enhances the asset's significance; (2) developers must demonstrate how the development contributes to the asset's conservation; (3) any harm to the significance of an asset must be justified for example by weighing the damage against the public benefit of the development. The Policy also requires that the significance of the locally listed heritage assets must be documented, which (if the principle is agreed by the village) will be done as part of the Neighbourhood Planning process. Do you agree that this policy gives sufficient protection, or do you think some more specific policy is required?

The text in the Recommendations section of the Place Appraisal would look something like this:

Opportunity - The National Planning Policy Framework allows for "locally important heritage assets" to be listed and given some additional protection through local planning policies (this is in addition to the high level of protection given to Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments). Assets don't have to be buildings - for example the pond with the bridge and weir at the end would probably feature high up in our list. The Local Plan refers to such a list, but in practice a list has not been created for Weymouth & Portland. Our Neighbourhood Plan gives us an ideal opportunity to create such a list for Sutton Poyntz, and then to ensure that the Planning Authority gives appropriate protection to those assets.

SUTTON POYNTZ TREE SURVEY

The contribution of trees to the character of the village was highlighted during the steering group village walkabout conducted on 7 June 2017. Examples identified included the willows around the pond and the coniferous lines close to the waterworks. Key views were also identified, both out of the village (such as the gate between Northdown and Springhead and the Kissing Gate to Cuckoo Field above Hunts Timber Yard) and into the village (Margaret's Seat and the Beacon). Trees play an important part in framing some of these views, but there are also places (for example, the Gateway) where they diminish a key view.

Looking onto the village from the Ridgeway, it is striking how the existing tree cover follows the watercourses within the village, while the valley floor and hill tops are largely bare. It is true that, in the historic centre of the village, houses replace trees but they still form a 'natural' path, sympathetic to the landscape, that flows from the base of the Ridgeway to the end of Puddledock Lane and on to the sea. Historic images indicate that there were many more trees (possibly elms) through the village, particularly along Puddledock Lane. The remaining elements of this green/blue/grey corridor should be afforded protection.

At ground level, trees provide important structural elements within the village. The scattered weeping willows by the pond contrast with the tall rigid lines of the conifers around the waterworks and Springhead. Each brings a distinct shape and aesthetic. In this context, trees play an important role in sustaining the economic benefits from tourists and visitors attracted to a picturesque location. There are also heritage and recreation aspects, for example, Veterans' Wood is both an important community facility and the last remnant of the wild, wooded area celebrated by John Constable.

There are increasing concerns that the council-managed system for approving the maintenance/felling of trees is ineffective, and no longer provides for local consultation. Moreover, at best, this is a reactive process that does not allow the village to highlight the wider contribution of trees to its character, structure, history and community life.

At present, the Place Appraisal touches only briefly on trees, it does not explain their role in shaping and defining the village. While there have been surveys of individual (or groups of) trees, we have yet to articulate the overall contribution of trees to our community. If we are to influence future development, and identify opportunities to sustain the environment and biodiversity in the face of climate change, we should commission a survey to explore these issues and to identify threats, future risks and opportunities. Such a survey would add to the rigour, quality and impact of the Place Appraisal as well as providing evidence for policy making.

The following brief describes this task and the outcomes required.

BRIEF FOR SUTTON POYNTZ VILLAGE TREE SURVEY

The Sutton Poyntz Village Tree Survey should:

- Describe the extent, pattern, age and diversity of trees within the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Forum Area (shown below).
- Assess the merit of the existing woodland, drawing where possible on extant surveys of individual specimens.
- Describe the importance of trees in the landscape and in shaping the character of the village. This includes key views into and out of the village and the architectural contribution within individual character areas (such as the Mill Pond, Springhead and Waterworks, Puddledock Lane, etc).
- Identify quality of life contribution of trees to the village and its economy.
- Address their role in combatting the effects of climate change. This should include flooding and soil erosion (both have affected the village in recent years) as well as sustaining biodiversity, ecological networks, etc.
- Propose processes and policies that could afford greater protection to existing trees.
- Identify the potential for development to sustain or enhance the contribution of trees to the village.

