

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 20th February 2018 in the Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz, commencing 19.40 hours.

Present: Katrina Blee (chair), Bill Davidson, Bill Egerton, Sue Elgey, Tony Ferrari, Andy Hohne, Huw Llewellyn, Colin Marsh, Liz Pegrum.

A total of three residents attended as observers.

1. Apologies

Apologies had been received in advance of the meeting from Keith Hudson, Susan Higham and Keith Johnson.

2. To Approve the minutes of the previous meeting.

The minutes of the meeting held on 16th January 2018 were agreed 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)

Item 3 – BE thanked LP for her advice following the last meeting and informed the meeting that this had enabled him to create a file containing all ‘neighbourhood@’ e-mail correspondence and confirmed that anyone with an e-mail client address would now be able to gain access to this information. The system was now active but had not been tested. BE was also able to report that the two duplicate e-mail addresses now in use did correlate exactly with regard to the number of e-mails received. LP confirmed that she was satisfied that these actions had discharged her concerns as to public access.

Item 7 – The request for a change in the Terms of Reference of the Steering Group, in respect of a maximum voting membership of 18 and application of Steering Group terms of reference to all sub-groups, had been agreed by the Sutton Poyntz Society at the last meeting. A revised paragraph (sub-section 3) on the creation of sub-groups had been inserted within the terms of reference and the maximum membership of the Steering Group amended to read 18. A hard copy of the revised terms was circulated by BE.

BE noted that the Sutton Poyntz Society Committee was concerned at the risk of expenditure incurred between grant periods and that which was not clearly covered by the terms of the grant. It was also explained that they would be revisiting the question of financial delegation and he would report back on the outcome after their next meeting. LP expressed concern that in future we must be sure that expenditure has been approved as in her opinion unauthorised expenditure could result in a levy on individuals of the Steering Group or the Sutton Poyntz Society. It was explained that a previous problem had arisen due to the £300 expenditure on the traffic survey being ineligible for grant support. BE requested greater clarity in those situations where no grant support was available and reference back to the Sutton Poyntz Society where doubt existed. CM questioned why the traffic survey expenditure was considered as “unauthorised” when the records of the Steering Group minutes for June and July indicated otherwise. BE stated that no approval for such expenditure had been recorded in the minutes of the Sutton Poyntz Society during this period.

For the benefit of the visitors present the chair explained the difficulties created by the complexities of the grant expenditure process. She suggested that in future, if

necessary, the schedule must be allowed to slip until authorisation of expenditure has been formally approved by the Sutton Poyntz Society.

The Steering Group unanimously agreed to adopt the amended Terms of Reference.

Item 8 – It was confirmed that all actions had been completed with regard to the advance publication of agendas and draft minutes.

4. To Address any items of Correspondence

Item 4a – It was agreed that the communication from Nick Cardnell (Weymouth and Portland Borough Council) in respect of consultants for local heritage assets, green space and key view assessment be addressed under Item 10 on the agenda.

It was further agreed that a communication (Item 4c), also from Nick Cardnell, regarding publication of conflicts of interest be considered under item 7 on the agenda.

Item 4b – A number of responses had been received following the letter to landowners and the chair read through the key points of each and sought the advice of the meeting. The decision of the meeting was as follows:-

WH and JH Davidson – Existing planning application referred to. Noted.

N and M Brown – No change of use intended. Noted.

Wessex Water plc – request for more time to collect information acknowledged.

J and J Cunningham – No change of use intended. Noted.

R. Porter – no change of use intended but identified the potential for development on one side of the area of land in the distant future. Noted.

Crocker family – present at the meeting and expressed concern regarding the lack of clarity of the community aspirations and the ability to foresee future intentions over an 18 year time period. In response to a question on the next steps in the process the chair suggested that aspirations would be clearer if there was community support for development outside of the current development boundary. After brief discussion on the use of open and specific questions it was suggested that a meeting with landowners would help clarify some of the issues from both parties perspective, although LP urged caution that we must take care not to irritate landowners.

JC Morris – no change of use intended to the arable land and a question was asked about the publication of Declarations of Interests which it was agreed would be addressed under item 7 on the agenda.

PJS Developments – a few points of clarification were raised and in a subsequent letter an offer was made to meet with the company planning consultant. This was agreed subject to resolving how best to schedule the meetings.

P. Broatch – responded with a number of specific suggestions related to grassland grazing, camping and eco-café development which the meeting felt formed a useful basis for further discussion.

Punch Taverns – holding statement produced and a further response was awaited.

W and R Egerton – no change of use planned. Noted.

S and D Emblen – comments on the need to correct the boundary as represented on the map and comment on the previous intent to build in the field which was now being developed as wildlife habitat and requesting any help in managing this. Noted, possible input from the biodiversity group.

S and L Grant Jones – confirmed use of land for horticultural purposes as part of their garden. Noted.

Terry Pegrum – an offer to meet and discuss future intentions was welcomed by the meeting.

The arrangements for meeting with landowners were discussed and it was agreed that Brian Wilson (consultant) facilitate the meeting of Steering Group members with landowners based upon a program of timed slots over one or two days, if possible. TF suggested that a summary of the aspirations of the community based upon the stage two survey be provided to landowners in advance as a basis for this discussion. BE noted that since a conflict between community and landowner aspiration was probable over issues such as the development boundary, some form of compromise arrangement may have to be considered during the process.

When responding to landowner feedback TF suggested that if no change of land use was indicated, only a summary of the survey results need be provided, while for those landowners where a change of use was proposed or a meeting had been requested the summary should be provided along with suggested dates for a meeting with Steering Group representatives. It was agreed to contact all landowners accordingly. **Action:KB**

5. To Note resignations from sub-groups and receive an update on new Steering Group members.

The chair confirmed the resignations of Jez Cunningham, Chris Balfe and Jan Bergman from the Housing and Planning sub-group. LP confirmed her resignation from the Sports and Recreation sub-group and the chair reported that Keith Johnson had agreed to join. Jan Bergman had decided not to join the Steering Group due to work commitments. A number of residents who had attended the January meeting had decided not to join the Steering Group but some intended to continue to attend as observers.

The chair placed on record on behalf of the Steering Group thanks to Jez Cunningham and Chris Balfe for their past input into the Neighbourhood Plan process.

In response to a question from BE the chair confirmed that the names of those who had chosen to step down be removed from the contact list on the village web site and asked that the composition of the survey sub-group be added to the list. **Action:BE**

6. To Appoint a Consultation Statement Co-ordinator.

The chair confirmed that there had been no volunteers forthcoming for this vacancy and given this situation suggested that the survey sub-group take on this key role. This was agreed.

7. To Finalise publication of Conflict of Interest information

In view of the concerns of some members about identity theft, the chair suggested that personal information be placed in the public domain with addresses and signatures redacted, or alternatively individuals wishing to access the declaration of interest forms do so through a request to the chair. After a brief discussion it was agreed to publish redacted forms (no signature or residential address) on the web site. The chair further noted that in order to maintain confidentiality it would be necessary to amend the details on some of the forms. **Action:KB**

8. Stage Two Survey/Housing Needs Survey.

8a) – to receive a report from the survey sub-group (pre-circulated). Upon introduction of the report LP strongly expressed her concern that a Housing Needs

Survey (number 294) issued by KB as a spare had been attributed on the spreadsheet to the business at Puddings Field and returned from “Terry’s pig employee” despite LP recording on her survey cover sheet that she had not in the end issued the extra form to this business, but instead to a house on Sutton Road or possibly Puddledock Lane. KB explained that she had recorded the spare form as having been issued to LP for passing onto the person concerned and had done so on the returns sheet since survey responses were already being received back at that stage. LP also expressed concern that form numbers had been used to identify individuals. KB explained that no traceability of numbered forms to individual respondents was possible due to random distribution and that the numbering related only to tracing which batches had gone to which distributors for logistical reasons. The only traceability to a specific survey form related to those respondents who had chosen to provide their name and address. AH was unable to find the record in question on the spreadsheet at the time, however, it was agreed to remove any erroneous reference to a specific individual and to record it as a ‘spare issued to LP’ as had been originally intended.

Action:AH

BD commented upon feedback he had received from residents who were particularly concerned about the number on the back of each survey form. In answer to a further concern it was confirmed that the number of non-returned forms was included on the final page of the report. CM suggested that such negative responses were relatively few and commented on the positive feedback that had also been received from a number of residents. BD sought confirmation as to how feedback comments had been captured and AH directed him to the cell on the spreadsheet relative to the specific question number.

8b) – to receive the schedules of survey feedback. KB suggested that in the interests of clarity all of the survey comments should be extracted and listed separately with clear reference to the question concerned. TF considered that it was impractical for the Steering Group to look at each comment on an individual basis and suggested that separate schedules should be provided for each sub-group relative to their topic area.

Action: Survey sub group and topic sub-groups.

8c) – to consider how/when to communicate results to the community. The suggestion by Brian Wilson (consultant) to present the data graphically was positively received. BE stated that he had completed some initial statistical analysis of his own and will circulate the results. His analysis did however suggest that there was no evidence of ‘survey fatigue’.

The survey sub-group were asked to meet and produce a summary data only report and to make provision for public access to the raw data from the stage two and housing needs surveys. It was also agreed that any attached letters should be included as part of the comments section.

Action: Survey sub-group

9. To Receive sub-group reports

- a) Place Appraisal – no further meeting had taken place but one was planned for 26th February. KB asked for contributions to the revision of the Place Appraisal and it was noted that the Biodiversity and Transport sub-groups have produced some revised material for incorporation.
- b) Biodiversity and the Natural Environment – CM reported that the sub-group had met twice since the last meeting and progress was being made towards a draft

chapter for the Neighbourhood Plan following very positive responses in the stage two survey in respect of enhancement of biodiversity and the creation of a green corridor. A policy on flooding was also 'work in progress' and as with greenspaces would require input from the Steering Group and other sub-groups as they also impacted on non-biodiversity aspects.

- c) Employment, Business and Tourism – AH reported that a meeting had not been possible due to illness but this would be organised in the immediate future.
- d) Heritage – BE reported that the sub-group had met twice with the focus on researching example chapters and developing further supporting evidence. They had also investigated possible heritage asset consultants through various bodies such as the Civic Society. KB informed the meeting that Brian Wilson had suggested some prospective consultants who had been involved in the Bridport and Puddletown plans and had local heritage experience and agreed to pass the details to BE. **Action:KB**
- e) Housing and Planning – LP reported that a meeting was planned for 6th March.
- f) Sports and Recreation – no meeting had been held.
- g) Transport – SE reported that a meeting had recently been held and a draft section for the Neighbourhood Plan produced and reviewed by Brian Wilson further to which a second revision was to be considered at a meeting on 23rd February. CM noted that feedback on structure and format from BW would be of value to other sub-groups and agreed to circulate the final draft prior to the March meeting. **Action:CM**

On a general note regarding use of feedback from the survey it was agreed that the responses to those questions where there was a tiny majority would need to take into account the opinions of those who had taken an opposing view and may require further consultation.

10. To Agree arrangements for professional assessment of potential green spaces, key views and heritage assets and a timeline for public consultation.

KB reported that a number of assessment criteria were available in relation to green space such as the North Dorset model that had been created by Nick Cardnell and emphasised that most neighbourhood plan groups conducted their own assessments. CM noted that much of the information provided in the Place Appraisal relative to the green corridor and key views would help to facilitate this assessment. Brian Wilson had been approached in order to create an independent assessment and had produced a quotation in respect of local green space and key views; this had only just been received that day and so was circulated at the meeting for consideration. LP suggested that the quote required the addition of 'scoping' information on the precise criteria to be used and this view was endorsed by the meeting. At this point BD declared an interest and asked that his abstention from voting be recorded.

BE proposed that BW supply assessment criteria and that once provided this be subject to Steering Group approval by e-mail round before authorising BW to proceed or not.

Action:KB

In view of the proposed level of consultancy work a discussion on available finance ensued during which BE confirmed that £5754 of approved grant expenditure remained unspent.

11. To Agree arrangements for drafting of the Neighbourhood Plan vision and objectives.

KB commented upon the importance of this item and CM reminded the meeting of the draft vision and objectives drafted by Brian Wilson 12 months ago. He noted that it had been decided some time ago that the draft objectives should be further developed by the respective sub-groups in preparation for the March meeting. It was agreed that the draft vision and objectives be re-circulated for consideration at the next meeting.

Action:CM

12. To Review progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetable

The following key targets in the 2018 plan were noted:

External audit completion by end February 2018.

Presentation of draft Neighbourhood Plan topic chapters by sub-groups for the March 2018 meeting.

The survey sub-group to meet before the March meeting.

Further consultation with landowners would need to be added to the schedule.

One of the residents present asked about the two six week consultation periods referred to in the long term plan. There was some uncertainty as to whether this may be duplication and it was agreed to clarify this after the meeting and amend the schedule if necessary.

Action:KB

13. To Receive the report on income and expenditure and agree a single point of accountability.

The accounts had been prepared by LP and circulated in advance. It was confirmed that the maximum grant available was £15k and £5.5k had already been spent. It was agreed that in future a budget of expenditure would need to be prepared well in advance and in order to minimise any potential cash flow problems KB and BE would meet at the earliest opportunity.

Action:KB/BE

It was confirmed that LP had mutually agreed with BE that she alone will deal directly with the accounts in future

14. To Review the need for technical support packages in lieu of grant funding.

KB confirmed that in addition to the £15k grant a number of free technical support packages were available some of which had already been used through our consultants. KB read through the list of package titles and concluded from her research that none of the packages available appeared to support the remaining work to be completed other than a health check package for the Neighbourhood Plan which the local authority were prepared to undertake at no cost.

15. Any Other Business

Each member present was asked if they had any other business. No matters were raised and the meeting was declared closed at 22.10 hours.

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