

# Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

**Agenda for the meeting on 17th April 2018 to be held in the Blue Duck Bar of the Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz commencing at 7.30pm.**

1. To Receive apologies (Advance apologies from Tony Ferrari)
2. To Consider the Appointment of a Vice-Chair
3. To Approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2018 (attached along with amendments requested by BD and LP).
4. To Receive an update on actions arising from the previous meeting (not otherwise on the agenda)
5. To Address items of correspondence  
Item 5a - Email count (from [neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk](mailto:neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk))  
Item 5b – Letter from Blue Cedar Homes (attached)
6. To Receive an update regarding consultation with landowners (summary of contacts and recent responses attached)
7. To Receive the Consultants reports on the assessment of Key Views and Local Green Spaces (PDF files attached).
8. To Receive sub-group reports including the final draft Neighbourhood Plan sections:
  - a) Place Appraisal
  - b) Survey/Consultation sub-group
  - c) Biodiversity and the Natural Environment
  - d) Employment, Business and Tourism including IT/Communications
  - e) Heritage (record of meeting in March outstanding)
  - f) Housing and Planning (record of meeting held on 04/04/18 attached and to be read in conjunction with Key Views report)
  - g) Sports and Recreation
  - h) Transport (previously circulated record of meeting held on 20/03/18 )
9. To Consider any proposed changes to the draft vision and objectives and confirm arrangements for the incorporation of these into the Neighbourhood Plan.
10. To Consider the arrangements for the production of a draft Neighbourhood Plan.
11. To Consider the impact of changes to the Grant Funding arrangements (Summary of work to be completed and estimated costs attached)
12. To Review progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetables (attached)
13. To Review the Draft Consultation Statement (latest version attached)
14. To Receive a report on income and expenditure (report attached)
15. Any Other Business
16. Date and Time of the Next Meeting

To confirm the date and time of the next meeting as Tuesday 15th May 2018 at 7.30pm.

## Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> March 2018 in the Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz, commencing 19.34 hours.

**Present:** Mike Blee, Bill Davidson, Bill Egerton, Sue Elgey, Tony Ferrari, Keith Johnson, Huw Llewellyn, Colin Marsh, Liz Pegrum.

In the absence of a chairperson Tony Ferrari was invited to chair the meeting and this was agreed.

### 1. Apologies

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

### 2. To appoint a chairperson.

Following the resignation of Katrina Blee nominations had been invited for the position of chair of the Steering Group. Only one nomination was received, that of Peter Dye, and in the absence of any further nominations the meeting agreed unanimously to elect Peter Dye as chair.

### 3. To Approve the minutes of the previous meeting.

The minutes of the meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> February 2018 were agreed as a correct record and were endorsed by the chair.

### 4. To Receive an update on any actions arising from the minutes of the previous meeting (not otherwise on the agenda)

Item 4 – CM noted that the action placed on KB of replying to landowners had not been completed and this was to be addressed in relation to Item 5 on the agenda.

Item 5 – BE had completed the action of updating the contact details on the village web site.

Item 7 – BE confirmed that the Declaration of Interests forms had been uploaded to the village web site. The situation regarding one form that required amendment to redact information was uncertain and was to be checked with Katrina Blee.

**Action:CM**

Item 8 a) – It was confirmed by BE that AH had removed the erroneous reference on the survey results spreadsheet.

Item 8b) – The Stage Two Survey comments had been extracted from the spreadsheet and circulated to sub-groups for their response. LP suggested that a response was not necessary beyond issue of a general note to inform the public that all comments had been taken into consideration. BD supported this view and was concerned that there was little value in a response as it would involve a degree of interpretation of comments and create possible misunderstanding. He suggested a general statement be included on the web site noting that ‘all comments had been read and considered, a full transcript had been placed on the web site and noting the value of the feedback provided’.

Item 8c) – It was believed that any additional letters/pages attached to the surveys had been included in the extracted comments, although this was to be confirmed with AH prior to publicising these on the web site.

**Action:CM**

Item 9d) – BE confirmed that he had received the details of prospective consultants from KB.

Item 9g) – CM had circulated the final draft Transport section for the Neighbourhood Plan, as agreed with Brian Wilson (consultant), to all sub-groups for use as an example of the preferred format.

Item 10 – CM confirmed the arrangements for Brian Wilson and Tim Gale to carry out a visit to assess the various key view and local green space sites on 21<sup>st</sup> March. BE and LP would accompany the consultants for the key views and CM and Jack Winsper for the Local Green Spaces. It was hoped to cover all sites in the day, however, if necessary a second visit would be organised.

Item 11 – The vision and objectives were to be discussed under Item 10 of the agenda.

Item 12 – It was confirmed that there had been no duplication in the timetable and the requirement existed for two six week public consultation periods once the draft Neighbourhood Plan had been produced.

Item 13 – BE confirmed that the action of a meeting to discuss advance preparation of budgets had not been completed owing to the resignation of KB. He was however satisfied that there were no specific budgetary concerns at the present time.

BD suggested that a message of thanks be sent to Katrina Blee in respect of the valuable work that she had accomplished as chair of the Steering Group since its formation.

**Action:CM**

## **5. To Address any items of Correspondence**

Item 5a – Responses to Letter to landowners. A response had now been received from Wessex Water, this stated that there was no foreseeable change of land use and outlined a program of continued co-operation with the local community. This was noted.

Item 5b – the e-mail count was noted.

## **6. To Confirm arrangements for meetings with landowners.**

Commenting on the draft letters of reply to landowners LP suggested a change in the wording as appropriate to reflect those replies where a meeting had actually been requested. It was agreed that CM together with Peter Dye as the incoming chair meet to finalise the wording of the letters and agree preferred dates for meetings with landowners. It was suggested that of the dates offered by Brian Wilson, the options of 16, 18 and 19 April were preferred and that the meetings should be held in the Blue Duck bar if it was available.

## **7. To Receive changes to the membership of the Steering Group and sub-groups**

The changes of membership to the sub-groups as outlined in the agenda were noted. Mike Blee was welcomed as a new member of the Steering Group.

## **8. To Receive the External Audit Report.**

The report produced by John Allen and circulated in advance of the meeting was accepted, it being noted that there were no significant data entry errors.

## **9. To Receive sub-group reports including draft topic sections for the Neighbourhood Plan.**

- a) Place Appraisal – BE confirmed that this sub-group had not met since the last Steering Group meeting.
- b) Survey/Consultation – CM outlined the work undertaken since the last meeting of extraction of the general and specific question comments from the spreadsheet along with a summary of the Place Appraisal feedback and of the Housing Needs Survey information and noted that these had been circulated to sub-groups for consideration. Whilst it was agreed to make all of the full data sets available on the village web site, several members questioned the need to provide individual responses to each comment. Feedback from the Housing and Planning sub-group indicated dissatisfaction with such an approach and this was supported by several members present. The primary concern was that this may result in a series of responses and counter responses that would detract from the overall process and would involve a degree of interpretation of responses that may not necessarily be representative of the original intent. It was therefore agreed to publish the full extracted comments from all documents without the inclusion of responses from the Steering/sub-groups. It was agreed that the web site page set up by BE to receive this information was satisfactory.

Comments were invited on the draft Newsletter that had been circulated in advance and discussion again took place on the merits of including a summary of 'types of comments' received against each question, particularly since the full comments would be accessible on the web site. CM was concerned that failure to include a summary would disadvantage those who did not have internet access; while others expressed concern that the summary could be misinterpreted. After a lengthy discussion HL proposed that the Newsletter be published with the comments summary as per the draft provided and this was agreed without dissent. It was further agreed to add a note to the Newsletter directing people to the web site or a Steering Group member should they require any clarification.
- c) Employment, Business and Tourism – AH had reported by e-mail that a meeting had been held and a draft section for the Neighbourhood Plan produced. Feedback from the consultant had indicated that the issues covered should be dealt with as a series of action points rather than policies and the sub-group would seek to address this with a redraft of the document by the end of March.
- d) Heritage – BE reported that a meeting had been held and a record of this was still to be prepared. However, a draft section for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan had been produced and circulated for comment.
- e) Housing and Planning – LP reported that following a recent meeting of the sub-group a draft section for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan had been produced and feedback requested. It was noted that the consultant had only seen part of the draft at this stage. LP commented that advice from the consultant that density of housing rather than specific numbers should be included within the Neighbourhood Plan appeared to be contradicted by the Lodders Neighbourhood Plan which had been 'made'.
- f) Sports and Recreation – due to a lack of members and inactivity of this group CM had joined with KJ to produce a draft section for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan. This had been amended following feedback from Brian Wilson and had been circulated to the Steering Group for comment.
- g) Transport – A draft had been produced some time ago and following feedback from the consultant had been circulated to other sub-groups as an example format. MB reported on the most recent meeting when a review of comments had been undertaken and considered relative to the policies and action points outlined in the draft document. The desire for a 20mph limit received several mentions in feedback, however, having sought further clarification from the Highways Department it was clear that the traffic survey data and accident statistical data did not meet the criteria for an enforceable 20mph zone. TF confirmed that any form of speed limit would require the support of the County Council Highways Department.

The chair noted that subject to receipt of the Employment, Business and Tourism section for the Neighbourhood Plan the timescales against the overall plan schedule had been met.

In response to a question from BE it was confirmed that Flooding was being addressed by the Biodiversity Group.

It was agreed to request responses to each of the draft Neighbourhood Plan sections within 14 days, the responses to be passed on to sub-groups for consideration in a re-draft which should be forwarded to CM prior to the Steering Group meeting on April 17<sup>th</sup>.

**Action: sub-groups/CM**

A timeline and arrangements for production of a draft Neighbourhood Plan following the April meeting would need to be agreed. **Action:CM/PD**

#### **10. To Consider the draft Vision and Objectives and their incorporation into the Neighbourhood Plan.**

CM reported that the draft version and one response suggesting some amendments had been produced 12 months previously and no further action taken in the intervening period, although the intention was that the individual topic objectives would be further developed by the respective sub-groups and included in the relevant sections of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. It was agreed that feedback on the vision and objectives should take place within the same timescale as the Neighbourhood Plan sections.

**Action:Sub-groups/CM**

#### **11. To Review progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetable**

The chair provided an overview of the schedule in the current period and noted that the process was on target.

#### **12. To Review the Draft Consultation Statement**

CM reported that since this had been passed to the Survey/Consultation sub-group he had now updated this in line with the work initiated by Peter Dye and had confirmed with the consultant that the document was satisfactory. The document had been circulated but no comments were forthcoming from the meeting. TF wondered if Peter Dye may wish to take responsibility for this again.

#### **13. To Receive a report on income and expenditure.**

A verbal report was given by LP in which it was noted that the only expenditure since the February meeting had been a total of £275 for consultancy fees. BE noted that there had been approximately £5.5k of expenditure so far and around £3k had been approved, this needing to be allocated before the month end. Around £2.2k had been earmarked for consultancy services and up to £400 would be required for printing of the Newsletter No. 4.

Katrina Blee had alerted the secretary earlier that evening to information from 'Locality' that indicated a change in the funding rules to the disadvantage of Neighbourhood Forums, such that the previous £15k grant funding availability may now be limited to £9k and which would therefore directly affect Sutton Poyntz. BE had contacted 'Locality' and was awaiting a response but was of the view that we may have to seek alternative funding options. TF suggested that he investigate funding options through the local authority in order to attempt to secure sufficient financial support to enable completion of the Neighbourhood Plan.

**Action:TF**

MB suggested lobbying central Government through the MP's, although the meeting felt that this was unlikely to succeed.

HL asked that a projection of the minimum finance required to see the Neighbourhood Plan through to completion is produced. **Action: BE**

#### **14. To Confirm arrangements for the authorisation and payment of invoices.**

CM outlined the current arrangements in which the Chair verified the invoices/log of work undertaken and passed these to the Treasurer of the Sutton Poyntz Society for payment. It was agreed that this arrangement was sufficient and should be communicated to the Peter Dye as the incoming chairperson. **Action:CM**

BE informed the meeting that having discussed possible changes to the Terms of Reference the Sutton Poyntz Society had decided that no change was necessary in relation to budgets and financial delegation.

#### **15. Any Other Business**

HL raised a concern as to the 'floor time' given to visitors at recent Steering Group meetings and the need to manage this more effectively in future. BD suggested that a specific time slot could be offered in order to ensure that there was sufficient time to deal with the main business on the agenda whilst maintaining open representation, whilst TF felt that this had not been a significant enough issue to warrant specific action. It was agreed that it should be left to the chair to make the judgement as to achieving the right balance between open contributions and potential disruption of the work of the Steering Group.

CM informed the meeting that he would meet as soon as possible with Peter Dye in order to ensure that the incoming chair was fully updated on the work of the Steering Group.

**Action:CM**

The meeting closed at 21.20 hours.

**The date and time of the next meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 17<sup>th</sup> April 2018 at 19.30 hours.**

#### **ITEM 3 Requested amendment to the minutes of the previous meeting**

Bill Davidson (billdgm@gmail.com)To:you + 13 more  
Colin

Two points from draft minutes.

1.

There is no mention of the point I made regarding the number of people in the village - BE agreed to amend ( not sure if it was website or newsletter now)  
no of people from '400 adults' to 456 people so as to echo what was in Place Appraisal doc.

2.

At point 9b) I did abstain from the decision proposed by HL - could this be noted please.  
thanks

Bill D

**Subject to the agreement of the meeting the Minutes Secretary suggests**

**Under 9 b, paragraph 2, sentence 3 to read “HL proposed ..... was agreed with one abstention (BD).”**

**Insert a sentence after this of “BD asked that the population estimate of 456 as mentioned in the Place Appraisal be used consistently for the newsletter and on the web site and BE agreed to action this.**

E-mail from Elizabeth Pegrum

Dear Colin

I attach latest H&P minutes - now including a mea culpa as we overlooked feedback. They need to be read in conjunction with the vey views document - assume you will circulate that?

Also attached is the latest funding update.

I have just had a look through the minutes and I am sure that under item 10 I asked whether the people whose land was being considered for green spaces or views should be informed. The answer was (along the lines) that it was not felt appropriate as the consultants should have no preconceived ideas and an approach from landowners might not be helpful.

9(e) End of section doesn't make sense, it reads contradicted by the Loders Neighbourhood Plan which had been 'made'.  
should it say contradicted by the Loders Neighbourhood Plan which had *included specific numbers*.

Finally under section 15 HL's proposal was (following an email from AH) that non SG members should be present and listen but not speak. Most of us were very much against this Stalinist attitude. I think this should be recorded.

I may be a bit late if my meeting in London over runs next week, I should be there at 8 latest as long as trains are on time, however just in case I thought I should let you have my comments in advance.

Best

Liz

## **ITEM 5 – TO ADDRESS ITEMS OF CORRESPONDENCE**

**Item 5a - Email count (from [neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk](mailto:neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk))**

2082 to the end of February 2018 (same as previously reported)

69 in March

39 so far in April

## Item 5b – Letter from Blue Cedar Homes



Ref: NY/rc

5 April 2018

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan  
Mission Hall  
Mission Hall Lane  
Sutton Poyntz  
Weymouth DT3

Dear Mr Egerton

**Re: Blue Cedar Homes**

I am writing to you from Blue Cedar Homes. We're a small company that builds discrete developments of homes that are purpose-designed for retirement living, allowing over-55s to retain their independence and live active lifestyles.

I am contacting you in your capacity as a representative of the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan steering group. Our research shows that there is likely to be a relatively greater need for retirement living homes in your Neighbourhood Area in the coming years, compared to other areas in the Weymouth and Portland District.

We pride ourselves on taking a unique approach to the way we that we select locations to build new homes and work with the local community to deliver them. We are vastly different to large housebuilders, offering a completely different product in high-quality, low density schemes that truly respond to the needs of older people and the wide community.

Rather than involving the local community immediately before or after a planning application is submitted, we believe that the best outcomes are often achieved when the community leads the process, telling us what is needed and where it should be built. We can then create schemes of the highest design quality, that residents take ownership of and value.

We would like to work with your Neighbourhood Planning group and feel that retirement living homes are something that your community is in need of and, if so, where you think that such homes could be built.

Please feel free to call me on 01392 441909, or to send me an email at [nick.yeo@bluecedarhomes.co.uk](mailto:nick.yeo@bluecedarhomes.co.uk).

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Nick Yeo'.

**Nick Yeo**  
**Area Director**  
Email: [nick.yeo@bluecedarhomes.co.uk](mailto:nick.yeo@bluecedarhomes.co.uk)

EAGLE HOUSE  
1 BABBAGE WAY  
EXETER SCIENCE PARK  
EXETER  
EX5 2FN  
TEL: 01392 441909  
FAX: 01392 369540

[www.bluecedarhomes.co.uk](http://www.bluecedarhomes.co.uk)



**Letter from Chair to owners of land outside the Defined Development Boundary.**

Peter Dye

73 Sutton Road  
Sutton Poyntz  
Dorset  
DT3 6LN  
5 April 2018

As you may know, I have recently taken over as Chair of the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

We wrote to you in January regarding the potential future use of your land in Sutton Poyntz.

I apologise for the delay in providing a follow-up, but we wanted to wait until we could offer sight of the responses to the formal consultation about future development in the village and the community's long-term needs.

Accordingly, I attach Newsletter Number 5 which summarises the results of the stage two public consultation.

You may have already indicated a desire to meet with the Steering Group, however we would be very happy to organise a meeting for any landowners or their representatives, now that you have access to the survey results.

If you have already indicated that you would like a meeting, or would now like to do so, we plan to hold these during the weeks commencing 9 and 16 April 2018. The proposed venue is the Blue Duck Bar, The Springhead. Please let me know, at this address, what dates and times would be convenient.

More information about Neighbourhood Plans and/or what we are doing locally is available on the following web sites:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2>  
<http://www.suttonpoyntz.org.uk/neighbourhood>

Peter Dye  
Chair Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Enclosure:  
Newsletter No 5.

**From:** Terry Pegrum <[terrypegrum@hotmail.com](mailto:terrypegrum@hotmail.com)>

**Sent:** 12 April 2018 07:14

**To:** Peter Dye

**Subject:** Pudding's Field, Plaisters Lane, DT3 6LG

Dear Peter

As part of the Neighbourhood Plan process I have registered my interest in engaging with the Forum about the future potential and opportunity that Pudding's Field offers to the village. To help me I have engaged Intelligent Land, a land and town planning consultancy with a wealth of experience in plan-making. I will be asking them to represent me at future meetings.

When I look at the village I see a community that is aging and introspective. It is only a generation ago that many properties in the village were still affordable to families and young people. New

developments in the 1970s provided homes for local people and provided a natural growth that settlements go through over time. Time cannot stand still, and what we face locally and nationally is a massive housing crisis.

I am not suggesting that the village should take a significant scale of housing merely that it should play its part in helping to provide a range and tenure of homes that are affordable to people, and that hopefully brings in some 'younger blood'. Simply, a mix of people of different ages helps provide a balanced and healthy community.

The Neighbourhood Plan provides an opportunity to think about how the village will be in 10 to 20 years' time. Who will live here, what homes will be needed how can we 'make it happen'. Planning is meant to be a positive process. So, let's plan positively, and in so doing I am willing to offer Pudding's Field as a site to deliver genuine affordable housing.

Yours sincerely

TA Pegrum

**From:** Liz Crocker <[elizabeth.crocker@ymail.com](mailto:elizabeth.crocker@ymail.com)>

**Subject: Re: FUTURE DEVELOPMENT IN SUTTON POYNTZ - CONSULTATION FEEDBACK**

**Date:** 9 April 2018 at 22:16:06 BST

**To:** Peter Dye <[peter.dye@outlook.com](mailto:peter.dye@outlook.com)>, "[neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk](mailto:neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk)" <[neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk](mailto:neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk)>

**Cc:** Hannah Crocker <[hannah.crocker@hotmail.com](mailto:hannah.crocker@hotmail.com)>

Dear Peter and Steering Group,

In addition to my family's previous letter submitted to the group on Tuesday 27 March 2018, we would like to submit a response to your correspondence received on Thursday 5 April.

We welcome the acknowledgment of our response to the groups query regarding our field's land use over the next 18 years. As you will see from our response, we felt this was an abstract exercise; no context or justification was provided, nor were we told how that data would be used. These questions unfortunately remain unanswered.

We have reviewed Newsletter Number 5 which we see shows support for the principle of designating local green spaces (Q4 part a). However, as the pre-emptive questions listing potential green spaces were discounted from the Stage Two Survey (Q4 part b) by the Steering Group, no local green sites could have been identified as a result of the Stage Two Survey.

As in our letter of 27 March, we understand an independent consultant has been to review the green spaces in the village. We, the land owners, were not notified nor were we included within the consultant's visit and assessment. We are not aware of evidence gathered or the subsequent conclusions.

Since the first time our field was included within a list of potential green spaces with no supporting evidence (in the now revoked Survey Two Question 4b) we have very clearly objected to the proposal. I appreciate you were not part of the Steering Group during this period so I am happy to re-send our correspondence.

Whilst we recognise and welcome the offer of landowner meetings with the Steering Group we are unsure as to what the purpose of a meeting would be at this stage? We, at this point, are not aware of our field being a potential local green space nor are we aware of any proposals or evidence which impact or relate to our land. To allow us to assess whether a meeting would be worthwhile we would welcome a proposed agenda or meeting objective. From our perspective we have been clear where we stand and we are unable to see any value in meeting until the Steering Group develops its proposals.

We are keen for meaningful engagement with the Steering Group and do hope this will not be the only offer of engagement with the landowners. We look forward to continuing to work with you in the future.

Best wishes,  
Richard, Ann, Hannah and Elizabeth Crocker

Peter Dye (peter.dye@outlook.com) To: you + 2 more Details  
Colin,

5<sup>th</sup> April 2018

**Hilary Davidson** has just phoned and said she would like to present her plans to the SG so we need to look at a date. At present, she says that she can only do the evening of 10 April.

Can you see whether the Blue Duck Bar is available? If so, we'll need to do a round-robin to see who can attend.

I suspect that Hilary might be more flexible if we went with a daytime meeting but I strongly suspect that this would impact on potential SG attendance.

Peter

## ITEM 8f – RECORD OF MEETING OF HOUSING AND PLANNING SUB-GROUP

### Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

#### Meeting of the Housing and Planning sub-group, Wednesday 4 April 2018, 7:30 PM.

Present; Liz Pegrum (EP) John Bellis (JB) Tony Ferrari (TF) Bill Davidson (BD) Mike Blee (MB)

(John Crisp (JC) subsequently sent apologies he had got muddled over the date)

**Purpose of the meeting;** to review draft policy documents, and to look at views policy following publication of draft *Independent Assessment of Candidate Locations for Key View Designation*.

1. EP reported that she had asked for feedback from the steering group on the draft policies drafted by JC that had been circulated to them prior to the previous steering group meeting on 20 March 2018. TF had been acting as temporary chairman at that meeting and had reinforced the request for feedback as this was a very important part of the plan. No feedback had been received by EP. *(Subsequent to meeting Colin pointed out that he had given feedback as had MB, this had been overlooked and will be reviewed at the next subgroup meeting)* It was therefore agreed that no changes should be made to policies 1, 2 and 3 pending review and comment by the new chairman of the group Peter Dye.
2. Discussions then turned to the Independent Assessment of Candidate Locations for Key View Designation. BD declared an interest as did EP given that they had interests in land over which key views have been reviewed. BD commented that the appointment of independent assessors of the views would not achieve the desired aim because they had been given as a starting point the list that had been put in the survey which had been recognised as leading and unfair at meetings of the steering group. EP commented that the list was unsuitable as the views, particularly those from the outside the village seem to have been put forward by people who didn't walk around the village on a regular basis. For example the key view from the Beacon had been missed out (she had pointed it out to the assessors and fortunately this is now included). Equally a key view within the village been omitted - the iconic view from the bridge by the mill back over the pond. BD said that as a landowner he was very disappointed that he had not been consulted and given the opportunity to meet the consultants. EP agreed and recalled that at the last steering group meeting she had said that it was important that the owners of land affected (in particular she had been talking about the green space land given the unhappiness those designations had caused) should be told that the survey was underway. The steering group had not wanted to do this and had specifically decided against it. In the process of arranging the views (EP had volunteered to drive assessors round) she had asked about talking to the landowners and been told that the assessors wanted no pre-conceived ideas and therefore representations from landowners would not be appropriate. The one sidedness of the survey together with the lack of objectivity in setting out views for assessment by the independent assessors did question whether we should be designating views at all within the neighbourhood plan. MB commented that we had paid for the assessment so we should go ahead with including key views regardless of the concerns over the objectivity of the work done. The rest of the group decided that it was something that should be put to the steering group and the new chairman for their comments.
3. We recognised that the steering group was very likely to want to have some assessment of key views in the final neighbourhood plan and therefore agreed that the best use of time at the meeting was to look at the key views assessment and see what we would be recommending for inclusion if the steering group decided to go ahead and designate views. There were 17 views assessed and only two had been rejected, and for a village the size of Sutton Poyntz designating this many views would be excessive. Including all of these views would probably be counter-productive, lessening the impact of any protection on the important views and giving a NIMBY's charter over the unimportant ones. It was also recognised that the group had to be careful what they wished for in terms of protecting views and green spaces, external pressure from self appointed committees telling people what they can and can't do on their own land is likely to lead to landowners putting up structures gates fences et cetera to directly undermine views and green spaces. Therefore we had to focus on the really important views.

4. The group then went through the views one by one to see what should and shouldn't be included. After consideration of the various views it was agreed that the important views were generally those from outside the village looking in, with the exception for some views within the village and key views around the pond. The views looking out of the village were generally vistas that could be seen from most footpath so the benefit of designating these were limited.
5. A brief summary of the discussions on each view is set out below (this should be read in conjunction with the independent assessment document);

**View 0** The assessors had been stunned that this had not been included in the initial list of views. It is the view from the bridge near the mill across the pond back to the pub. We all agreed that this was an important view, iconic and should definitely be included. Discussed the land around Miss Saunders's house on the left of this view, JC had previously suggested this would be suitable for redevelopment with cottage style houses to improve the look of this side of the pond.

**View 1** this is the view over the gate beside the pond towards the White Horse (although can't quite see the white horse from here) it was felt that this gave a feeling of openness to the central core of the village and linked it with the open countryside. Before deciding to include this view it was felt important that the landowners should be consulted fully rather than being given a fait accompli by the steering group.

**View 2** The general feeling was that this view, East from the end of White Horse Lane was one of green fields with hills beyond which was not remarkable and no better than any other view from the footpaths around the village. Therefore recommendation was that it should not be included. Note that the report says its view west when it is in fact view east.

**View 3** similar comments as for 2 above. Including this type of view dilutes the impact of designating the really important views.

**View 4** similar comments as for 2 above. Including this type of view dilutes the impact of designating the really important views.

**View 5** not seen suitable by the assessors therefore not to be included. The group recognised that this is a good example of what might happen when there is unwanted interference over private land.

**View 6** similar comments as for 2 above. Including this type of view dilutes the impact of designating the really important views.

**View 7** not seen suitable by the assessors therefore not be included.

**View 8** this is an important view as it frames the entry into the village, it gives a feeling of openness and views of the hills beyond. There was concern amongst the group that if the houses on the left-hand side below number 89 (Halfway Up) were to be knocked down and redeveloped then this view of the Ridgeway beyond might be lost and this have significant impact on the character of this end of the village. Therefore it was agreed that a view from the Sutton Poyntz stone down to **View 9A** in the assessment should be designated. (Should owners of the gardens bordering on this road be consulted before designation?) It was thought that **View 9A** was not as important as that was dominated by the overdeveloped house at the junction. EP to take a sweep of photographs to illustrate the key view of the drive down the hill from the beginning of the village to the Cart Shed.

**View 9** not seen suitable by the assessors therefore not be included.

**View 9A** see 8 above.

**View 10** poor photograph of the view north from the track below Charlbury, EB to take a new one removing the fields in the foreground and better capturing the view. It was thought this sets the linear ribbon development aspects of the village (Plaisters Lane) into their geographical context and was an important view. To be included.

**View 11**, as the assessors said not very accessible and doesn't really add a great deal, therefore not to be included

**View 12** it was thought that this view added little to that available from Margaret's seat, EP recalled that at the time the assessors were rather bemused as to why this had been included when the Beacon had not.

**View 12A** this is the view from the Beacon, a better photo is required but it was felt that this really sets the village and its context with the Water Works and surrounding trees at the centre of that view. Photograph in the assessment is not great and EP to take a better one.

**View 13** Margaret's seat the best view of the village with Portland and the sea beyond. Iconic extremely important and to be included

**View 14A** this is the view from the bottom of the Whitehorse escarpment back towards the village, the original list had it from the style at the foot of the escarpment looking back although the

assessors thought it was better from halfway across the field. Housing and planning sub- group lukewarm as to whether it was important.

**View 15** this is the view from Winslow Hill looking back towards the village photo was missing from the report but EP will take one to add in. It does give panorama of the village with the escarpment behind and this is agreed to be an important view.

To summarise,

There is divergence of opinion within the H and P group as to whether or not we should be having a policy of views at all. Therefore it was agreed that that a decision on whether or not one should be included in the final plan should be put back to the steering group for a final decision.

If that decision is that view should be included, then the H&P sub group, having reviewed in detail the independent assessment produced by Tim Gale, recommend that the following views would be their preferred ones for inclusion in the neighbourhood plan. It is a very strong recommendation that before any further work is done on whether these views (or others) are included, the land owners should be fully consulted and proper consideration given to their concerns and reservations.

View 0 iconic view of village pond

View 2 From pond towards White Horse over gate

View 8 to be reworked a series of views sweeping down from the Sutton Poyntz stone towards the junction outside the Cart Shed

View 10 North from path below Charlbury

View 12A From The Beacon

View 13 Margaret's Seat

View 15 From Winslow Hill

**EP 4/5/18**

## ITEM 11 – TO CONSIDER THE IMPACT OF CHANGES TO GRANT FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS

### OUTSTANDING WORK TO COMPLETE SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

The following tasks (and approximate costs) have been identified by Brian Wilson as essential steps in completing the Neighbourhood Plan:

#### Essential Work

Ser No	Task	Cost	Notes
1.	Drafting of Basic Conditions Statement	£1,320	Three day's work, based on ten policies in the NP
2.	Advice on drafting policies (wording) and accompanying text	£220	Half a day's work.
3.	Review of full draft of NP document	£220	Half a day's work.
4.	Final review of draft Place Appraisal	£220	Half a day's work.
5.	Advice on presenting Regulation 14 stage responses	£220	Half a day's work.
6.	Printing of Neighbourhood Plan and Newsletter	£70	Assuming 50-60 copies of a 32-page Plan and a single-side Newsletter.

The following tasks are judged to be desirable, but not essential:

#### Desirable Work

Ser No	Task	Cost	Notes
7.	Contingency	£500	To cover unexpected tasks or additional work.
8.	Heritage Asset Assessment	£1,800	
9.	Advice and drafting for SEA submission	£220	Half a day's work.
10.	Attendance at SG meetings	£165	Per person + travel expenses

**ITEM 12 – REVIEW OF PROGRESS AGAINST THE LONG AND SHORT TERM TIMETABLE**

**SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN TIMETABLE**

TARGET ACTION	MONTH & YEAR																												
	2017			2018												2019						2020							
	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	F
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				█	█																								
Production of draft NP by SG					█	█	█																						
April 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 Vision/objectives collated by CM and sent to respective sub-groups.	05/04/2018	CM

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 arrangements for completion of the Neighbourhood Plan following changes to grant funding rules.	17/04/2018	Steering Group

**ITEM 13 – TO RECEIVE CURRENT DRAFT CONSULTATION STATEMENT**

# **Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan**

## **DRAFT Consultation Statement**

**Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Steering Group**

**August 2017**

# Contents

## Purpose

## Consultation Stages

1. **Preliminary Consultation: February 2016**
  - How We Consulted
  - Representations Received
  - Main Issues Raised
  - How We Used the Results
  
2. **Neighbourhood Plan Area Application: June 2016**
  - How We Consulted
  - Representations Received
  - How We Used the Results
  
3. **Village Consultation (Stage One Survey): October 2016**
  - How We Consulted
  - Representations Received
  - Main Issues Raised
  - How We Used the Results
  
4. **Village Consultation Drop-in Morning: March 3<sup>rd</sup> 2017**
  - How We Consulted
  - Representations Received
  - Main Issues Raised
  - How We Used the Results
  
5. **Stage Two Village Consultation (Stage Two and Housing Needs Survey): December 2017/January 2018**
  - How We Consulted
  - Representations Received
  - Main Issues Raised
  - How We Used the Results
  
- 6 **Consultation with Landowners: February 2018**

**How We Consulted**  
**Representations Received**  
**Main Issues Raised**  
**How We Used the Results**

## **Purpose**

The purpose of the consultation statement is to demonstrate how individuals, , businesses households (including those owning holiday homes), land-owners, and statutory bodies have been involved in creating the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, through a process of direct engagement, one-on-one conversations, meetings, newsletters and open public interaction. The type and scale of consultation is described, alongside the feedback received. More detail on the information provided, and the documents employed, is provided in the supporting annexes.

This Consultation Statement will be submitted to the local planning authority as one of the key supporting documents of the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

## **Initial Discussions**

The possibility of creating a Neighbourhood Plan for the village of Sutton Poyntz was first discussed in 2010 by the Sutton Poyntz Society (295 members, with 253 living within the village itself), even before the Localism Act became law. As the village was not a parish, but within the Borough of Weymouth and Portland, there was uncertainty about how this could be progressed (and funded). However, by early 2016, following discussions with Council Officers, it was agreed that the Sutton Poyntz Society could (subject to certain changes in its constitution) act as a non-parish Neighbourhood Forum.

## **Preliminary Consultation: February 2016**

How We Consulted: During February 2016, a Neighbourhood Planning newsletter (Annex A) was hand-delivered to every dwelling within the proposed Neighbourhood Plan Area (some 230 households). Additional copies were delivered to businesses within the village and to households immediately outside the proposed area including Plaisters Lane, Puddledock Lane, Sutton Road, Verlands Road and Winslow Road. A total of 393 households received the newsletter.

The purpose of this was to inform the public of the proposals to produce a Neighbourhood Plan and seek representations on the proposed boundary for the Neighbourhood Area. It also sought volunteers from the whole of the community who were prepared to participate in a Neighbourhood Plan steering group.

The proposal to create a Neighbourhood Plan, and turn the Sutton Poyntz Society into a Neighbourhood Forum, was unanimously approved at the Sutton Poyntz Society AGM on 13 April 2016.

Representations Received: Twenty responses were received.

Main Issues Raised: There was one outright objection, on the basis that a Neighbourhood Plan was unnecessary and could be divisive, but the remainder were supportive, although some concerns were raised. One respondent felt that the process could be taken over by vested interests, but the remainder addressed the proposed boundary and the possible exclusion of households, at the end of Puddledock Lane and Sutton Road, that had traditionally regarded themselves as members of the village.

How We Used the Results: The representations were noted for future reference as was appropriate and the proposed Neighbourhood Area boundary was revised to accommodate the additional dwellings where practicable and a revised Neighbourhood Area map produced.

## **Neighbourhood Plan Area Application: June 2016**

How We Consulted: In order to meet statutory requirements the draft Neighbourhood Form and Neighbourhood Plan Area Application was submitted to Weymouth and Portland Borough Council on 27 May 2016. The formal consultation period ran from 10 June to 5 August 2016. The application was publicised on-line and in the Dorset Echo. Posters were also put up around the

village and in the Springhead Public House. Pending approval, a Neighbourhood Forum Steering Group of volunteers was established, Terms of Reference agreed and a Chairperson elected. The Steering Group first met on 17 May 2016. Every effort was made to ensure broad representation, including those not members of the Sutton Poyntz Society, those with second homes or those working in the village but living elsewhere. Consequent to the request for volunteers, included in the initial newsletter, over a dozen members of the village (including non-members of the Sutton Poyntz Society) attended the first Steering Group meeting.

Representations Received: The Borough Council received a total of eight representations, five from statutory bodies and three from residents. The statutory body responses were as follows:

- The DCC Flood Risk Management team had no objection to the proposed designation, but provided information on local flood risks that needed to be borne in mind during the planning process;
- The DCC Planning Obligations Manager noted a small area of safeguarded building stone within the Neighbourhood Area;
- Historic England had no objection to the proposal, provided useful information on heritage assets that need to be protected by the Neighbourhood Plan and resources available to help, as well as offering further discussions should they become necessary;
- Highways England had no objection, and noted that the Neighbourhood Area was remote from the nearest strategic highway;
- Natural England offered no direct observation on the application, but provided very helpful information on how Neighbourhood Plans should seek to protect natural assets.

The three individual representations were discussed at the Borough Council Management Committee meeting on 20 September 2016. One representation was in favour of the application. The other two representations questioned the democratic accountability of the Sutton Poyntz Society, but did not present any evidence that the Society did not meet the legally prescribed definition of a Neighbourhood Forum. One of the representations questioned the small size of the proposed Neighbourhood Area, with limited local services and development land, and suggested Preston Ward as more suitable. The Officers' Report recommended that the area was suitable and noted that the arguments in the two dissenting responses were not reasons for the application to be rejected. The Borough Council Management Committee formally approved the application on 20 September 2016. How We Used the Results: The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group researched other plans, sought training for members and prepared for the first public consultation.

### **Village Consultation (Stage One Survey): October 2016**

How We Consulted: The purpose of this consultation was to seek the general views of the public as to what they liked and disliked about living in the area and their views in relation to a number of key themes based upon ideas the steering group had gathered from an overview of other Neighbourhood Plans. This would help to identify the Vision, Objectives, key Policy areas and aspirations of the community.

During October 2016, a second newsletter (Annex B) and community survey form (Annex C), drafted and agreed by the Steering Group, were hand-delivered to each household within the Neighbourhood Plan Area (230 households). Where possible, members of the Steering Group spoke with each household to explain the process and encourage them to provide their views and opinions. Where people were out, a letter with contact details was left explaining the purpose of the initiative and encouraging their participation. To follow this up, two open days (Sunday 30 October and Monday 31 October 2016) were organised in the Mission Hall, shortly after the survey was distributed, to enable villagers to learn more about the Neighbourhood Plan, talk with members of the Working Group and provide their own views on the content of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Representations Received: 77 completed forms were returned by hand, mail or email. Although individual returns were encouraged (and sufficient forms printed and distributed), most responses were provided by households. The response rate was therefore approximately 20-30%. Over 400 separate 'post-it' notes, detailing concerns and offering ideas and suggestions, were provided by 66 unique visitors over two days.

Main Issues Raised:

## **LAND USE & CONSERVATION**

Protect important views and the green wedge gap  
Care for trees, hedges and the village pond  
Protect the countryside and rural lanes  
Better communicate and cooperate with landowners

## **BIODIVERSITY & THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT**

Cooperate with landowners and environmental groups to conserve habitat  
Include biodiversity criteria in new build planning  
Promote clean tidy environment

## **HERITAGE**

Protect heritage sites and ensure development protects their character and setting  
Provide information on village's heritage

## **HOUSING & PLANNING**

Retain our village character and sense of community  
Focus on smaller houses, both for younger families and for downsizing  
Encourage full-time occupancy of houses  
Growth through infill rather than from incursion into open country  
Use of appropriate materials and design in keeping with village character

## **TRANSPORT**

Preservation of bus service  
Lower speed limit, and more considerate parking to improve access  
Improved foot and cycle access, especially Puddledock Lane

## **SPORTS & RECREATION**

Support for Mission Hall and Springhead as village social facilities  
Improve facilities such as a playground or sports field  
Maintain footpaths and tracks - easy access to beautiful countryside and coastline, with great views of and from the village  
Potential for a Village Green

## **EMPLOYMENT, BUSINESS & TOURISM**

Work with employers to create jobs  
Encourage small businesses, and encourage facilities for visitors  
Improved communications coverage, speed and reliability  
Non-intrusive infrastructure  
Continued use of traditional village communications



How We Used the Results: The results from the first survey enabled the steering group to draft an overall vision, objectives for each of the key topic areas, identify some key policy areas and aspirations and establish topic sub-groups that would prepare the draft Neighbourhood Plan sections.

### **Village Consultation Drop-in Morning: March 3<sup>rd</sup> 2017**

How We Consulted: An opportunity was provided at the monthly village coffee morning for stakeholders to openly discuss with Steering Group members the results of the Stage One Survey and the next steps to be taken. Members of the public were also encouraged to join the topic sub-groups which would research policies and develop further consultation questions of a more specific type based upon feedback from the initial survey. An outline timetable of the key steps through to completion of the Neighbourhood Plan was provided as a focal point for discussion.

Representations Received: 38 people attended the coffee morning and three residents who were not currently members of the Steering Group agreed to join sub-groups, one on Transport and two on Housing and Planning.

Main Issues Raised: Understanding the next steps in the Neighbourhood Plan process and the work of topic sub-groups.

How We Used the Results: A revised timetable was produced and further non-steering group members involved as members of sub-groups. A summary of the results and information on the next steps was published in Newsletter No. 3 (Annexe D)

### **Village Consultation (Stage Two and Housing Needs Surveys): December 2017 to January 2018**

How We Consulted: The purpose of this consultation was to provide an initial assessment of the level of public support for specific types of Neighbourhood Plan policy that had emerged from the earlier public consultation or from sub-group research. It would also seek to determine the future housing needs of households within the Neighbourhood Area.

Following the submission of draft questions by the six topic sub-groups (Biodiversity and the Natural Environment; Employment, Business and Tourism; Heritage; Housing and Planning; Sports and Recreation and Transport) which were agreed by the November Steering Group a Stage Two Survey of specific questions related to these topics was produced (Annex F). In November 2017 a newsletter (Annex E) was produced informing the public of the work undertaken since the first survey and the next steps to be taken. With the help of our consultants a Housing Needs Survey (Annex G) was produced and agreed by the Steering Group at the November 2017 meeting when arrangements for the consultation were finalised and ratified. The logistics of the process were delegated to a Survey sub-group.

On December 1<sup>st</sup> 2017 an open forum attended by several members of the Steering Group was held as part of the regular village coffee morning schedule. Fifty two people attended during which the work of the sub-groups was publicised and the forthcoming public survey explained.

From 1<sup>st</sup> December the Stage Two Survey (Annex F), Housing Needs Survey (Annex G) and a covering explanatory letter (Annex H) were hand delivered to all premises within the Neighbourhood Area (residential and business) informing residents and other stakeholders. Where possible, members of the Steering Group spoke with each household to explain the process and encourage them to provide their views and opinions. Where people were out, a letter with contact details was left explaining the purpose of the initiative and encouraging their participation. This was followed by two further door knocking exercises over the weekend of 16/17 December 2017 and during the first week in January 2018, again a reminder letter being left when people were out. Prior to each of the three key stages 12 posters were placed in prominent places around the village (Annex I) reminding people to return their survey forms.

A Draft Place Appraisal document had been produced in 2017 by a sub-group set up for the purpose and following agreement at the November 2017 Steering Group meeting this was made publicly available for comment at the December 1<sup>st</sup> 2017 coffee morning. The introductory letter distributed with the surveys made reference to this document being available at the village website address and this was verbally communicated by distributors. Additionally 75 hard copies of the Place Appraisal were made available on a loan basis through the distributors for those without electronic access or who preferred this format.

A deadline for returns of the 5<sup>th</sup> January was publicised. A number of survey forms were returned after this date and accepted, the final return being received on 12<sup>th</sup> January.

Representations Received: Out of 533 Stage Two Survey forms distributed, a total of 253 completed forms were returned by hand, mail or e-mail, this represented 267 respondents or 50.1%. Although individual returns were encouraged (and sufficient forms printed and distributed), most responses were provided by individual households. Survey forms were sent by e-mail to those stakeholders who were not residents and forms were distributed upon request to their employees who were working in the neighbourhood area

A total of 245 Housing Needs Survey forms were distributed to households within the neighbourhood area, 31 of which were returned complete, a total of 12.7%. Those households without housing needs, as identified by responses to the first question, were informed that they were not required to return the form.

Main Issues Raised:

**The survey responses and comments were recorded, cross-checked and external verification completed.**

**The results showed:**

### **Biodiversity and the Natural Environment**

Significant support for the proposed flood policy; the suggested Biodiversity Green Corridor; a policy for the enhancement and conservation of biodiversity; the creation of a list of important green spaces; the creation of a list of protected key views; a policy in support of the retention of trees orchards and hedges within new development; replacement of felled trees with an appropriate species and consultation with the Neighbourhood Forum on tree protection related issues.

### **Employment, Business and Tourism**

A small minority of people supported the provision of a village shop selling general store items, groceries, arts and crafts and with a tea/coffee facility; 70 people offered voluntary labour hours in the shop; the most favoured sites for a shop were at the Cartshed or near the Springhead.

A significant majority of residents were opposed to attracting new business although there was support for provision of work or office space within homes.

Mobile phone reception was described as excellent or variable and internet speed and reliability was seen as satisfactory.

A small minority believed that problems associated with increased traffic outweighed the benefits of tourism and there was strong opposition to B and B's/hotels, holiday lets and camp sites but strong support for community-led guided tours .

### **Getting Around**

A minority of people supported traffic management restrictions between Winslow and Verlands Road and on the bend below Wyndings while there was minority opposition to proposals at three other locations.

A small majority of people favoured provision of a public car park with very strong support for this to be located in the field adjacent to the Springhead Pub.

With regard to future new developments most people were opposed to the inclusion of pavements but supported the inclusion of street lighting.

A significant majority of respondents favoured additional parking provision within new developments despite the potential for higher house prices and strongly supported the proposals for increased resident and visitor parking space provision. There was also a majority in favour of the inclusion of electric vehicle charging points in new housing development.

## **Heritage**

A significant majority agreed with the creation of a list of local Heritage Assets.

## **Housing and Planning**

There was clear support for the building of between one and twenty new homes over the period of the Neighbourhood Plan and for the retention of the existing development boundary and the containment of new building within the boundary; a majority also favoured demolition of existing housing to make way for a higher build density and the building of new homes in the gardens of existing properties.

The suggestion of a site outside of the development boundary for 100% affordable housing was strongly opposed.

Regarding future development type and style there was strong support for taking account of nearby building design and materials and that these should reflect the local styles both within and outside of the historic core. Whilst a small majority favoured encouraging contemporary/innovative building design.

## **Sports and Recreation**

A very significant majority agreed that the Village Pond, Mission Hall, Springhead Public House, Waterworks Museum and Veterans Wood were all of significant value to the community.

There was strong support for the additional community facilities of a Village Green and Community Allotments, with a small majority in support of a Village Shop and a slightly larger majority in favour of a childrens play area.

The provision of a Sports Field was opposed and that of a Larger Meeting Hall very strongly opposed.

## **Comments on the Place Appraisal**

A total of 272 comments were received both supportive and critical. These constituted 29 of a general nature, 9 criticising the accessibility to the draft Place Appraisal document, 83 suggested corrections or improvements, 53 were of a generally supportive nature and did not make any specific suggestions, 35 related to questions contained within other sections of the survey and 60 related to specific subject topics.

## **Response to the Housing Needs Survey**

The key issues arising from this survey were; current properties being too large and the need for smaller units and some bungalows (due to problems with stairs).

The majority of respondents were in the over 45 age group with twice as many couples as single people being in housing need.

How We Used the Results: The feedback preferences and comments from the Stage Two Survey were used to revise specific topic objectives and write draft policies and community aspirations for incorporation into the draft Neighbourhood Plan. The comments relating to the Place Appraisal were considered as part of the review of this document and many incorporated in order to improve the final version.

The data provided by the Housing Needs Survey was used by the Housing and Planning sub-group to inform its work on policies for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan.

All abstracted data was published in a spreadsheet format on the Sutton Poyntz Village web site. The response data to each question in the Stage Two Survey along with a summary of comments and a summary of the key themes arising from the Housing Needs Survey was produced in a hard copy newsletter (Annex J) that was delivered to all premises within the Neighbourhood Area and to those businesses operating within this defined area.

### **Consultation with Landowners: February to April 2018**

How We Consulted: A list of 39 landowners who owned land outside of the current development boundary was compiled. A letter (Annex K) was drafted which requested details of the plans for the land holding in the future, ways in which they felt they could contribute to the community aspirations and ways in which they felt the community could help them.

The letter which included a map of the land concerned was distributed on 1<sup>st</sup> February with a deadline of 16<sup>th</sup> February for returns.

A summary of the survey results was forwarded to all landowners and those whom had indicated a planned change in land use or who had requested a meeting with the Steering Group were offered several optional dates for a meeting with representatives of the Steering Group.

Representations Received: Out of a total of 39 letters distributed 16 responses were received by the deadline and one follow up response several weeks later. 10 responses stated that there was no planned change of use, 4 outlined their plans/requested a meeting to do so and 1 provided no clear response as to their future intentions. One business respondent noted the letter and forwarded it to another department for a detailed response which is still awaited.

Main Issues Raised: Two respondents confirmed projected future use for horticultural purposes. One respondent provided details of the intended future use of the land for pastoral grassland with some extended use of the temporary campsite and proposals for an eco café. Of those respondents who requested a meeting the following issues were subsequently raised.

- 

How We Used the Results: Initial responses were used to confirm land ownership and take no further action or make amendments to land ownership maps or arrange for further consultation through correspondence or meetings with individual landowners as was appropriate. The chair wrote to those landowners who had responded on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2018 offering a meeting with the Steering Group to discuss future land use proposals following publication of the results of the survey.

**Annexes:**

- A. Sutton Poyntz Society Neighbourhood Planning Newsletter 1 - February 2016.
- B. Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Newsletter 2 - October 2016.
- C. Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Stage One Consultation Survey.
- D. Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Newsletter 3 – March 2017
- E. Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Newsletter 4 – November 2017
- F. Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Stage Two Consultation Survey
- G. Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Housing Needs Consultation Survey
- H. Covering letter for Stage Two Survey.
- I List of Public Poster Sites
- J. Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Newsletter 5 – April 2018
- K. Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Initial Letter to Landowners – February 2018

## Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Grant Expenditure Analysis to 31 March 2018

Grants Received (GROSS ie some repaid and reapplied for in this total)		-16,800.00
Grants refunded		<u>5490.23</u>
Net Grant		<u>-11,309.77</u>
Brian Wilson Associates	6,771.40	
Corfe Mullen PCC (Chairman's expenses)	94.46	
Printing (Reimburse Egerton and Blee)	1,243.13	
Hall Hire	78.00	
Egerton travelling costs	67.00	
M Haine data stick	11.60	<u>8265.59</u>
Cash at 31 March 2018 (to be refunded)		<u>-3,044.18</u>

NB This excludes unauthorised expenditure of £300 on the traffic survey which disallowed by the grant making body and eventually paid by the Sutton Poyntz Society