

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan
Consultation Statement

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

February 2016 to February 2019

Contents

Purpose

Initial Discussion

Consultation Stages

- 1. Preliminary Consultation: February 2016**
 - How We Consulted**
 - Representations Received**
 - Main Issues Raised**
 - How We Used the Results**

- 2. Consultation through the Neighbourhood Forum Steering Group: May 2016 to present**
 - How We Consulted**
 - Representations Received**
 - Main Issues Raised**
 - How We Used the Results**

- 3. Neighbourhood Plan Area Application: June 2016**
 - How We Consulted**
 - Representations Received**
 - How We Used the Results**

- 4. Village Consultation (Stage One Survey): October 2016**
 - How We Consulted**
 - Representations Received**
 - Main Issues Raised**
 - How We Used the Results**

- 5. Village Consultation Drop-in Morning: March 3rd 2017**
How We Consulted
Representations Received
Main Issues Raised
How We Used the Results
- 6. 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
- 7. General Consultation with Landowners: February to September 2018**
How We Consulted
Representations Received
Main Issues Raised
How We Used the Results
- 8. Specific Consultation on Key Views and Local Green Spaces: December 2017 to September 2018.**
How We Consulted
Representations Received
Main Issues Raised
How We Used the Results
- 9. Specific Consultation on Heritage Assets: August 2018 to October 2018**
How We Consulted
Representations Received
Main Issues Raised
How We Used the Results

- 10. Regulation 14 Formal Consultation: 8th November to 24th December 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, written surveys, one-on-one conversations, meetings, newsletters and open public discussion. 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 submission version of the 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.

Consultation Stages

1. Preliminary Consultation: February 2016

How We Consulted: During February 2016, a Neighbourhood Planning newsletter (Annexe 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 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 approved by majority vote 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 Neighbourhood Area boundary was revised to accommodate where practicable the additional households in Puddledock Lane and Sutton Road. The remaining issues were addressed as the plan progressed.

2. Consultation through the Neighbourhood Forum Steering Group: May 2016 to present.

How We Consulted: As a result of the request for volunteers, included in the initial newsletter (Annexe A), over a dozen members of the village (including non-members of the Sutton Poyntz Society) attended the first Steering Group meeting. Pending approval, a Neighbourhood Forum Steering Group of volunteers was established, Terms of Reference agreed, and a Chairperson and Secretary elected. Every effort was made to ensure broad representation; including those who were not members of the Sutton Poyntz Society, those with second homes and those working in the village but living elsewhere. Membership of the Steering Group remained open throughout the planning process and the composition was subject to gradual change over that period of time. The Steering Group first met on 17 May 2016 and agreed to hold open meetings on the third Tuesday of each month.

The monthly meetings were advertised on the village web site and village noticeboard along with the membership of the Steering Group and Sub-Groups (once these were subsequently formed). Additional Sub-Group members were co-opted as the process progressed and other persons in the community with specialist knowledge were consulted from time to time, for example in relation to biodiversity.

Numerous residents, landowners and Sub-Group members attended the Steering Group meetings on many occasions during the process and this provided an opportunity for open representation and consultation on specific issues. This resulted in enhanced understanding and helped inform the decision making process in relation to the policies and aspirations.

All minutes of Steering Group and Sub-Group meetings were placed on the village web site, initially in draft form and subsequently as the approved version once agreed by the Steering Group. All minutes may be accessed at:

<http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/meetings>

Representations Received: All items of correspondence were attached to the agenda which was circulated in advance of Steering Group meetings and was made publicly available on the village web site, with the main agenda being placed on the village notice board. Records of correspondence were received and archived at a dedicated e-mail address - neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk. This information is publicly accessible upon request and access was requested and provided on at least one occasion. The e-mail count as at 21st February 2019 was 2974.

Main Issues Raised: Sub-Groups were asked to provide reports on progress within their respective topic areas by submitting a written record of meetings and this was followed with a verbal report to the Steering Group. The results of the Stage Two Survey formed a major contributor to the discussions within each Sub-Group and directly impacted policy decisions.

Several representations were made by various stakeholders at Steering Group meetings, particularly with regard to Local Green Space, Local Heritage Assets, Housing and future land use .

How We Used the Results: Actions arising from the Steering Group discussions were incorporated into the policy and aspirations, either directly or through requests for further research by Sub-Groups, who subsequently reported back to the Steering Group. This input was used to develop the content of the Neighbourhood Plan.

3. Neighbourhood Plan Area Application: June 2016

How We Consulted:

In order to meet statutory requirements the draft Neighbourhood Forum and Neighbourhood Plan Area Application were submitted to the Weymouth and Portland Borough Council (WPBC) on 27 May 2016. The formal consultation period ran from 10 June to 5 August 2016. The application was publicised on-line, in the Dorset Echo and in the Register (the local free magazine). Posters were also put up around the village and in the Springhead Public House.

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 Dorset County Council (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 WPBC 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 the whole of Preston Ward as being 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 WPBC 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, sought advice from various third parties and prepared for the first public consultation.

4. 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. The feedback would help to identify the Vision, Objectives, key Policy areas and aspirations of the community. During October 2016, a second newsletter (Annex B) incorporating a community survey form, drafted and agreed by the Steering Group, was hand-delivered to each household within the Neighbourhood Plan Area (230 households) and e-mailed to 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. 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 Steering Group and provide their own views on the content of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Representations Received: A total of 77 completed survey 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 to the two open days. A detailed summary of the responses is provided (Annex C).

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 that any development protects their character and setting

Provide information on the village's heritage

HOUSING & PLANNING

Retain the 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 were publicised in Newsletter Number 3 (Annex D). These results 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 research and prepare the draft Neighbourhood Plan sections.

5. Village Consultation Drop-in Morning: March 3rd 2017

How We Consulted: An opportunity was provided at the monthly village coffee morning for stakeholders to discuss with Steering Group members the results of the Stage One Survey and the next steps to be taken. Attendees 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 the 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 (Annex D) which was distributed to each property in the Neighbourhood Area and e-mailed to other stakeholders.

6. Village Consultation (Stage Two and Housing Need 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 and/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 late 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 (Brian Wilson Associates) a Housing Needs Survey (Annex G) was also produced and agreed by the Steering Group at its 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 1st 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 1st 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) and communicated either in writing or electronically to 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 reminding people to return completed surveys, again a reminder letter being left when people were out. As with the Stage One Survey, 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 1st 2017 coffee morning. The introductory letter distributed with the surveys made reference to this document being

available at the village web-site address and this information was also 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 5th January 2018 was publicised. A number of survey forms were returned after this date and accepted, the final return being received on 12th January 2018.

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 Need 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 need, 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 Local 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 were seen as satisfactory. A small minority believed that problems associated with increased traffic outweighed the benefits of greater tourism and there was strong opposition to increased Bed and Breakfast/Hotel provision, 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 that this be in the field adjacent to the Springhead Pub.

Regarding future 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, the retention of the existing development boundary and for 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. 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 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 children's 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

A total of 57 (12.7%) of the forms issued to stakeholders were returned of which 31 contained data for inclusion in the analysis. 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). Most 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 addressed as part of the on-going review of this document and many were subsequently incorporated into the final version.

The data provided by the Housing Need 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 including comments was published in a spreadsheet format on the Sutton Poyntz Village web site. During the period 28th March to 3rd April 2018, a 12-page printed summary (Annex J) of the consultation results (less those part b questions relating to key views, heritage assets and local green spaces) including the number of responses to each question option, a summary of comments and key themes arising from the Housing Need Survey was delivered to all premises within the Neighbourhood Area and distributed electronically to other stakeholders. Copies were also sent to over thirty landowners and businesses, seeking feedback and offering a meeting with the Steering Group if this was thought to be helpful. No specific comments on the overall Stage Two and Housing Need Surveys' summary have been received following the publication of the results.

7. General Consultation with Landowners: February to September 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 1st February 2018 with a deadline of 16th February 2018 for returns. As noted above a summary of the survey results was forwarded to all landowners. Those who 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. As a result, open meetings were arranged as follows:

Meeting of the Steering Group with Terry Pegrum (owner of Puddings Field) and his representative on 19th June 2018.

Meeting of the Steering Group with PJ Seal Estates on 6th July 2018.

The offer of a meeting with Punch Taverns was subsequently declined in writing by the landowner representative.

A proposal to meet with Wessex Water plc was made in June 2018 and subsequently took place in Bath on 13th September 2018.

A minute was taken at each of the above meetings and circulated for endorsement as approved minutes.

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 and 1 provided no clear response as to their future intentions. One business respondent, Punch Taverns noted the letter and forwarded it to their Estates department for a detailed response; a proposal to meet being subsequently declined.

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.

- Terry Pegrum (Puddings Field) presented some affordable housing options for land in his ownership and which is outside of the defined development boundary (see minute of a meeting held on 19th June 2018)
- PJ Seal Estates presented some ideas which included possible affordable housing options for their land outside the defined development boundary should there be a call for sites (see minute of the meeting held on 5th July 2018)

How We Used the Results: Initial responses were used to confirm land ownership and either 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 26th March 2018 offering a meeting with the Steering Group to discuss future land use proposals following publication of the results of the survey. Meetings were arranged in response to any subsequent requests.

8. Specific Consultation on Local Heritage Assets, Key Views and Local Green Spaces: December 2017 to September 2018.

How We Consulted: The Stage Two Neighbourhood Plan Survey, distributed in December 2017, included (within the respective questions) a list of proposed sites in relation to Heritage Assets, Key Views and Local Green Spaces. The Steering Group had agreed at the November 2017 meeting to remove some Green Space locations and to inform households on the list of proposed Local Heritage Assets. However, following vigorous representations, further consultation took place as outlined below.

Representations Received: Following distribution of the Stage Two Neighbourhood Plan survey in December 2017, concern was expressed by several landowners and residents that some of the questions were leading and, in particular, that the choice of potential heritage assets and local green spaces was neither objective, nor were the benefits/disadvantages made clear. As a result, it was agreed - following attendance by several residents at the December Steering Group meeting - that the responses to the proposed list of key views, heritage assets and Local Green Spaces would be excluded from the survey analysis. However, in order to inform potential policies in these important areas, the Steering Group decided to commission separate independent studies by external professional consultants in order to identify potential key views and local green spaces and to seek similar studies for heritage assets once a scope of work had been produced and quotations obtained.

Following agreement on a scope of work for the Key View and Local Green Spaces studies in February 2018, Brian Wilson and Tim Gale of Brian Wilson Associates were engaged to undertake these studies. This involved desk-based mapping and preparation of assessment criteria prior to a full day site visit on 21st March 2018 during which all sites identified by the consultants for assessment were visited and viewed from public access points. Following

receipt of the final independent reports (Annexes L and M) in April 2018, these were sent separately to all affected landowners asking for comment on their accuracy and feedback on the specific recommendations. Several landowners responded to the Local Green Spaces (Annex L) and Key Views reports (Annex M), providing feedback by email while three landowners also attended the Steering Group meeting on 17 April 2018 to raise individual concerns. The latter have also attended several subsequent meetings - as recorded in the respective minutes. The option to meet with the Steering Group was offered to all respondents. All of the feedback was considered by the relevant Sub-Groups in developing draft policies and a detailed response provided to each respondent.

Main Issues Raised: Two respondents challenged the Local Green Space (LGS) report in terms of factual accuracy and sought evidence aligned to specific sources of reference. Further concerns were expressed regarding the impact on land values by one of these respondents. A third respondent requested minor amendments for reasons of accuracy but welcomed the designation of all local green spaces including their own. Further extensive consultation with two landowners took place through their attendance at several Steering Group meetings and evidential based responses and in one case an informal site visit by the Chairperson took place at the request of the landowner in order to achieve a better understanding and try to reach a consensus.

One corporate respondent (Wessex Water) objected to the proposed designation of Local Green Space for some of the areas of their land since they were already designated in other ways including SSSI status, and because of the potential impact on future operational planning. Following a written response provided by the Sub-Group, a meeting was arranged at the Wessex Water offices in Bath on 13th September 2018 in order to seek a better understanding of the respective positions and find an acceptable solution. As a result, the Steering Group agreed to address some of the concerns regarding administrative impact of the Local Green Space designation through amendments to the policy and statements of clarification within the supporting text regarding justification and intent.

The Steering Group also agreed to accept the Housing and Planning Sub-Group recommendation for a much-reduced list of 'the most important' Key Views to be included in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

How We Used the Results: Following discussion within the respective Sub-Groups, and at the Steering Group, policy amendments taking into account the views of the respondents were included in the final policy sections (policies BNE 2 and H&P 3) of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Further representations were dealt with as part of the Regulation 14 formal consultation process and are recorded in Annex T.

9. Specific Consultation on Local Heritage Assets: August to October 2018.

How We Consulted: Refer to sub-section 7 above.

Representations Received: Refer to sub-section 7 above.

Following the provision of additional funding and agreement on a scope of work for the Heritage Assets report at the June 2018 Steering Group, Kim Sankey of Angel Architecture was engaged to produce a list of important local heritage assets. The study took as a starting

point the work already completed as part of the AONB survey undertaken earlier by Kim Sankey, as well as preliminary work by the Heritage Sub-Group. Potentially affected property owners were informed by hand delivered letter the day before the consultant (Kim Sankey) undertook a half-day field visit - accompanied by members of the Steering Group and Heritage Sub-Group - on 23rd August 2018 (minutes posted on Sutton Poyntz village web site). The resulting draft report produced by Angel Architecture – initially identifying 26 potential candidates for listing - was sent to all affected property owners on 7th September 2018 along with a covering letter explaining the implications of inclusion of a property on the list and setting a deadline for responses of 25th September 2018 in time for the next Steering Group meeting. It was also proposed, if there was sufficient demand, to organise a public meeting with the consultant to discuss methodology, content and recommendations. Five written responses were received from affected householders - all of which challenged the accuracy of the report relative to their properties and two of which questioned in detail the validity of the methodology adopted. A total of 16 residents, the vast majority from properties included on the list, subsequently attended an open meeting (Annex N) addressed by Kim Sankey on the 4th October 2018 in order to express their concerns and seek answers on matters of detail. While this resolved a number of concerns, it was agreed that the consultant would provide a written response (Annex O) to all the issues raised and provide a revised report.

One additional representation, concerning one of the entries in the final Heritage Report list, was received as part of the Regulation 14 Consultation – too late to be reviewed by Ms Sankey. This representation (see Annex T) should be considered if the Local Planning Authority ever uses the Heritage Report for the purpose of creating a formal Local Heritage Asset List.

Main Issues Raised: Written responses to the consultants' report raised the following issues: factual accuracy; methodology; and assessment criteria.

The primary issues raised at the open meeting related to the methodology and assessment criteria employed, conservation area status, scope of the assessment report, points of detail/factual accuracy and implications of non-designated listing for property owners. Some of those present requested that further properties not listed in the report should be considered for inclusion as well as contesting the inclusion of their own properties.

How We Used the Results: As a result of the representations received, the initial draft list was modified as follows: (a) two properties were removed from the list, on the basis that the visible fabric was not of the age that might initially be apparent; (b) one house and garage, initially listed separately, were combined into a single entry; (c) at the suggestion of the Heritage Subgroup, the entry for a number of houses in Silver Street was significantly altered so that the statement of significance focused on the very unusual layout of the street itself, rather than on the houses themselves; (d) finally, as a result of suggestions made at the Open Meeting on the 4th October 2018, two properties not on the initial list were reassessed, and one of these was added as a new entry. This led to a list of 24 entries in the final version of the Heritage Report (Annex P).

Following the publication of the consultant's revised report, and after discussion within the Heritage Sub-Group and the main Steering Group, changes were made to the two proposed

Heritage policies (HE1 and HE 2). The revisions were approved for submission as part of the Regulation 14 formal consultation by the Steering Group at the 6th November 2018 meeting. Following Regulation 14 feedback, further substantial changes to the draft policy and aspirations were endorsed for inclusion in the submitted version of the Neighbourhood Plan at the January 2019 Steering Group meeting.

10. Regulation 14 Consultation.

How We Consulted: Arrangements for consultation were discussed at the Steering Group meetings on 16th October and 6th November 2018. A draft newsletter and response form were agreed at the November meeting for communication with all stakeholders, either electronically, as hard copy, or both. These contained details of the consultation period, location of copies of the Place Appraisal and Draft Neighbourhood Plan (Annex S), how to submit responses, details of walk-in days and where to seek assistance.

On 8th November, a copy of Newsletter Number 6 (Annex Q) along with a Response Form (Annex R) were hand delivered to each residential or business property in the Neighbourhood Area. The pre-submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan was made available to other external stakeholders based on: WPBC advice; the list of 'consultation bodies' described in schedule 1 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended); and best practice from other Neighbourhood Plans. These included, amongst others, Dorset County Council, WPBC, (Shadow) Weymouth Town Council, neighbouring Parish Councils (Osmington, Broadmayne, Bincombe, Poxwell), the MP for South Dorset, Local Councillors, Environment Agency, Highways Agency, Natural England, Historic England, Wessex Water, Weymouth and Portland Chamber of Commerce, Dorset Clinical Care Commissioning Group, Salisbury Diocese, Ridgeway Team Churches, Punch Taverns and landowners residing outside of the Neighbourhood Area.

A total of 13 posters (laminated A4 copy of the Newsletter No. 6) were located around the area at specific sites (Annex I). A total of 45 copies of the draft Neighbourhood Plan (Annex S) were produced and made accessible in the village Telephone Box, Mission Hall, Springhead Public House and Preston Church. Additional copies were available from the Chairperson, whose contact details were provided. All the above hard copy information was also made available electronically on the Sutton Poyntz Village Web Site from the 8th November 2018. Representations received either as hard copy or electronic copy were logged (Annex T) as they were received, a reference number, date of receipt, consultee details and representation text being recorded. Provision was made within the document for replies and actions in relation to the revised Neighbourhood Plan.

Two walk-in sessions on 25th November 2018 10.00 to 17.00 and 26th November 2018, 12.00 to 16.00, were held at the Mission Hall in order to provide an opportunity for stakeholders to access the draft Neighbourhood Plan and discuss or clarify any issues in relation to the Plan and/or the process for its production as well as the next steps to be undertaken.

Representations Received: All written responses received, both electronic and hard copy, were logged (Annex T). These totalled 37 of which 31 were received by the appointed deadline. All were recorded in the same format.

A summary record of consultee comments made at the Walk-in sessions in the Mission Hall held on 25th and 26th November is also provided (Annex U). A total of 19 members of the public attended over the two days.

Main Issues Raised: The issues raised in relation to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan (Annex S) were recorded (Annexes T and U). Redacted versions of Annexes T and U are hyperlinked within this document and will be published on the village web site following endorsement by the Steering Group. Non-redacted versions of these documents are available from the Steering Group upon request by authorised bodies or their representatives.

How We Used the Results: Each representation was considered by the respective Sub-Groups and the Steering Group and a written response provided which was recorded against the corresponding entry (Annex T). Where actions agreed by the Steering Group necessitated amendments to the draft Neighbourhood Plan these were incorporated. The draft summary of Regulation 14 responses was considered at the December 2018, January 2019 and February 2019 Steering Group meetings. The revised Neighbourhood Plan, along with this Consultation Statement and the Basic Conditions Statement was circulated to each member of the Steering Group in advance of, and subsequently endorsed at the February 2019 Steering Group meeting, all agreed changes being incorporated and agreed prior to final submission.

The key changes to the Neighbourhood Plan arising from the Regulation 14 consultation process are summarised below :-

- Re-arrangement of the overall layout to make it more user friendly.
- Section 1.7 Management and Monitoring – Amended text to reflect on-going discussion with the shadow Weymouth Town Council.
- Policy BNE 1 – Changes to the final criterion to address concerns raised by WPBC.
- Summary of Intent for Policy BNE 1 - Amended text so as to more closely relate to the policy.
- Summary of Intent for Policy BNE 3 – Amended text to emphasise how the policy will be applied and allow for dispensation.
- Policy GA1 – Re-wording of criterion 3 and 4 to address concerns raised by WPBC regarding the practicability of application.
- Policy GA 2.1 - Re-wording to address concerns raised by WPBC Re-wording of criterion 3 and 4 to address concerns raised by WPBC regarding the practicability of application.
- Policy GA 3 - Slight re-wording to address concerns raised by WPBC to ensure that it fully meets the intent.
- Policy GA 4 – Slight re-wording to emphasise policy intent.
- Policy HE 2 – Removal as a policy and insertion as an aspiration.
- Introduction to Section 4.4 – Additional explanatory text relating to the removal of Policy HE 2.
- Section 4.5 - Inclusion of a Map defining the Conservation Area.
- Supporting text to Policy H&P 1 – Changes to section on ‘Design Guidance’ to provide a more representative balance between traditional and contemporary design aspects in order to address concerns raised by a number of consultees.
- Policy H&P 2 - Minor changes to wording to clarify the intent of the policy with regard to higher density and smaller home construction within the development boundary.

- Policy H&P 3 – Annotation of Map M-HP3 and the associated photographs to more accurately reflect the scope of the key views.
- Policy H&P 4 – Re-wording of H&P 4.1 to reflect the wider application of this policy and transfer of policy H&P 4.2 to the section on policy intent. Additional text supporting the justification of this policy in terms of higher levels of surface water run-off.
- Policy SR 2 – Removal of reference to conflict with other policies as advised by WPBC. Minor re-wording to slightly expand the ‘recreational’ intent.

The final version of the Neighbourhood Plan was submitted to the WPBC on 8th March 2019 along with the following documents:

Consultation Statement (including the hyperlinked Annex documents).

Basic Conditions Statement.

Statement on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Qualifying Letter from Natural England on Appropriate Assessment.

Sutton Poyntz Place Appraisal.

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 - Summary of Results.

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

L. Independent Assessment of Candidate Sites for Local Green Space Designation: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan; Wilson, B and Gale, T; April 2018

M. Independent Assessment of Candidate Sites for Key View Designation: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan; Wilson, B and Gale, T; April 2018

N. Minutes of Heritage Asset Open Meeting held in Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, on 4th October 2018

O. Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Heritage Assessment: Letter by Kim Sankey, Angel Architecture, 3 October 2018

P. Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Heritage assessment: Kim Sankey, Angel Architecture, October 2018

Q. Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Newsletter 6 – November 2018

R. Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Response Sheet

S. Draft Neighbourhood Plan for Pre-submission Consultation, 6th November 2018

T. Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Record of Regulation 14 Consultee Responses and Steering Group Replies, 8th November to 24th December 2018 (redacted version)

U. Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Summary of Regulation 14 Consultee Issues Raised at the Walk-in sessions held on 25th and 26th November 2018 (redacted version)