Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Agenda for meeting on 17th October 2017 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 Bill Davidson, Liz Brierley, Andrew Price, Sue Elgey, Keith Johnson).**

2. **To Approve minutes of the previous meeting held on 19th September 2017.**

3. **To Receive an update on actions from the previous meeting (not otherwise on the agenda)**

4. **To Review progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetable.**

5. **To Address any items of correspondence**
   Item 4a – Information relevant to the discussion on the Tree Survey (under item 7b)

6. **To Receive a report on the Steering Group meeting with Brian Wilson and Associates held on 23rd September 2017.**

7. **To Receive reports of sub-group meetings including notification of additional members**

   a) **Place Appraisal (see record of meeting PA031017)**
   b) **Biodiversity and the Natural Environment (see record of meeting Bio111017, survey questions and PA Recommendations)**
   c) **Employment, Business and Tourism including IT/Communications (see record of meeting EBT021017 and EBT101017 (PA Recommendations))**
   d) **Heritage**
   e) **Housing and Planning (see PolicyTemplate and outline of survey questions)**
   f) **Sports and Recreation (see PA Recommendations)**
   g) **Transport (see record of meeting Trans121017, survey questions and PA Recommendations)**

8. **Any Other Business**

9. **Date and Time of the Next Meeting**
   To confirm the date and time of the next meeting as Tuesday 21st November 2017 at 7.30pm.

CORRESPONDENCE ITEM 4a – 17/9/2017.

Information from Sutton Poyntz Society relevant to discussion on Tree Survey.

William Egerton (wmegerton@gmail.com)To:you + 1 more Details Slideshow

I attach some correspondence the Society has been having on tree applications, both generally and related to Littlecot/Limoncello in particular. As a result of a series of applications over the last 6 years, the number of trees in the front garden of Littlecot/Limoncello has been cut from 27 to just 6. The Borough Council does not seem to have the appetite to try to preserve trees in the Conservation Area. I think this is something the Biodiversity & Natural Environment subgroup might want to look at; firstly to find out what tree protection the village wants and secondly to look at how we can achieve better protection, if that's what the village wants. One particular concern we have at the moment is that the Council have stopped consulting on tree-related applications, so the Society has no right to make representations - the Council will make its own mind up which normally seems to mean approval of whatever is requested.

In previous correspondence with Graham Cox, the Council's Trees Officer, he said he would welcome being involved in any tree-related discussions in our Neighbourhood Planning activity. I think privately he feels a bit frustrated that the Council isn't tougher on tree protection, and that some Councillors (including at least one of ours) are quite hostile to trees.
Can I leave this with you as part of your Subgroup's work.
Regards,
Bill

Subject: Re: Trees at Limoncello, Plaisters Lane, Sutton Poyntz

Date: Fri, 13 Oct 2017 08:04:59 +0100

From: William Egerton

To: Graham Cox

CC: Jean Marshall, Cllr Ian Bruce (WPBC), Cllr Hazel Bruce (WPBC), Cllr James Farquharson (WPBC), Cllr Tony Ferrari

Dear Graham,
Thank you so much for your prompt reply and also for the very gentle way you have put me right on the question of consultation. I now see that I had not understood the context of the sections I quoted, and agree entirely that they relate just to applications made by the local authority itself. It's disappointing to us, but we accept entirely that there is no obligation on

the Council to consult. Please accept my humble apologies.
The question of the quite rapid deterioration of the woodland area up Plaisters Lane is still of course a matter of great concern to us. It is one of the things we will be looking at in our Neighbourhood Plan work; we are preparing some detailed questions for the village in a second round of consultation, and it would be helpful if we could discuss the tree-related questions with you. If I may I will pass your contact details to the team that is doing this work. In any case, we will look forward to a further response from you in due course.

With many thanks,
Bill

On 12/10/2017 16:48, Graham Cox wrote:

> Hello Bill
>
> Thank you for your email.
>
> With regards to the property Limoncello, I'll have a look at the planning history for the site bearing in mind what you set out here. Once I have a full picture I shall give you a call to discuss. You'll have to leave it with me for a week or two, as there's clearly quite a bit to go through! I'll be mindful of what you say about the Sutton Poyntz Society's aspirations for the village and its particular character.
>
> With regards to process, I believe the sections to which you refer relate to applications made by a local planning authority, where it's important for the process to be as transparent as reasonably possible. For conservation area notifications more generally, the government guidance is fairly clear: there is no requirement for consultation, though a LPA may choose to do so if it considers it appropriate. Paragraph 130 of its publication "TPOs and trees in conservation areas" is the key reference https://www.gov.uk/guidance/tree-preservation-orders-and-trees-in-conservation-areas#Protecting-trees-in-conservation-areas . Perhaps you could have a look at this guidance and let me know whether you agree?
>
> Many thanks
>
> Graham
>
> **Graham Cox Senior Tree & Landscape Officer Dorset Councils Partnership**
>
> **T: 01305 251010**
>
> **From:** William Egerton
> **Sent:** 12 October 2017 12:46
> **To:** Graham Cox
> **Cc:** Jean Marshall; Cllr Ian Bruce (WPBC); Cllr Hazel Bruce (WPBC); Cllr James Farquharson (WPBC); Cllr Tony Ferrari
> **Subject:** Trees at Limoncello, Plaisters Lane, Sutton Poyntz
>
> Dear Graham,
>
> Jez Cunningham forwarded to the Sutton Poyntz Society committee his correspondence with you about the recent trees application at Limoncello. We were very concerned at the **outcome**, and also at the **process**. I would like to discuss both of these.
>
> First, the outcome of this recent application; the garden of Littlecot used to have numbers of trees, most of them not particularly special but cumulatively important, marking the southern end of an old area of coppice on either side of Plaisters Lane. As a result of a number of planning applications, the majority of the trees that were there just a few years ago are now gone. The relevant applications are:
>
> - 11/00169/TRCO, which was intended to be refused because of the amenity value of the trees, but was permitted by default because of an error in response dates;
> - WP/12/00347/FUL and WP/13/00478/FUL for the erection of Limoncello, which allowed three poor condition trees to be felled with intended replacement (which

never happened) by a hazel hedge and two plane trees. The Tree Survey provided for this application described some of the trees as of high amenity value. In particular, the lime was described as "a particularly good example of the species" but other trees were of class B including 3 sycamore and one ash that were allowed to be felled or reduced to mere hedging this year.

- WP/CA/14/00119 for the felling of 5 trees (plus a less important line of conifers in the back garden) on the northern boundary of Littlecot's garden;
- WP/CA/17/00077 for the felling of most of the remaining trees in the front garden of Limoncello including a number assessed as class B just 5 years earlier. The application sought to 50% pollard the lime, with the contractor describing it as a "large tree that had outgrown its location" rather than "a particularly good example" - fortunately only a 20% crown reduction was allowed. The ash at the other end of the front boundary was pollarded down to a rather low hedgerow level.

The net effect of all this is shown in the site plan below. Some trees in the back garden are shown on Google Earth photos but have not been described in any of the application documentation; they are shown as "unknown species" and may be shrubs rather than trees. For the front gardens, however, the plan below shows all the trees that were standing in 2011, with those felled marked in red. In 2011 there were 27 trees; there are now just 6.

The Sutton Poyntz Society has long been a supporter of trees as important contributors to landscape and amenity. Our policy at present is to oppose felling of trees, particularly of indigenous species, unless really necessary, and to ask for replacements suited to the location when trees really must be felled. Thus we aspire to the total stock of trees in the village being preserved. This location up Plaisters Lane is particularly important, partly because the trees mask what would otherwise be a vista dominated by roofs and partly to be faithful to the history of the area. For the Neighbourhood Plan being written at present, the village will be asked about its trees policy, which may well change as a result. At present, however, the Society retains its existing policy, and is therefore outraged at the astonishingly rapid loss at this particular site. The Local Plan has policies for tree protection that are quite like the Society's, and we feel this loss is a sign of a major weakening of the Borough Council's support for its own trees policy.

We think there are two things that ought to be done in future to ensure that the Borough's Local Plan policies, specifically ENV10, are applied. Firstly, we do not think the assessments you make of trees' value takes into consideration the group value where a tree is part of a group. In the past your predecessor used the TEMPO model for assessing trees; this specifically includes group value as one of its metrics. There does not seem now to be any objective assessment of trees, or indeed often any report to justify decisions. We have explained in the past (letter to you dated 3/2/2015 and letter to David Evans dated 12/4/2015) why we think in particular that the trees along Plaisters Lane need to be considered as a whole rather than individually.

We would now therefore ask that where felling is allowed a report should always be published that refers among other things to any value the tree has as part of a wider group.

Secondly, we have been concerned that the Council almost never seems to require that trees permitted to be felled should be replaced. This seems to us to be specifically contrary to the provisions of the Local Plan. In particular paragraph 2.5.6, in the preamble to ENV10, is explicit in asking for tree replacement where tree loss is unavoidable. Without more protection by the Council, the stock of trees will decline as has happened at Littlecot/Limoncello.

We ask therefore that the Council makes more use of your powers to demand tree replacement where felling is necessary.

I now want to discuss your recent change of **process** for tree-related applications. You wrote to Jez Cunningham that "there is no legal obligation for consultation in respect of tree work applications". We have now had a chance to investigate the legal background, and simply think your statement is wrong. . Section 17 of the Town & Country Planning (Trees) Regulations 1999 introduces an amendment to Section 11 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992; the amendment is entitled "Applications by interested parties under tree preservation orders", and sets out a consultation process including publicity for the

application for 21 days and consideration of any representations made during that period. There is a more recent set of regulations (Town & Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012), which revokes and replaces the majority of the 1999 Regulations, but paragraph 26 of these 2012 regulations specifically provide that Section 17 of the 1999 Regulations continues to be valid. The net effect, we believe, is that there is still a very clear legal consultation requirement for applications for tree work. You are obliged to publicise the application for a minimum of 21 days, and to give consideration to any representations made.

We ask, therefore, that the Council should change its process for tree work applications, and revert to one that is legally compliant.

With best wishes,
Bill Egerton
Secretary, Sutton Poyntz Society

From: **Graham Cox**
Date: 19 September 2017 at 15:28
Subject: Trees at Limoncello, Plaisters Lane, Sutton Poyntz
To: Jez Cunningham
Dear Mr Cunningham

Thank you for your email enquiry.

In April this year, driven by ever dwindling resources, we were obliged to introduce a number of changes to the way in which we deal with tree work applications and conservation area notifications. Essentially, we're now only dealing with work for which there's a statutory requirement and as there's **no legal obligation for consultation in respect tree work** applications (as distinct from planning applications, which are dealt with under different legislation) we no longer do that. Application details are made available on the web as usual, but I'm afraid the onus is now on councillors and parish councils to check the weekly list and to make representations as necessary.

The online pages were updated to reflect these changes but, unfortunately, we've had some problems with the website reverting to it's previous layout. I imagine this is where the **misunderstanding** has arisen.

Please accept my apologies for this error; our IT department is working hard to rectify it.

Many thanks

Graham Cox

Senior Tree and Landscape Officer

Dorset Councils Partnership serving:

North Dorset District Council, West Dorset District Council and Weymouth & Portland Borough Council

www.dorsetforyou.com/contactus

From: digitalteam@dorset.gov.uk [mailto:digitalteam@dorset.gov.uk]
Sent: 12 September 2017 11:52
To: Customer Care
Subject: Weymouth & Portland Borough Council Customer Service Centre

Online Form Submission

Form	Weymouth contact us form (id: 2197957)
Article	Email Weymouth and Portland Borough Council (id: 419027)

The user was viewing https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/article/419027/Email-

Weymouth-and-Portland-Borough-Council

Weymouth contact us form

About you

Your Name:	Jez Cunningham

Reply

How should we reply?	email
Message subject:	Attn: Jean MARSHALL
Your message (2000 chars)	I have just seen that this tree planning application WP/CA/17/00077 has been approved but the consultation period has not yet elapsed. The work has even started today. Why is there a consultation period if you, the planning officers who are there to enforce the rules, do not obey them yourselves. I'm appalled, Regards J Cunningham

PA MOVING FORWARD: BIODIVERSITY AND THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Recommendations

- Ensure that planning applications for new development incorporate mandatory consultation with local groups and contain specific practical recommendations for conserving and enhancing wildlife and habitat and arrangements for monitoring and independent verification of corresponding actions.
- Define a green corridor with interconnectivity to green spaces as a basis for protecting wildlife and habitat from detrimental development schemes.
- Establish arrangements for co-operation with developers, landowners, residents, tenants and other stakeholders regarding the provision of information on practical measures for biodiversity conservation and enhancement.
- Publish guidance for consideration in planning applications as to specific measures to reduce flood risk (To consider how far we go with this, do we split into information for guidance and mandatory requirements for planning or leave as it is)

Risks

- Destruction of habitat such as ancient trees, hedges, stone walls, older buildings, rural lanes as a result of development .
- Loss of connectivity such as hedges, wooden gates, tree overhang which are vital to the movement of species for food as well as seeking more favourable habitat as climate change occurs.
- Increased levels of pollution due to greater traffic movement and intensive agriculture.
- Loss of species and habitat by a failure to address increased flood risk and poor enforcement of planning mitigations related to flood risk.

Challenges

- Persuading landowners, farmers and residents to adopt biodiversity friendly practice in land use.
- Demonstrate the value to developers of conserving and enhancing wildlife habitat in terms of ethics and reputation (consider combining with the above bullet point and rewording as a combined statement)
- Establishing effective means of communicating with statutory and other public bodies on planning matters associated with biodiversity.
- Ensuring that agreed planning conditions related to nature conservation are implemented and verified (some duplication of final bullet point under risk)

Opportunities

- Extend the biodiversity relationship established with Wessex Water to other landowners.
- Gain greater awareness and involvement of the community as a whole in biodiversity programs and gain recognition for the leisure and health related benefits.
- Introduction of threatened species such as Hedgehogs.

Options

- Raise the profile of biodiversity when establishing planning conditions for new development.
- Create additional green space with connectivity to existing green space.
- Provide information on simple measures that all stakeholders (developers, landowners, businesses, residents) can take to conserve and enhance biodiversity.
  (Consider combining the Opportunities and Options sections).

Way Forward

- Establish pro-active formal consultation between the community and Local Planning Authority on the impact of development on biodiversity.
- Engage with landowners and other stakeholders to share information and establish joint biodiversity activities.
- Identify suitable green space from a biodiversity perspective.
- Continue to build ecological survey data eg. tree survey, invertebrate survey.
- Update the 2009 Village Biodiversity report and incorporate guidance on actions that residents, landowners, developers and others could take to benefit biodiversity.

Draft Biodiversity Questions for Community Survey	
Questions	Notes/questions for consultants
General	We are thinking that it would be best to shape questions to allow an answer of Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Disagree and Strongly Disagree instead of Yes/No So this would be the question, and the detail is worded as a statement. – is that the right approach?
General	We feel we need to include some introductory text to each question, to give context and to allow the community to understand the implications of agreeing/disagreeing. E.G. what constitutes green space and what the implications are for planning if designated, give some examples of planning conditions that might be appropriate, maybe include detail of what current protections there are within the Local Plan, what is a green corridor and why it is important. Should this be within the survey (we think yes) with some cross references to the Place Appraisal, in which case we would have to ensure that the biodiversity maps are included within the Place Appraisal Section 1, or would we just refer people to peruse the Place Appraisal text prior to considering their answers?
1. Planning applications for new developments will be required to include a specific assessment of how wildlife and habitat is to be both conserved and enhanced and specify the precise arrangements for monitoring and independent verification of actions	What about extensions, if these should be included too, should we delete 'for new developments'?
2. The following sites should be designated as green spaces	We are working on a list of green spaces which we will assess ourselves against the criteria then submit

within the Neighbourhood Plan: a) b) c) d) e) f) g)	to you for comment. Some green spaces might be important to designate for non-biodiversity reasons, in which case this question may appear elsewhere in the survey possibly? Would ask for agree/disagree etc. on each one. Not all are publicly accessible, but we think there is value in asking people how often they use those that are, do you agree?

3. Planning applications should include measures to avoid any increase in flood risks such as non-permeable parking areas and driveways, selective tree planting to reduce run-off	We are not sure about whether this can be embedded in policy, or whether we can only encourage this, also what about permitted development, e.g. people covering their previously green front garden with hardstanding. Advice please!
4. Do you support the completion of a tree survey in order to establish priorities for protection from a biodiversity perspective (eg rare mosses and lichens, veteran trees) as well as those which should be removed (dangerous, diseased, non-indigenous, etc).	This may or may not be needed. We already have full information on trees in the village from a biodiversity perspective, this includes the identification of most of the veteran trees (there are no ancient trees), and we also have done a hedgerow survey so they are covered). We are therefore unsure at this stage of the benefits or added value of commissioning a tree survey, we are going back to the Steering Group on this point to ask why they want a professional survey done, what scope it should have, eg over and above biodiversity, and most importantly, how would it be used in NP policies. It may be that the idea came from disappointment with recent tree decisions. It is likely to be controversial within the community if it is perceived as a way of stopping people managing trees in their own gardens in a way they want to (subject of course to current requirement to apply within the conservation area for any tree works, and of course we also have some TPOs). Your thoughts would be appreciated.
5. Do you consider the extent of the area of the green corridor as shown on Map x is appropriate?	In the introductory text we will explain what a green corridor is, how important surrounding areas are in case people are put out that they are not included in the green corridor. Ultimately though we do have evidence from our bird and bat surveys that the area identified is more or less correct for the defined green corridor.

HOUSING & PLANNING – FIRST DRAFT OF QUESTIONS

Dear All

I have sent my background email to the planning and housing subgroup to Colin for onward circulation. We met on Monday 9 October to devise some questions. Our deliberations arrived at the following list. Please note that this is for discussion at this stage. Is not definitive and we would welcome your comments and observations so that we can finalise the questions and their presentation.

I am on holiday next week so unable to attend the steering group meeting. Tony and others will be there and I look forward to receiving the group's comments via the minutes so that the subgroup can meet again to produce a final draft for comment by Brian and Julie in the light of the discussions. If any of you would like to make specific comments or recommendations please do email me as I would find that enormously helpful given that I am unable to attend next Tuesday.

It is worth noting that WE's notes on objectives and policies shown on the markup of the housing and planning note that I circulated to the subgroup were thought to be presupposing the answers and so were rejected and will be tailored for the draft version of the housing and planning policy in the light of survey question responses. The attached is not the group's draft policy just a working document to indicate what might look like based on the Loders village plan.

Draft questions1. Housing need (these questions will form part of the housing need survey sent to each household)

1.1 How many new homes does your household think should be built in the village?

State number here

(NB Our group preferred not to suggest ranges of numbers)

1.2 Who do you think we should be encouraging to move into any new houses? (Tick any box that applies)

- Existing villagers downsizing
- Existing villagers upgrading
- People retiring to Sutton Poyntz
- Second homeowners/holiday homes
- Retirement homes
- Social housing
- Key workers' homes
- Affordable housing

1.3 Does your household, or members of the household have aspirations to move to or within the village in the next 10 years?

Y/N

If yes would your household housing requirement be: (Tick any box that applies)

- To move to a larger home
- To move to a smaller property
- To move to a retirement home

- For homes for family members moving out of existing home
- For homes for family members wanting to move to the village
- For homes to accommodate family or employed care worker to look after older or infirm occupants
- For new affordable/key workers/social housing for family members

2 **Development Boundary** (these questions will form part of the main survey)

We had some discussion about the development boundary and were unable to answer the following questions;

- Do we provide a map to go for the survey?(we thought this was difficult to do and potentially and confusing)
- Do we suggest sites? (We thought not as this was thought leading and provocative)

We would include the following preamble:

The development boundary is tightly drawn around the existing housing and does not allow for development in green space between houses on the edge of the village and gardens of houses on the edge of the village. Details of the development boundary can be found in the Place Appraisal on the village website.

2.1 Changes to the development boundary

Please indicate your thoughts on any change to the development boundary, would you be in favour of any of the following? Please tick all that apply.

- Use gardens on the edge of the village, which are currently outside the development boundary
- Infill green spaces between existing housing on the edge of the village
- No change to development boundary
- Change to the development boundary to encompass a site or sites for new development within the village

2.2 Development of brownfield sites within the village

We have identified a number of sites could be considered brownfield sites. These are referred to in the Place appraisal and the main ones of Wessex water site, land around the spring had public house and the cart shed.

Would you support redevelopment of Wessex Water site?

Y/N

Would you support redevelopment of the land around the Springhead Public House?

Y/N

Would you support the development of the Cart Shed (EB questions relevancy of this as permission already granted on this site?)

Y/N

Are there any other sites that you consider to be brownfield sites?

Y/N

If yes please give details below

……
……

(Question – are allotments green spaces? Where do we include these?)

2.4 **Development on existing plots or green spaces within the** village (this probably needs expanding further)

Any such development would have to be in accordance with the local planning policy which states that in conservation area there should be careful consideration about development of gardens within the village boundary.

- Do you agree with demolition of existing homes to build new houses?

Y/N

- If yes, with reference to the Place Appraisal, which of the following areas village should be considered for such redevelopment? (Tick all that apply)
    - Historic Core
    - West side
    - Plaisters Lane North
    - Gateway
    - Puddledock South

- Do you agree that gardens of existing homes can be redeveloped to give additional new houses?

Y/N

- If yes, with reference to the Place Appraisal, which of the following areas village should be considered for such redevelopment? (Tick all that apply)
    - Historic Core
    - West side
    - Plaisters Lane North
    - Gateway
    - Puddledock South

(Question – are allotments green spaces? Where do we include these?)

3**. Character and design**

We were rather stumped with this;

Current environmental standards would make any new builds sufficiently green for anyone standards and as we have to follow policy thought it rather pointless to ask any questions on this area.

On design there was a question of whether we should be trying to make the village more ‘chocolate box’, or should we be more adventurous given that the village is a mishmash of different styles and types of property, most relatively modern and some of dubious aesthetics.

We stated we wanted to continue with village character, we found it difficult to define character other than a rather schizophrenic combination that has been cobbled together over time, chiefly in the last century.

The best questions we've come up with (and we would particularly welcome your ideas here!) are;

The Place appraisal has defined distinct areas of the village, these have different building styles and ages but it is not possible to define what is the village character in terms of a period of development or particular style. The neighbourhood plan steering group were interested in what type of future development would be welcomed by the village. Please confirm what type of development might be appropriate for each of the five areas of the village as defined in the Place Appraisal. Please tick as appropriate

- Historic Core
    - no development
    - cottage/traditional style
    - modern cutting-edge design

- West side
    - no development
    - cottage/traditional style
    - modern cutting-edge design

- Plaisters Lane North
    - no development
    - cottage/traditional style
    - modern cutting-edge design

- Gateway
    - no development
    - cottage/traditional style
    - modern cutting-edge design

- Puddledock South
    - no development
    - cottage/traditional style
    - modern cutting-edge design

4 Key Views

We had some discussion as to whether the key views were outside the village looking in, or inside the village looking out. We were not altogether agreed on this, however for the purposes of the survey we felt that the outside views from the hills were almost a given and should be detailed in the Place Appraisal and were not really a great topic of debate. The questions below have been drafted accordingly.

4.1 The Place Appraisal is to find a number of key views and green areas in the village and the Neighbourhood Plan would aim to include these in its final version. We are seeking your opinions on these and would also appreciate your comments on any additional views and spaces that you feel are important.

The Place appraisal (page…) Has identified it X (number here) key views from the village to the surrounding countryside. Do you agree that all of these views are important?

Y/N

If **no** which views should be removed from the list?

……
……..

Are there other key views that have not been included in the list?

Y/N

If **yes** please specify below

……
…….

Question for the meeting; should we do similar questions for green spaces and views into the village?

Also can we ask questions about existing eyesores in the village, or is there nothing to be done if they exist and do not breach planning?

Summary

These questions are in a very raw state and will need more work but we felt it useful to get something on paper to spark discussion so that we can finesse them before submitting to Brian and Julie for their comments.

Housing and Planning group 9/10/17

SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN:
PROPOSED POLICIES TEMPLATE HOUSING AND PLANNING DRAFT 1
For discussion 9 October 2017 meeting

Policy number and title:
NUMBER TO BE AGREED , HOUSING & PLANNING
Policy intention:
Provide a brief explanation of what the policy is intended to achieve in planning terms. *These are in the main the policies suggested by William Egerton, obviously this might change once we have carried out a proper survey of the village in order to justify the selection of our policies.* • 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 • Protect important views and the green wedge gap • Better communicate and cooperate with landowners • Avoidance of garden grabbing (Julie said we should check local policies on this) NB The sub-group confirmed on 9/10/17 that these were assumptions that need to be answered by the survey, and are not approved, agreed or adopted by the group. Indeed there was some oppositionto them as they presupposed the survey answers,
Policy justification:
A fairly brief summary of the evidence (facts, statistics, etc) that would justify having such a policy and specifying it in the way proposed. At the moment we only have the initial survey which was not scientifically designed and is statistically unreliable. This section will need to be completed after the proposed village surveys, and once we have justification or otherwise of the policies above.
Evidence base:
A simple list of the evidence sources your policy justification is based upon. It could be one source or many. These could be sources created by you e.g. the Place Appraisal, or produced by others e.g. Environment Agency flood risk maps. Again the evidence base will refer to the Place Appraisal and the survey results but this will have to follow once we have those results.
Related Local Plan policies:
The number and name of any policies in the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan that are related to your proposed Neighbourhood Plan policy. Bear in mind that your policy may need to 'conform' with these Local Plan policies i.e. broadly align and not contradict.

I have not had a chance to clarify these but hope to do so before we meet in November, I will also follow up on Julie's suggestion that we find out about garden grabbing policies in WD

Initial draft policy:

Have a go at drafting your policy. It does not need to be in any sense perfect. The consultants will review and advise in due course. You may want to look for similar policies used in other Neighbourhood Plans for wording ideas.

Before anyone gets into a tizzy the following is not a suggestion for the finished article, we cannot draft the policy before consultation so what I have done is to plagiarise the Loders approved plan to give us a basis for discussion and some ideas as to what it might look like. For obvious reasons I didn't feel that I should start drafting the policy without input from the group. I have put the Loders wording in green below and edited out bits that do not apply in our circumstances.

HOUSING Objective and Policies

Village and Planning Context:

The village Survey showed that ……. *(the majority sentiment was for the community to grow incrementally with support for a rate of housing growth of 'up to 10 houses' over the plan period to XXXX. The majority view was in favour of small dwellings for small family homes, homes for first time buyers and for people to downsize – preferably as infill development. Smaller homes would also provide a more balanced mix of available homes.*

Affordable housing was felt to be the biggest need. Affordable housing can be provided as an exception to normal development policies outside a defined development boundary. Local residents would prefer such sites to be located close to the village to benefit from and support community assets; to be in small groups (preferably of two to three small dwellings of two to three bedrooms), and that their design should be in accordance with the design policies in this plan. When affordable homes are provided, the landowner will be required to enter into a legal agreement to make sure that these remain affordable in perpetuity, and that they are offered to people with a local connection before they can be offered to others. This legal agreement will apply to any subsequent landowners if the land is sold.)

Housing Objective

As a community we want to…. (remain much as we are - whilst allowing for organic and incremental growth of housing that broadly reflects the past rate of growth and addresses our local needs for housing in the plan period to ….. We want to ensure that this new or additional housing is of high quality design, small in scale for small family homes, homes for first time buyers and people wishing to downsize, and preferably provided by infill development (but not infilling the gaps and local green spaces identified in this plan).

Provision of New Homes

The village is not an area that would be suitable for a significant level of growth because of its rural nature. There are many constraints and a significant level of growth would exacerbate the problems currently experienced on the rural roads, with more on-street parking and traffic movements.

However change can be positive, and the slow and piecemeal development of villages is one of the characteristics of rural Dorset. In the village survey the residents were asked their views on how the area should develop. The majority felt that xxx dwellings would be appropriate

In preparing the neighbourhood plan, studies were undertaken to examine the potential for housing development in the village and in peripheral areas of the parish. This showed that sufficient capacity existed in the village within the area of the proposed development boundary to meet residents' aspirations for housing growth and accommodate this number of dwellings.

The type of development considered to be appropriate was ……..

Development Boundary

Following consultation on options, the development boundary defined by ??POLICY NO was agreed
on the basis that there was potential for organic growth in keeping with the special historic an rural character and without overloading the infrastructure of the area. No specific sites have been identified in this plan, but the plan policies and development boundary are intended to facilitate the potential
for new sites and opportunities to come forward.

??POLICY NO 1 : Location of Development in relation to the Defined Development Boundary
Development will be supported within the defined development boundary that has bee drawn around Sutton Poyntz (see map ???). Any new buildings (other than for farming and other land-based rural businesses, or associated rural workers' housing) and associated land (such as gardens or parking areas) should be located within this development boundary. In exceptional circumstances new buildings may be allowed outside of this boundary, and in these circumstances where the need for new building is justified, they must be well-related to the village and sensitively designed to respect and enhance the character of the local area.

??POLICY NO 2 Provision of New Homes
Within the defined development boundary (DDB) new housing providing in the region X new homes over the plan period will be supported, so long as the development is acceptable in all other respects.
Development of new housing within the development boundary should be provided through
- ***infill development within an existing continuous built up frontage,***
- ***the change of use or subdivision of an existing building, or***
- ***backland development where this is in keeping with the historic and local pattern of development.***

??POLICY NO 3: To Protect and Enhance the Character and Appearance of the Are
New development must demonstrate how it responds to its context and the establishe character of the area in which it is located and take account of the Sutton Poyntz villag design statement and Conservation Area appraisals.
Development proposals (including new buildings and extensions / alterations to existing buildings) will be supported where they are sympathetic with adjacent buildings and achieve a high quality of design, use of materials and appropriate detailing which reflect local distinctiveness and respects the character of the village. I considering whether proposals achieve this requirement, particular regard should be paid to:

Loders info not relevant here will need to be drafted in conjunction with place appraisal information

Maps:
State whether a map or maps would be useful to help describe the policy in the NP. It probably will be useful if the policy relates to specific sites, features or bounded areas. *Here we will need to look at important views, green space etc.*

Date drafted: 8/10/17
Drafted by: Elizabeth Brierley

THEME: TRANSPORT

Recommendations

- Establish on-going dialogue between public transport providers and the community with a view to promoting greater use of the village bus service through a more accessible and convenient service.
- Ensure that all planning applications that could impact access and movement of pedestrians, equines, cyclists and public and private motorised traffic include proposals for mitigating such effects.
- Carry out studies to seek measures that will improve the safety of pedestrians and improve ease of access for traffic.
- Planning applications to include at least 2 off-street parking spaces for each home and one additional visitor space per four houses. At least one electric charging point to be provided for each property.
- Carry out studies to seek measures that will bring about traffic calming within the Neighbourhood Plan area.

Risks

- Loss of the village bus service resulting in increased social isolation and reduced convenience for work, leisure and service access purposes.
- Degradation of rural footpaths by new development and increased traffic usage.
- Increased road congestion with its detrimental impact on amenity, free movement and safety.
- Increased risk of road traffic accidents including collision with pedestrians as volume and speed of traffic increases (Sat-Nav, housing development, leisure use of inter-connecting public footpaths).

Challenges

- Reducing traffic speed without recourse to obtrusive measures which are out of character with the area.
- Reducing dependence upon the car as the preferred means of transport at a time when public transport provision is being cut back.
- Reducing on-street traffic congestion and damage to the narrow lanes as a result of larger vehicles, greater volumes and higher speeds of traffic.
- Retaining local rural bus services in the face of commercial operator pressures and tighter financial controls on local authorities.

Opportunities

- Maintain dialogue with public transport providers in order to promote greater use of the village bus service.
- Follow up discussions with the Highway Authority in seeking solutions to highway access problems such as on-street parking around the village pond and south end of Sutton Road and degradation of public footpath access along Puddledock Lane.
- Use speed monitoring data to inform the evaluation of appropriate solutions to reduce traffic speed to a safe level.

Options

- To engage proactively with the local authority, transport providers and the community in order to establish an integrated approach to transport provision with the aim of improving access and the ability to get around for all.
- To identify suitable areas (temporary or permanent) for off-street parking provision and engage with businesses in order to seek both short and long term solutions to overspill parking.

Way Forward

- Establish formal arrangements for regular consultation between First Bus and the village community.
- Establish a single point of contact between the Dorset County Council and the village community on matters of public footpath maintenance.
- Continue dialogue with the Dorset County Council through the local County Councillor in order to pursue viable options for maintaining year round public footpath access along the whole of Puddledock Lane.
- To identify long term solutions to the congestion caused by on-street parking locations through consultation with the Springhead and Cartshed Garage owners.
- To pursue the use of road markings and/or other measures between Winslow Road and Verlands Road in order to improve traffic flow, particularly for emergency and public service vehicles and provide refuges/passing places.
- Seek to establish a speed management policy throughout the Neighbourhood Plan area.

SUGGESTED TRANSPORT RELATED QUESTIONS FOR THE 2017 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SURVEY.

In order of priority for inclusion.

1. Do you support the use of traffic management restrictions (road markings, bollards, signage etc as appropriate) at key hazard points (see map below (tbp) or do we specify these individually).
2. In order to reduce increasing congestion caused by on-street parking adequate provision for vehicles must be made when planning for housing development .
3. Do you agree with a policy of ensuring that a minimum standard of off-street parking provision is incorporated as part of planning consent, based upon 2 car spaces for each home with one additional visitor parking space for four homes or part thereof ?
4. Would you support the creation of a village car park?
5. For new development would you support the provision of pavements and street lighting?
6. Should a policy of incorporating at least one electric vehicle charging point into each new build home be adopted?

THEME: RECREATION & SPORTS

Recommendations

- The key social facilities in the village should be afforded greater protection by being formally listed as ‘Asserts of Community Value.”
- Future development proposals should seek to maintain and, where possible, enhance the recreation and sports facilities available to the village.

Risks

- A future change in use of the Springhead. The landlord (Punch Taverns) could sell the building and land for development.
- The Diocese of Salisbury could revoke or sell the lease of the Mission Hall.
- Wessex Water could close the Waterworks Museum and deny the village access to Veterans’ Wood or the use of the Waterworks and Waterworks Field for the biannual Victorian Street Fair.

Challenges

- High property values make it attractive to convert existing social facilities into housing.
- There are no sports facilities in the village and no children’s play area, other than in the Springhead garden.
- Only a small proportion (less than 15%) of the village can use the Mission Hall at any one time.
- The popularity of the Springhead brings employment and increasing economic security but also higher traffic levels.

Opportunities

- Partnership with Wessex Water to secure new housing within the Waterworks while protecting the site’s heritage, biodiversity and community assets.

Options

- To engage proactively with landlords and landowners with the aim of enhancing community facilities.
- To secure additional protection for existing facilities and seek to influence future development proposals for the benefit of the community

Way Forward

- The village should be consulted to identify Assets of Community Value in support of a formal application under the Localism Act.
- Engage with Wessex Water and Punch Taverns to identify development opportunities of potential value to the community.
- Endeavour to purchase the Mission Hall lease.

SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN TIMETABLE

TARGET ACTION	MONTH AND 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	M
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																												?	?	?