

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 17th October 2017 in the Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz, commencing 19.36 hours.

Present: Katrina Blee (chair), John Crisp (deputising for Liz Brierley) Bill Egerton, Tony Ferrari, Susan Higham, Keith Hudson, Andy Hohne, Huw Llewellyn, Colin Marsh.

1. Apologies

Apologies had been received in advance of the meeting from Bill Davidson, Liz Brierley, Andrew Price, Sue Elgey, Keith Johnson and Peter Dye.

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 19th September 2017 were approved as an accurate record and endorsed by the chair.

3. Actions from the previous meeting (not otherwise on the agenda)

Item 3- Land ownership (Plaisters Lane) – AH informed the meeting that he had identified the owners of the three parcels of land at the top of Plaisters Lane but had yet to obtain the respective contact addresses. He offered to try to identify the landowners further down the hill and would refer to the map provided by BE and liaise with him as necessary. **Action: AH/BE**

Item 4 - Housing insulation standards policy – CM asked about follow up action on the question of insulation standards in new homes. TF commented upon this in the absence of LB and stated on behalf of the sub-group that the adopted standard was sufficient and there was no mileage in building this topic into the neighbourhood plan, a view strongly supported by John Crisp. After brief discussion it was agreed that TF would verify the current policy and the flexibility as to the use of enhanced insulation standards in new build housing. **Action: TF**

Item 6 Extension of the neighbourhood plan grant funding period – BE explained that this was still being progressed. **Action: BE/KB**

Item 6 Traffic monitoring survey – TF had previously confirmed that speed, volume and direction of traffic were monitored and stated that he was currently pursuing the survey results. **Action: TF**

The chair declared that any other actions arising from the previous meeting were to be addressed elsewhere on the agenda.

4. To Review progress against the Neighbourhood Plan timetable

The revised timetable arose from the September 23rd meeting with Brian Wilson and Associates. KB explained that this had been forwarded to the consultants and Nick Cardnell of Weymouth and Portland Borough Council in order to ensure that they were kept informed. AH suggested that a more detailed weekly timetable should be included for work over the next couple months in order to ensure that targets were not missed. Whilst accepting the importance of the proposed schedule CM cautioned against short cutting the process in a desire to meet target dates. **Action: CM**

5. To Address any items of correspondence

The chair confirmed that there were no items of correspondence other than those that related to items to be dealt with elsewhere on the agenda.

6. To Receive a report on the steering group meeting with Brian Wilson and Associates held on 23rd September 2017.

AH commented that this had been a useful meeting.

In response to a question from CM as to what had been the key issues to come out of the meeting SH suggested; the connection of the Place Appraisal to the consultation process, how the Place Appraisal supports the Neighbourhood Plan, the importance of evidence and the revised timetable. CM asked for clarification of the balance between the Place Appraisal and the Neighbourhood Plan documents. SH saw the content of the Place Appraisal as providing the basis for questions to be included in the next public consultation survey the responses to which would be reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan. In discussion it was suggested that we would need to continue to build the Place Appraisal content but KB questioned whether it would develop as a living document. BE commented that the Place Appraisal had developed beyond what was originally intended and was unsure as to its role as a 'living document'. TF felt that the Place Appraisal would evolve into the Neighbourhood Plan although several others disagreed. In summary the chair suggested that the Place Appraisal would probably remain as a living document until after feedback from the second public survey and remain in support of a concise Neighbourhood Plan of some 30 pages length. SH emphasised that the current focus should be on developing questions for the forthcoming public consultation.

7. To receive reports of sub-group meetings.

Place Appraisal – In the absence of PD a summary report was presented by BE which identified the following key actions; Mike Haine was making good progress reformatting the Place Appraisal document, PD had re-drafted section 5 of the latter, recommendations for the section on moving forward were still to be received from the Housing and Planning and Heritage sub-groups. On an additional note BE informed the meeting that Glen Stracey had offered to make his drone available for further aerial photography if required.

Biodiversity and the Natural Environment – CM reported that at the last meeting the sub-group had drafted and submitted questions for the public consultation survey, completed the Place Appraisal template on moving forward and provided an update on the mapping exercise which had been facilitated with the help of BE. Much discussion had taken place on the quotations passed on by PD for completion of a **tree survey** and the group had concluded that a recommendation could not be made due to the lack of clarity as to the required scope and intended use of the information. It had also been noted that the original request from the Sutton Poyntz Society had arisen as a result of the significant removal of trees around two properties in the village and that the issue was more to do with an apparent lack of enforcement. Recent correspondence (pre-circulated with the minutes) with the trees officer at Weymouth and Portland Borough Council indicated that a lighter touch was being applied to tree protection issues. KB suggested that Neighbourhood Plan policy could be used to re-affirm the protection afforded by policy ENV10 of the Local Plan. AH wondered if a survey would provide any significant additional information to that obtainable from current known sources whilst TF suggested that the completion of a tree survey could be included as an addendum to the Neighbourhood Plan with the option of action at a later date.

In responding to a suggestion by KB to re-inforce thorough application of the tree policy, BE stated that the key priority was to include a question in the next survey as

to whether the public wanted to protect trees and to include a statement putting this into the context of enforcement issues. KB commented that a short context statement for all questions in the public survey was important and some constructive feedback from our consultants had been received in this respect. It was agreed to ask the biodiversity sub-group to develop a question and supporting context statement that would address tree protection.

KB worked through the questions drafted by the sub-group and the following comments were noted.

Q1 Regarding the protection and enhancement of biodiversity HL expressed some concern in relation to work such as home extensions and the potential level of detail that may be required to assess the impact on biodiversity.

Q2. Green space provision would involve discussion with other sub-groups and required further investigation as to what was a permissible green space. JC questioned the definition of a green space and it was agreed to circulate the standard template to the Steering Group. JC would obtain the information from BE.

Action: CM

Q3. Flood protection – discussion took place as to the problems of the enforcement of a preference for permeable as opposed to non-permeable driveways and it was recognised that this needed to be carefully worded to reflect what was achievable

Q4 – A question was required as to whether stakeholders wanted to protect trees in the context of those on their own property as well as those on others property.

Q5. – Support for an assigned 'green corridor' – JC questioned how a green corridor was to be defined and the purpose of the question explained in order to obtain objective responses. It was agreed that a carefully drafted context statement would be required in respect of this question.

KB commented upon the style of questions and quantifying the responses e.g. 'strongly disagree to strongly agree' and noted that all questions did not necessarily have to be in precisely the same style.

Employment, Business and Tourism including IT/Communications – SH reported on the draft survey questions which were divided into four key areas; Village shop (which would probably require voluntary staffing), encouraging new small business (to help create jobs for young people), improving communications and IT, encouraging tourism through more campsites, guided tours etc.

CM suggested that the type of goods sold in the shop may be a suitable question extension and suggested that we should be more optimistic about our ability to influence IT providers.

Heritage – BE reported that no meeting had taken place since the last steering group and that a meeting was planned in the immediate future to finalise a list of sites of importance and agree questions for the public survey. It was considered that current national and local policy would suffice to protect listed buildings. Possible questions for the survey would be to seek agreement on the proposed list of assets and whether Local Plan policy ENV 3 is sufficient or needs to be strengthened by additional neighbourhood plan provisions.

Housing and Planning – TF provided feedback in the absence of LB and reported that two perspectives had been considered in the discussions; personal aspirations and

desired changes to the village community in the future. Key areas of focus in formulating section 1 questions were; usage of properties, types of property and numbers of dwellings. KB considered that the Housing Needs Survey would address most of the issues asked for in this set of questions, although JC questioned the value of asking the community about housing needs when in his opinion external factors would override any such views. KB suggested that enlisting the help of the consultants in reviewing the draft questions would help to move this forward.

Continuing, TF explained that section 2 and 3 of the proposed survey was about where local people wanted new housing to be sited and raised questions as to whether the development boundary was to be extended and if so where to locate this. JC stressed the need to ascertain local views on the development boundary as a first priority.

TF reported that it had proved difficult for the group to arrive at a consensus as to questions for the survey due to widely differing opinions and perceived self-interest. CM suggested that the group needed to focus on objective questions that would enable the views of the community to be determined irrespective of group members' personal interests and BE commented on the need for carefully balanced questions in this respect. JC felt strongly that vested interests remained a major barrier to moving forward.

TF explained that the sub-group had been unable to make progress in relation to the character of design. JC suggested that a "fudge" question based upon design in sympathy with what was already present was a possible way forward. BE suggested that reference be made to the five character areas in the Place Appraisal as a basis for a question in terms of whether future design should be faithful to the village core or the specific character areas.

With regard to 'key views' the group were ill-prepared since they understood that this was to be dealt with by the Place Appraisal as opposed to the Housing and Planning sub-group. BE commented that the Place Appraisal sub-group had done some work on views out of the village but not into the village. It was agreed that the Place Appraisal sub-group do further work on this issue in the first instance. CM suggested that with the loss of Andy Price the group may need extra members and this was noted. KB had already offered to join the Place Appraisal sub-group if they wished.

The Steering Group, whilst recognising the very difficult task facing this sub-group in drafting questions, urged them to reconvene to resolve the issues, however following a suggestion from TF, he and JC said they would prefer to liaise and "re-construct" the housing questions prior to submitting these to the consultants for review.

Sports and Recreation – In her report SH noted that the primary focus had been on identifying and protecting community assets. A key question would be based around a provisional list of community assets in order to establish the public view of their 'value'. A further question would relate to community assets that may be needed in the future such as a village green, shop, community allotments, sports field, larger community hall. In this way it would be possible to determine current assets requiring protection as well as desirable assets for the future.

JC stressed the importance of the retention of the public footpath network. It was explained that some action had already been taken on this by the transport sub-group which had resulted in improved signage and the two sub-groups would need to co-operate on this issue. SH explained that a map of walks was being considered and KB provided some examples from elsewhere for guidance in this respect.

Transport – CM reported that the most recent meeting had addressed questions for the public survey, information for the draft Place Appraisal section 5 and a first draft section for the Neighbourhood Plan titled 'Getting Around'. With reference to the questions the following comments of the meeting were noted:

Q1 Traffic management restrictions – there was broad agreement within the context of reasons of safety and traffic flow.

Q2 New development car parking provision to help reduce on-street parking congestion – BE suggested that since the status of current information on parking spaces was advisory the neighbourhood plan policy could make this mandatory. SH raised the question as to whether this included business and it was agreed not as currently worded.

Q3 to Q5 No specific comments were made in relation to questions on a village car park, provision of pavement and street lighting in new development or electric vehicle charging points in new developments.

CM stated that some useful feedback had been received from the consultants including a suggestion that questions may be grouped under a single stem.

8. Any Other Business

The chair asked each of those present if they had any items of other business; no additional items were raised.

The chair concluded the meeting by requesting that the final survey questions with supporting context statements, a Housing Needs Survey (Brian Wilson and Associates) a draft Place Appraisal be ready for endorsement by the Steering Group on December 1st.

In order to meet the current planned deadlines an additional meeting was proposed by the chair for Tuesday 31st October at 7.30pm at the normal venue in order address specifically the draft survey questions from sub-groups, the Place Appraisal and the Housing Needs Analysis. **Action: KB (actioned 18/10/17)**

There being no other matters raised the meeting closed at 21.50 hours.

Date and time of the next meeting.

The date and time of the next meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 31st October 2017 at the Springhead Pub at 19.30 hours.

This will be followed by the normal monthly meeting at the same time and venue on Tuesday 21st November 2017.