

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Agenda for meeting on 19th December 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 Sue Elgey).**
- 2. To Approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 21st November 2017 (request for amendment tabled by LB and attached).**
- 3. To Receive an update on actions arising from the previous meeting (not otherwise on the agenda)**
- 4. To Address items of correspondence**
 - Item 4a - Objections received from residents in relation to proposed Local Heritage Assets and Green Space.**
 - Item 4b - Enquiry from John Llewelyn regarding landowner consultation.**
 - Item 4c - Acknowledgement from Historic England (Stage Two Survey)**
 - Item 4d - Acknowledgement from Nick Cardnell, W&PBC (Stage Two Survey)**
 - Item 4e - Advice from Brian Wilson and Associates regarding various objections arising from the Stage Two Survey consultation process.**
 - Item 4f - Resident enquiry regarding exclusion of their property from the Neighbourhood Area.**
 - Item 4g - Issues arising from a request by LB for pre-agenda access to specific items of correspondence intended for the full Steering Group.**
- 5. To Receive a progress report from the Consultation Survey Sub-group including proposed arrangements for recording and analysis of completed surveys (proposal attached).**
- 6. To Consider the Appointment of a Place Appraisal Editor and Consultation Summary report writer.**
- 7. To Receive reports from sub-groups on matters other than those related to Item 5 on the agenda.**
 - a) Place Appraisal**
 - b) Biodiversity and the Natural Environment.**
 - c) Employment, Business and Tourism including IT/Communications .**
 - d) Heritage**
 - e) Housing and Planning**
 - f) Sports and Recreation**
 - g) Transport**
- 8. To Review progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetable.**
- 9. Declaration of Interest records (item requested by LB – original request and advice from Local Authority)**
- 10. Any Other Business**
- 11. Date and Time of the Next Meeting**

To confirm the date and time of the next meeting as Tuesday 16th January 2017 at 7.30pm.

Notification of proposed correction to the minutes under Item 2 of the Agenda

Elizabeth Brierley To:you + 14 more Details

Colin

After farrago of nonsense after the last time I challenged the accuracy of the minutes I did not immediately email to comment on them, however they seem to have failed to record some important matters that were raised at the meeting and in the light of today's email they must be amended to accurately reflect discussions.

There was significant discussion as to whether land owners whose land was designated as a green space had been consulted and as a result some areas were removed - Miss Saunders's garden being one example but you only mentioned the verges by name, although the ref numbers may include that plot it is not helpful in terms of future reference because those items are being removed and so references will be lost. The minutes should be clear as to why some were removed and some were left in and the recognised lack of communication with the landowners should be acknowledged. We discussed the allotments and the pig field and I was under the impression that the owners were going to be informed before the survey was issued. I may be wrong on the conclusion but these were definitely discussed and I definitely said they should be consulted in advance of the survey. This must be recorded in the minutes.

Unsurprisingly at least one of the landowners is justifiably enraged and they are not alone, the survey has gone down very badly in some quarters of the village and I fear it is creating a great deal of dissent amongst those villagers who already consider the Sutton Poyntz Society to be an undemocratic and autocratic body of NIMBY incomers and see the neighbourhood plan as an offshoot of that group. Not helped by the strangle hold over both by certain parties.

I hope those people in the village who do feel this process is being badly run will speak up, the Springhead was alive with outrage on Friday night, and when I was delivering the surveys last week one lifelong resident asked if it was from the SPS and gave a Nazi salute.....

Liz

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting 19 December 2017

Item 5

Stage Two Survey and Housing Needs Survey: Collation and recording of survey results

The Consultation Survey Sub-Group suggests that four volunteers from the Steering Group undertake this task, split into two teams, each inputting half of the returns on to a spreadsheet.

The teams would then swap their returns and check every input done by the other group for any mistakes.

The volunteers would then undertake the task of summarising the results for each question. This could be done in a similar way, i.e. with two teams taking half the questions, then checking the other team's summary for accuracy.

The volunteers would also need to type up and reference any text comments submitted.

The surveys can be delivered to the input teams on Friday 5th January, with a view to the results being available for the Steering Group meeting on February 20th.

It may be worth considering asking Brian Wilson to attend the meeting on February 20th to facilitate discussion of the survey results and discuss what the Group's next steps should be.

K Blee

13.12.17

SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - DETAILED TIMETABLE FOR 2017

ACTION	COMPLETION DEADLINE	BY WHOM
PRODUCE DRAFT PLACE APPRAISAL HARD COPIES (15)	31/10/2017	PD/BE
PRODUCE DRAFT HOUSING NEEDS SURVEY	31/10/2017	B WILSON
AGREE AND PRODUCE DRAFT QUESTIONS FOR NEXT PUBLIC CONSULTATION	31/10/2017	SUB-GROUPS
CONSIDER AND AGREE DRAFT PLACE APPRAISAL AND QUESTIONS FOR NEXT PUBLIC SURVEY (OR IDENTIFY FURTHER WORK NEEDED)	31/10/2017	STEERING GROUP
AGREE COMPOSITION OF PUBLIC SURVEY SUB-GROUP	31/10/2017	STEERING GROUP
AGREE NEWSLETTER BY E-MAIL ROUND	16/11/2017	SURVEY SUB-GROUP
DISTRIBUTE NEWSLETTER	19/11/2017	SURVEY SUB-GROUP
SURVEY SUB-GROUP TO MEET AND PRODUCE DRAFT HOUSING NEEDS SURVEY (HNS), POSTER FOR COFFEE MORNING, STAGE TWO SURVEY(STS), NEWSLETTER	21/11/2017	SURVEY SUB-GROUP
FURTHER WORK UNDERTAKEN WHERE NECESSARY ON DRAFT PA AND SURVEY	21/11/2017	SUB-GROUPS
STEERING GROUP ENDORSE PLACE APPRAISAL (PA) , HOUSING NEEDS SURVEY (HNS) AND STAGE TWO SURVEY (STS) AND COVERING LETTER	21/11/2017	STEERING GROUP
AGREE ARRANGEMENTS FOR PRINTING, ACCESS AND DISTRIBUTION OF PA,HNS,STS.	21/11/2017	STEERING GROUP
AGREE DATES AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION MEETINGS RE SURVEYS AND PA	21/11/2017	STEERING GROUP
FINALISE ARRANGEMENTS FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION	30/11/2017	SURVEY SUB-GROUP
DRAFT PLACE APPRAISAL AND PUBLIC SURVEY LAUNCHED AT COFFEE MORNING	01/12/2017	STEERING GROUP
DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING NEEDS SURVEY AND STAGE TWO SURVEY AND INFORM RESIDENT AS TO PLACE APPRAISAL ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS.	01/12/2017 - 05/12/2017	STEERING/SUB-GROUP DISTRIBUTOR
RETURN VISIT TO REMIND RESIDENTS OF THE NEED FOR SURVEY COMPLETION AND ATTEMPT COLLECTION OF COMPLETED SURVEYS	15/12/17 – 17/12/17	STEERING/SUB-GROUP DISTRIBUTOR
SUB-GROUPS TO CONTINUE TO BUILD EVIDENCE AND DRAFT POLICIES FOR FIRST DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN AND REPORT ON PROGRESS	19/12/2017	SUB-GROUPS
REVIEW PROGRESS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION	19/12/2017	STEERING GROUP
CONFIRM ARRANGEMENTS FOR ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION FEEDBACK.	19/12/2017	STEERING GROUP
FURTHER RETURN VISIT TO REMIND RESIDENTS OF THE SURVEY RETURN DEADLINE AND ATTEMPT COLLECTION OF COMPLETED SURVEYS	1/1/17 – 5/1/17	1/1/17 – 5/1/17
COLLATE PUBLIC CONSULTATION FEEDBACK	05/01/2018	STEERING GROUP
CONSIDER PUBLIC CONSULTATION FEEDBACK RESULTS AND ANALYSIS AND AGREE NEXT STEPS	16/01/2018 20/02/2018	STEERING GROUP/SUB-GROUPS

AGENDA ITEM 4 – CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

ITEM 4a Communications from Residents - Local Heritage Assets and proposed Green Space.

ROSE COTTAGE, SILVER STREET and PIG FIELD AND WOODED AREA ADJACENT TO ALLOTMENTS.

10 December, 2017

Cc Nick Cardnell, Senior Planning Officer, Dorset Council Partnership

Ref: Objection to Stage Two Survey

Dear Katrina & Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Planning Forum Steering Group,

Thank you for your correspondence regarding green space designation and heritage asset nomination within the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, Stage Two Survey. As a property and land owner I am impacted by both proposals. This letter sets out my objection to the proposal to designate the “pig field and wooded area adjacent to the allotments” (G10) as a green space and the proposal to nominate Rose Cottage, Silver Street as a Heritage Asset (HA8).

Heritage England advise that significant weight needs to be afforded to responses received from the owners of the properties proposed as heritage assets.

Green Space Designation Within Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

Within the Survey, if the responder agrees with the principle of designation of green space in the village, question 4 then asks “Do you agree that the following proposed sites should be designated for protection as green space within the Neighbourhood Plan subject to meeting the necessary criteria?” The survey then lists all the green spaces in the village, with no supporting evidence or justification for their inclusion. There is also no indication of privately owned land within this list.

For clarity paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the “necessary criteria” that green space must meet to be designated as Local Green Space; designated green space must be:

- in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves
- demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife
- local in character and is not be an extensive tract of land

It is important to remember that paragraph 77 of the NPPF also states that not all green spaces or open space is suitable for designation as Local Green Space. Green space designation must be supported by robust and proportionate evidence and must demonstrate the particular importance to the local community. Evidence should describe ways in which the space is used or enjoyed by the community and what the particular local significance is. For land in private ownership consideration must also be given to whether the special characteristic or significance identified by the community will endure in the long term, especially as ownership or management of land, including land usage, may change. The community should also be made aware that local green space designation does not change or create public access rights to the land.

Survey question 4 does not seek to capture the evidence required to support green space designation i.e. how the community uses the space or what the local significance is, it merely captures a one-dimensional aspiration. I am concerned that survey responses supporting the designation of a particular green space will be misinterpreted as community significance. Community significance must be explained and supported by evidence. Survey question 4 has seemed to miss an important step in policy development: namely evidence gathering, identifying an aspiration and then retrospectively finding evidence to support that claim is not sound policy making. The potential green spaces listed within question 4 provides no evidence or rationale for the land meeting the “necessary criteria” preventing the respondent from making an informed decision.

The “pig field and wooded area” to which the survey refers is privately owned by myself, Richard Crocker. The land is over one and a half acres of mixed characteristics and is currently used to graze livestock. Only four bungalows and one house have views on to the field, there is no public access, no community use of the field, no recreational value, no historical significance and I would say the field has limited scope for tranquillity and beauty as there are limited public views from the road. Any claims of wildlife importance will need to be evidenced, by records and ecological surveys and expert advice. No wildlife surveys of the field have taken place, so no such claims can be supported. Any wildlife surveys of the land will require the landowner’s permission; no trespassing will be tolerated.

Stage One Survey which the Forum ran earlier this year (March 2017) identified the community need for a village green and a sports area and a dedicated children’s play area. The pig field and wooded area is not going to deliver these community needs.

It is for these reasons I do not consider the “pig field and wooded area” as a suitable candidate for the green space designation. I sincerely ask the Neighbourhood Forum to re-consider the appropriateness of such a designation. If the proposal to designate “pig field and wooded area” persists the Forum must demonstrate a) the community significance of our land by sharing the supporting evidence and b) the local need for such a designation. We, the land owners, should be provided with this information and then have the opportunity to make representations, simply allowing us to reply to a public survey or consultation is not sufficient. There has to be a separate dialogue with the private landowners.

As a private land owner, who has invested in the village I feel disproportionately impacted (financially and emotionally) by the Forum’s proposal.

Heritage Asset Designation Within Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

Question 13 of the Survey states that a list of heritage assets has been identified by the Forum using guidance from Historic England and a scoring system. The criteria and the scoring system were not publicly available, but were provided by the Steering Group’s Chair upon request.

For clarity, Historic England, Local Heritage Listing Advice Note 7 (p9), provides a suggested list of 10 potential heritage asset assessment criteria; the assessor must set the criteria thresholds to determine significance. Of the possible 10, the Forum used the following five criteria: age, aesthetic, historic, social & group. A mark of 1-5 was awarded against each criterion by members of the Heritage Sub-Group. Those assets achieving the highest combined score were included in the proposed heritage asset list within the Survey.

The scoring thresholds used by the Heritage Sub-Group remains unclear, for example, what was the threshold for “old”? If five was awarded does that mean the building was from 1900s or 1800s, for example? What was the threshold for “group” value? What was required to mark a group as a five? Heritage England guidelines state that groupings of assets should have a “clear visual design or historic relationship”. Some of the heritage asset “street scenes” cover up to 6 houses, with varying characteristics. HA8: Silver Street, scored highly on group value (3.02), however I believe they have no visual design or historic relationship between the group, so I question how they can be marked so highly? For example, the group of three cottages: Albert Cottage, Ebenezer Cottage & Rose Cottage have no historic relationship

and bare no design relationship to neither each other, nor the rest of the properties on Silver Street. Aesthetic interest, is another criteria which Silver Street scored highly on (2.04). Aesthetic interest is described by Historic England as the intrinsic design value of an asset relating to local styles, materials or any other distinctive local characteristics. Rose Cottage does not have any distinctive local characteristics, for example the group of three cottages: Albert, Ebenezer and Rose Cottage have three completely different building styles.

It is for these reasons I believe the scoring system is not robust and there is not sufficient evidence to support heritage asset nomination of Rose Cottage. As a minimum nominations need to be backed by information of sufficient detail and accuracy to demonstrate that they meet the requirements set by the selection criteria. This evidence has not been provided to the property owner or to the community.

The Survey states that if the responder supports the designation of heritage assets in the village, then they should indicate which "assets on the list below should be included?". I find this to be an incredibly prescriptive approach. The Forum has decided upon the selection criteria without any consultation with the local community. Consulting on the proposed list of assets does not constitute consulting on the heritage asset selection criteria, as neither the criteria requirements nor the resulting scores were published within the survey. Heritage Asset England guidance recommends the community are consulted on both the selection criteria used and the resulting properties identified. The community can play an important role in supporting the overall process, especially the development of the selection criteria and nomination of assets. In the Forum's Stage One Survey (March 2017) within the Heritage section there was no suggestion of designating village properties, suggestions were made to recognise the nearby Bronze Age, Iron Age, Roman and Medieval Sites (5 supporters) or to link with the Thomas Hardy Trail (2 supporters). Both these proposals have been overlooked.

I object to Rose Cottage being included within the Heritage asset list (HA8) as it does not meet the selection criteria, and I request it is removed from the proposed list. The all or nothing blanket "street scene nominations" seems overly prescriptive and disproportionate. Perhaps a compromise for HA8 is to nominate the Silver Street pavement, rather than the properties?

I am disappointed to find that the Forum's constitution makes no provision for a dispute resolution between the Forum and an impacted community member. There is only mention of conflict resolution if the Steering Group cannot reach agreement. Please consider how a property owners' and landowners' views and objections resulting from the Forum's proposals can be duly considered and balanced compromises reached between the two parties. It is important that all members of the community feel like they have a voice and are listened to by the Forum, especially those with an objection.

I must also ask the Forum to host more inclusive community engagement events to support future surveys and consultations. Only one engagement event was held to support the Survey's consultation period: a coffee morning on 1 December at 10:30 am, please be aware hosting such events during traditional working hours will result in skewed community engagement.

Yours Sincerely,

Richard, Ann, Hannah, Elizabeth Crocker

From: Katrina Blee

Sent: Monday, December 4, 2017 9:08:24 AM

To: Hannah Crocker; William Egerton; neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk

Cc: ncardnell@dorset.gov.uk; agalpin@dorset.gov.uk; Elizabeth Crocker

Subject: RE: FAO: Bill Egerton - Heritage Asset Objection

Dear Hannah,

Thanks for your further email, which I will also put on the next agenda for the Steering Group.

I am very sorry that you have not received the information regarding the Heritage Ssub-Group's initial work on potential local heritage assets. I have managed to obtain this from our Minutes Secretary, so please now find this attached.

I think HA8 is a street scene which includes houses on Silver Street.

Regarding green spaces, again nothing has been nominated. Question 4 of the survey starts with the question as to whether the community wishes to create a list of green spaces or not. The list in the table is simply a list of green spaces we could think of that people might not want to see used for other purposes. The Steering Group has not decided the details of green space assessment, as we do not know yet if the community wants green spaces protected: if an assessment is necessary, I would be in favour of this being undertaken independently by a planning professional.

Kind regards,

Kate Blee

From: Hannah Crocker
Sent: Sunday, December 3, 2017 7:44:01 PM
To: Katrina Blee; William Egerton; neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk
Cc: ncardnell@dorset.gov.uk; agalpin@dorset.gov.uk; Elizabeth Crocker
Subject: Re: FAO: Bill Egerton - Heritage Asset Objection

Dear Katrina,

Thank you for the clarification regarding the society's approach to handling correspondence.

I received my Stage Two Survey on Saturday 2nd December and having studied the map on page 8 of the survey I note that HA8 does not cover Rose Cottage. However we received a notification leaflet on 23 November, which informed us our property was included within the Heritage Asset list. I therefore urgently request clarification from Society on whether Rose Cottage is part of the proposed Heritage Asset 8 or not.

Question 13 of the Survey states that "Using guidance from Historic England, we have looked at potential assets for a local list and assessed them using a scoring system. Those which scored sufficiently to meet the criteria are listed in the table below." In accordance with the requirement for neighbourhood planning forums to be open and transparent please may you share not only the criteria used but also the resulting scores from the "scoring system". Bill Egerton has not yet shared the information promised within your previous email. Please may this information be shared urgently to allow an informed and timely response to the survey. We do not want to be disadvantaged for not being able to attend the coffee morning on 01/12/17, due to work.

Within the survey I also note the Society's proposal to designate 'green spaces', we own the proposed green space at G10- 'the pig field and wooded area adjacent to allotments'. Receipt of the survey was the first we knew about any proposal to designate our private land as a green space and this came as a huge shock. The survey states: "Do you agree that the following proposed sites should be designated for protection as green space within the Neighbourhood Plan subject to meeting the necessary criteria". Please may the society urgently provide a) the justification for nominating the pig field and wooded area as green space and b) what the "necessary criteria" to which you refer to are. Again this information will allow for an informed and timely response to the survey.

Best wishes,

Hannah

From: Katrina Blee

Sent: 01 December 2017 14:21

To: Hannah Crocker; William Egerton; neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk

Cc: ncardnell@dorset.gov.uk; agalpin@dorset.gov.uk; Elizabeth Crocker

Subject: Re: FAO: Bill Egerton - Heritage Asset Objection

Dear Hannah,

Apologies, I may not have made myself clear in that we have a protocol in the Steering Group that correspondence is considered by the whole group before a full answer is issued. If you and your sister are attending on the 19th December this of course will be ideal to facilitate the discussion. IN the meantime it would not be appropriate for me to comment further apart from further clarification of the position.

The survey does state that the suggested list was drawn up using Historic England's guidance, and therefore we are through this survey consulting on this too.

Details of the criteria used was available at the coffee morning, and I will ask Bill, who is the member of the Steering Group on the Heritage Sub-Group, to email these across to you as you were unable to attend.

I look forward to discussing this further with you on 19th December.

Kind regards,

Katrina.

From: Hannah Crocker

Sent: 01 December 2017 13:37

To: Katrina Blee; William Egerton; neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk

Cc: ncardnell@dorset.gov.uk; agalpin@dorset.gov.uk; Elizabeth Crocker

Subject: Re: FAO: Bill Egerton - Heritage Asset Objection

Dear Kate,

Thank you for your email, although I am saddened to hear that Bill Egerton did not share our response sooner, we emailed and hand delivered a hard copy of our objection on 26 November. The leaflet advised we contact Bill Egerton to "get additional information and to make representations". I feel very let down as additional information has not been provided and the survey is being launched regardless. I also feel the majority of the points raised within our objection letter remain unanswered. As the property owner I am still without an explanation of the local importance or significance of my property.

I am pleased to hear the nomination of heritage assets is not a foregone conclusion. However I remain concerned about the content of the survey. Based on Historic England Heritage Asset guidance the community should in fact be consulted on, *not only* the principle of drawing up a local heritage asset list, but the scope and criteria used to identify potential heritage assets. As the imminent survey contains lists of pre-identified heritage assets you have failed to consult the community on the heritage asset criteria. Historic England advise that "Local [Heritage Asset] Lists will be more effective if supported by objective criteria and both criteria and content have been tested through public consultation".

<https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/local-heritage-listing-advice-note-7/heag018-local-heritage-listing.pdf/>

The list of heritage assets identified in your leaflet must have been based on some criteria and the society must publicly share this criteria. To allow properties to appeal heritage asset nomination they must be able to prove they do not meet the criteria, by withholding the criteria from property owners you are denying property owners the right to appeal.

From what you describe, I am concerned that the survey questions may be leading, that is, if the survey respondent supports the nomination of heritage assets in the village, they must therefore agree with the proposed heritage asset lists identified by the society. I note Rose Cottage is included within a group of about 10 other houses (Group HA8) there must be the possibility to break up this group- it can not be an all or nothing approach. Rose Cottage is actually part of a detached group of three houses, with no design or historic relationship with the other houses in 'HA8'.

As we are unable to attend this morning's coffee morning, due to work, I along with my sister (Liz, cc'd) would welcome the opportunity to meet with you and Bill to discuss heritage asset nomination before the next steering group. We are available any evening for the following two weeks (apart from Mondays), please let us know what time will work best for you.

Thank you for lodging our correspondence and objection for the next Steering Group meeting on the 19 December- I along with my sister will be attending.

Best wishes,

Hannah

From: Katrina Blee

Sent: 01 December 2017 09:23

To: Hannah Crocker; neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk; William Egerton

Cc: ncardnell@dorset.gov.uk; agalpin@dorset.gov.uk

Subject: Re: FAO: Bill Egerton - Heritage Asset Objection

Dear Ms Crocker,

Thank you for your email. I did not receive the first one (I believe the neighbourhood@... email goes to Bill Egerton).

The survey has now been printed, however just to clarify, it asks first of all if people agree with the principle of drawing up a local heritage list, then for those that agree, a list of possible assets is given. Therefore please be reassured that no decisions have been made yet as to whether the Neighbourhood Plan will include a list, or what that list may contain.

I will formally lodge your correspondence with the Steering Group when it next meets on 19th December so that your objection to your property being included in any list is recorded. Please do also take the time to respond to the survey when you receive this.

Kind regards,

Kate Blee

From: Hannah Crocker
Sent: 30 November 2017 11:22
To: neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk; Katrina Blee; William Egerton
Cc: ncardnell@dorset.gov.uk; agalpin@dorset.gov.uk
Subject: Fw: FAO: Bill Egerton - Heritage Asset Objection

Dear Katrina and Bill,

Please may you confirm receipt of my objection email (below and attached) and hand delivered letter on 26 November (delivered to Bill Egerton as advised by the leaflet). Due to the generic email address used, I am keen to ensure it has been received and is being considered. For completeness I have also submitted our objection letter via the 'Contact Us' portal of the Society's website.

I can only hope the lack of acknowledgement and communication to date is a result of the seriousness with which the Society are considering our letter. As we have requested our property to be removed from the proposed Heritage Asset list, we feel a response before the launch of the survey is only reasonable.

I understand Committee Members will be attending a coffee morning tomorrow (Friday 1 December 10:30am) however due to work we are unable to attend. It is most disappointing your community engagement is happening during hours which most can not attend.

Best wishes,

Hannah Crocker

From: Hannah Crocker
Sent: 26 November 2017 18:01
To: society@suttonpoyntz.org.uk
Cc: ncardnell@dorset.gov.uk; agalpin@dorset.gov.uk; Elizabeth Crocker
Subject: FAO: Bill Egerton - Heritage Asset Objection

Dear Bill,

Please find attached a letter with regard to our objection relating to the heritage asset nomination of Rose College, Silver Street.

Please note the letter is from my father, Richard, but due to my father's ill health please direct all correspondence to myself or my sister Elizabeth Crocker (cc'd).

Yours Sincerely

Hannah Crocker

26 November 2017

Dear Sutton Poyntz Society Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group,

Please be informed as the property owner of Rose Cottage, Silver Street I strongly object to your proposal to list Rose Cottage as a 'locally important heritage asset' under Weymouth & Portland's ENV4 Policy. I hereby request you remove the proposal from the imminent Neighbourhood plan survey.

Historic England (Historic England Advice Note 7, Local Heritage Listing, 2016) advise that the process to select heritage assets should engage the community from the very beginning, starting with public notification of the intention to create a local heritage list, along with public consultation on the selection criteria to be used. As there is already a proposed list of heritage asset properties, this public engagement and transparency with regard to the selection criteria seems to have been overlooked. It also needs to be made clear how the heritage list will support the local development plan.

The leaflet delivered through my door, on 23 November, was the first notification I received of my property being nominated as a heritage asset. Historic England state that property owners should be provided within an explanation of the local importance of their property and the way in which the property meets the, to date, unknown heritage asset selection criteria. The group must also explain the planning implications of such a listing. This information was either missing or ambiguous in the leaflet received.

I feel Rose Cottage fails to meet the nationally recognised heritage asset selection criteria and significance for heritage asset nomination. The 'street scenes' to which you refer may be pretty, but what heritage significance do they represent and to whom? Heritage assets include those which contribute to the areas special historical, archaeological, social, artistic or architectural interest. Not buildings that simply contribute to the 'beauty of the village'. Beauty is subjective.

I therefore repeat my request that Rose Cottage is removed from the proposed heritage asset list. I have copied in Weymouth and Portland Planning for information regarding my objection.

If the survey on the village heritage assets goes ahead as planned I will submit a formal objection and will look to fellow impacted residents to support such an objection. Heritage England advise that significant weight needs to be afforded to responses received from the owners of the properties proposed as heritage assets. I would also expect a route of appeal to be provided, the grounds of appeal should be based on evidence that the property fails to meet the heritage asset criteria.

I am disappointed that I have had to engage with the planning society in this manner as I would like to support the work of the group. However, the unilateral nomination of my property as a heritage asset provided me with no other option.

Yours Sincerely

Richard Crocker

From: Katrina Blee

Sent: 01 December 2017 09:27

To: neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk; William Egerton; C Varley

Cc: agalpin@dorset.gov.uk; society@suttonpoyntz.org.uk; ncardnell@dorset.gov.uk

Subject: Re: Heritage Asset Objection

Dear Ms Varley

Thank you for your letter and email.

To clarify, the survey which is being distributed in the next few days, asks first of all if people agree with the principle of drawing up a local heritage list, then for those that agree, a list of possible assets is given. Therefore please be reassured that no decisions have been made yet as to whether the Neighbourhood Plan will include a list, or what that list may contain.

I will formally lodge your correspondence with the Steering Group when it next meets on 19th December so that your objection to your property being included in any list is recorded. Please do also take the time to respond to the survey when you receive this.

Kind regards,

Kate Blee

From: C VARLEY

Sent: 30 November 2017 19:40

To: neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk; Katrina Blee; William Egerton

Cc: agalpin@dorset.gov.uk; society@suttonpoyntz.org.uk; ncardnell@dorset.gov.uk

Subject: Heritage Asset Objection

Dear Mr Egerton

Please find attached a letter with regard to our objection relating to the heritage asset nomination of Ebenezer Cottage, Silver Street.

Kind regards

Catherine Varley

29 November 2017

Dear Mr Egerton

I have been informed by my neighbour Mr Richard Crocker who lives at Rose Cottage that there is a new plan in place by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group that has listed my house Ebenezer Cottage as a "locally important heritage asset". This is the first time that I have known of this proposal as my cottage is currently rented and I have not received any information from the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. I only heard about this by chance from my neighbour. I would request from the outset that my property Ebenezer Cottage is removed from your proposal to be a locally important heritage asset. Having spoken to other people who have had their properties listed as "heritage assets", this has caused them problems with planning consent and when they came to sell their houses. I do not wish to get into the same position.

Mr Crocker, who lives next door to me has given me a copy of his response, the content of which I would support in full. I would also reiterate, as he has done, that I have certainly not been contacted with any of these propositions. I was not notified that there was an intention to create my home as a local heritage asset and I have not been provided with an explanation of the local importance of my property and the way this would affect my property. As you know Heritage England does advise that significant weight needs to be given to responses received from the owners of properties proposed as heritage assets and there has to be an appeal process in place to accommodate this.

Although I entirely support the concept of preserving Sutton Poyntz and some of the actions of the Planning Group, as my neighbour has rightly felt, the unilateral nomination of my property as a heritage asset is not acceptable and has left me with no option but to insist that Ebenezer cottage is removed from the proposal.

Yours Sincerely

Mrs Catherine Varley

Copy:

Sutton Poyntz Society

Katrina Blee Chair

Mr N Cardnell Weymouth & Portland Planning

Mr A Galpin Weymouth & Portland Planning

'ALLOTMENTS' on PUDDLEDOCK LANE

SIMON GRANT-JONES FWCB, LWCB, Cert.Ed.
Blacksmith

Award Winning

A Fellow and Licentiate of the Worshipful Company of Blacksmiths

Hand-Forged Wrought Ironwork and specialist toolmaker

FAO: The Steering Committee

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood plan

Date 15/12/17

Cc Nick Cardnell, Senior Planning Officer, Dorset Council Partnership

Dear committee,

After reading the stage two survey questionnaire for the Sutton Poyntz neighbourhood plan, my Wife and I feel that we would like to voice our objection regarding proposals for our land referred to in the latest questionnaire as "Puddledock allotments". We note that our land has been selected in question 4 of the questionnaire for potential designation as "green space".

Our land never has been or will be "Allotments" and we strongly object to this proposal and the wording used. The land is our private garden which is used by us for horticulture purposes and for keeping some livestock, (poultry and bees).

We are both amazed and upset that no member of the committee has had the courtesy to approach us and discuss this proposal and we have only found out through the questionnaire that was posted through our door.

The garden as a whole was originally attached to Puddledock Cottages and was allocated to, and cultivated by, the farm workers who lived in the cottages.

We bought the garden from the Diment family approximately five years ago and the garden has never had public access or been offered as allotments. Various locals were given permission by the Diment family to garden a plot and as current owners of the land we have allowed continuation for five of our friends for the short term.

We have never intended the land to be used for public use but solely for our own personal use. We are happy for existing plot holders to carry on in the short term and their plots will not be offered to anyone else should they decide that they no longer wish to maintain them.

Sadly, to confirm this situation we have had to lock the gate with only the plot holders being granted access.

We do not want the restriction of being labelled as "greenspace" and we do not welcome the Villagers trying to dictate to us over how we should use our land.

If the committee insists on pursuing the possibility of labelling our garden as greenspace then we will have no alternative but to ask the current gardeners to leave. The garden can then not be viewed or misconstrued as "allotments". We would be very upset at the prospect of doing this as our current

arrangements allow the gardeners to pursue their hobby and gain enjoyment from our property. All of them were previously allowed to garden plots by the Diments and have been there for many years, it will be a huge blow to them to have to leave their plots and not to be associated with the garden anymore. We hope that it will not come to that as we value our friendship with them and are more than happy for them to continue under the current arrangements and circumstances.

Simon and Lyn Grant-Jones

Copies to garden plot holders.

ITEM4b from Landowner Representative regarding Consultation with Landowners and the advisory response from Brian Wilson.

From: John Llewelyn
Sent: 13 December 2017 13:38
To: Katrina Blee
Subject: Re: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Katrina

We understand the the Neighbourhood Plan is of course a community led project and there are no specific rules on how the Neighbourhood Forum should manage their consultation but it would seem clear that the term would include taking account of as well as listening to the views of those affected and that this includes not just residents but business owners, landowners and other interested parties.

One criticism of these type of Forums is that they can become hijacked by those managing the process at an early stage, either in a well meaning attempt to direct the process to the “desired result” as perceived by that group or, slightly more cynically, towards the interest of interested parties within the group.

Either way, the group tries to frustrate the process of consultation to circumvent or manipulate the proceedings. An example of this would be if the group only took the views of a certain parties and excluded others who they think may disagree with the desired result. This has been done by, for instance, sending a survey to the residents with selective and leading questions on it which enables the Forum to conclude that there is no need to consult with others - by for instance, concluding that as the residents do not want any development, there is no need to talk to the landowners/business owners. Thus, true consultation is neatly circumvented and avoided.

Whilst this may defeat the consultation at this informal stage, it may only lead to that consultation process being invalidated at the two later formal consultation stages due to the failure to consult (combined with the suggestion of bias formerly alluded to). Bringing the consultation process to the attention of affected parties but then not allowing them to participate is not what was intended by the regulations dealing with pre-submission consultation. Invalidation of the process would be a massive waste of time and resources so no one as an interest in that.

We can do no more than point this out and look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours sincerely

John Llewelyn

‘As you are aware, a Neighbourhood Plan is a community led project. At early consultation stages, such as this informal consultation, there are no specific rules on how the Neighbourhood Forum should manage their consultation.

I would however encourage the group to consult with local land owners, as this is best practice. I can see from your email that you have directly asked them this question and would await their response.

As I have mentioned, this is an informal consultation, there are however two further formal consultations set out in [regulations](#) known as Pre-submission consultation (regulation 14) and Publishing (regulation 16) both of which require qualifying bodies to

“publicise, in a manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area”. This includes landowners. The second of these consultations is organised by the Borough Council’

From: Brian Wilson
Sent: 05 December 2017 14:49
To: Katrina Blee
Cc: neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk
Subject: Re: Fw: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

Katrina,

Landowners:

If there is local support for development, I would advise that the next stage is a call for sites, which is open to all local landowners.

All of the sites put forward by landowners would then be assessed on a consistent basis, which uses the same set of criteria.

Then, when the draft NP is formally consulted upon, landowners (like residents) will have an opportunity to comment. There will be a six week consultation at that point. The assessment of sites should also be made available for anyone to see at that stage.

You might want to add that, in the event anyone on the steering group/sub-groups puts forward a site themselves, they would not be allowed to take part in the site assessment process nor any decision about what development sites to include in the draft NP.

Local green spaces:

Landowners of sites which are being proposed as Local Green Spaces in the draft NP, will have a formal chance to comment at that stage. If they object, you will have to properly consider their objection and either accept it or give a stated reason why not.

The assessment criteria for Local Green Spaces should certainly be made widely available at that stage.

In truth, whether or not you make the existing LGS assessments available for people to see at this survey stage is up to you - there is no right/wrong answer in NP process terms. I can see that it might look more transparent. On the other hand, there's something to be said for establishing whether residents support these LGS proposals before finalising the assessments and going public with them.

Kind regards,
Brian
Brian Wilson Associates

On 05/12/2017 10:35, Katrina Blee wrote:

Hi Brian.

Please see below concerns from a landowner. If you remember we agreed at the session on 23rd September to delay sending a letter to landowners inviting them to present to a SG meeting, to await the community's opinions as to whether we should look outside the DB for housing.

Mr Llewellyn's concern is that there are residents who are landowners who have already had input to the process by way of completing resident surveys and sitting on the Steering Group committee.

We have also received representations from people unhappy about their property being suggested as green space, key view or local heritage asset, we took out some references to individual properties from the survey on the heritage assets and green spaces, but essentially they are still there in street scenes etc. One representation also states that we need to consult on proposed criteria as well as on the sites themselves.

Any advice would be appreciated before our next meeting on 19th December.

Kind regards,

Kate

From: John Llewelyn
Sent: 05 December 2017 09:43
To: Katrina Blee
Subject: Re: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Katrina

As a matter of transparency, perhaps you could ask your consultant to outline the procedure overall with steps and timeframe so it is clear to all involved what will be done at each stage and with whom?

Some landowners are living in the village and so they have earlier access to the consultation process, are allowed to go to the meetings, fill out consultation paper responses and even sit on the committee making the decision while other landowners are excluded entirely from the process until that committee allows them to join the conversation at some unknown later date towards the end of the process. Could you ask your consultant if that differing treatment is reasonable in their opinion as well please?

Many thanks

John

On 4 Dec 2017, at 18:44, Katrina Blee wrote:

John,

Your email will be considered in full when the Steering Group next meets on 19th December, however just for clarification, at the moment the village's views on key topics, including the development boundary are being sought, and following advice from our planning consultant it was thought best to await the results before consulting landowners and finding out aspirations they may have for their land.

Kind regards,

Katrina.

From: John Llewelyn
Sent: Monday, December 4, 2017 2:25:54 PM
To: Katrina Blee
Subject: Re: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

Hi Katrina

Could I just check something Katrina, there appear to be a lot of phases that have been aimed at residents only and not land owners.

As such, landowners who do not live in the village have had no opportunity to comment on or get involved in the process at all whilst those that do have land and are resident are able to be involved in the consultation process and in fact are on the committee making the decisions.

Could you provide an overview of the process as a whole to enable us to see when we will be able to become involved in the process.

You will recall our concerns about bias and not being involved in the process despite being the main land owner in the area and it does seem to be on the extreme side of unreasonableness that we still do not have any way of taking part in this process. You say that you have made contact with landowners but that is hardly consultation or is it in your view?

Yours sincerely

John Llewelyn

On 4 Dec 2017, at 09:22, Katrina Blee wrote:

Further to my recent email, please now find attached the two surveys which have been distributed this weekend to residents.

The Draft Place Appraisal may be accessed at:

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

Kind regards

Katrina Blee Chairman, Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

ITEM 4c – Acknowledgement from Historic England

From: Stuart, David
Sent: Monday, December 4, 2017 10:31:47 AM
To: Katrina Blee
Subject: RE: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

Thanks Katrina

I wasn't sure if it was a formal consultation of any kind but it obviously looks to be targeted at the community.

So there doesn't appear to be anything we need to respond to at this stage other than to say we are pleased to see how the historic environment is being addressed.

Kind regards

David

David Stuart | Historic Places Adviser South West

Historic England | 29 Queen Square | Bristol | BS1 4ND

<https://historicengland.org.uk/southwest>

From: Katrina Blee
Sent: 04 December 2017 10:23
To: Stuart, David
Subject: RE: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

I sent the newsletter, it was just saying about the forthcoming surveys, I'll forward it again.

Katrina

From: Stuart, David
Sent: Monday, December 4, 2017 10:22:11 AM
To: Katrina Blee
Subject: RE: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Katrina

I didn't get your previous email. Can you let me know what all this relates to?

Many thanks

David

David Stuart | Historic Places Adviser South West

From: Katrina Blee
Sent: 04 December 2017 09:18
To: Stuart, David
Subject: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

Further to my recent email, please now find attached the two surveys which have been distributed this weekend to residents.

The Draft Place Appraisal may be accessed at:

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

Kind regards

Katrina Blee

Chairman,

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

ITEM 4d – Acknowledgement Letter from Nick Cardnell, W&PBC re: Stage Two Survey

From: Nick Cardnell <NCardnell@dorset.gov.uk>

Sent: Monday, December 4, 2017 5:48:54 PM

To: 'Katrina Blee'

Subject: RE: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

Hi Katrina,

Thank you for circulating the place appraisal, two surveys and cover letter. I will certainly read through.

From my quick look, the place appraisal appears a very comprehensive piece of work – well done for pulling this document together.

I am also aware of concerns relating to the local list of Heritage Assets and will seek some feedback from my conservation colleagues.

Nick Cardnell

Senior Planning Officer – Planning (Community & Policy Development)

Dorset Councils Partnership serving:

www.dorsetforyou.com/contactus

From: Katrina Blee

Sent: 04 December 2017 09:11

To: Nick Cardnell

Subject: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

Further to my recent email, please now find attached the two surveys which have been distributed this weekend to residents.

The Draft Place Appraisal may be accessed at:

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

Kind regards

Katrina Blee

Chairman,

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

ITEM 4e Advice from Brian Wilson and Associates regarding Landowner, Local Heritage and Green Space objections arising from the Stage Two Survey consultation.

From: Brian Wilson
Sent: 05 December 2017 18:05
To: Katrina Blee
Subject: Re: Fw: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

Katrina,

My advice on local heritage assets would be the same as that for Local Green Spaces. People will have a formal chance to comment during the draft NP consultation and they should certainly be able to access the supporting evidence at that stage. Whether you make it widely available any sooner is your call, but is not a requirement.

For all that, it is not unhelpful to know in advance where there are likely objections on things like LGS and heritage assets. I don't doubt they will at least be born in mind when the draft NP comes to be written.

Brian
Brian Wilson Associates

On 05/12/2017 15:00, Katrina Blee wrote:

Thanks, what about the local heritage asset list?
Katrina.

From: Brian Wilson
Sent: 05 December 2017 14:49
To: Katrina Blee
Cc: neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk
Subject: Re: Fw: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

Katrina,

Landowners:

If there is local support for development, I would advise that the next stage is a call for sites, which is open to all local landowners.

All of the sites put forward by landowners would then be assessed on a consistent basis, which uses the same set of criteria.

Then, when the draft NP is formally consulted upon, landowners (like residents) will have an opportunity to comment. There will be a six week consultation at that point. The assessment of sites should also be made available for anyone to see at that stage.

You might want to add that, in the event anyone on the steering group/sub-groups puts forward a site themselves, they would not be allowed to take part in the site assessment process nor any decision about what development sites to include in the draft NP.

Local green spaces:

Landowners of sites which are being proposed as Local Green Spaces in the draft NP, will have a formal chance to comment at that stage. If they object, you will have to properly consider their objection and either accept it or give a stated reason why not.

The assessment criteria for Local Green Spaces should certainly be made widely available at that stage.

In truth, whether or not you make the existing LGS assessments available for people to see at this survey stage is up to you - there is no right/wrong answer in NP process terms. I can see that it might look more transparent. On the other hand, there's something to be said for establishing whether residents support these LGS proposals before finalising the assessments and going public with them.

Kind regards,
Brian
Brian Wilson Associates

On 05/12/2017 10:35, Katrina Blee wrote:

Hi Brian.

Please see below concerns from a landowner. If you remember we agreed at the session on 23rd September to delay sending a letter to landowners inviting them to present to a SG meeting, to await the community's opinions as to whether we should look outside the DB for housing.

Mr Llewellyn's concern is that there are residents who are landowners who have already had input to the process by way of completing resident surveys and sitting on the Steering Group committee.

We have also received representations from people unhappy about their property being suggested as green space, key view or local heritage asset, we took out some references to individual properties from the survey on the heritage assets and green spaces, but essentially they are still there in street scenes etc. One representation also states that we need to consult on proposed criteria as well as on the sites themselves.

Any advice would be appreciated before our next meeting on 19th December.

Kind regards,

Kate

ITEM 4f - Enquiry by resident regarding exclusion from the Neighbourhood Plan Area.

I sent the previous one from the Neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz email address. Here is the enquiry again:

This is an enquiry email via <http://www.suttonpoyntz.org.uk/> from:
Victoria Bailey

Hello

I have just stumbled upon your website and note that I am excluded from your area despite my Title Deeds state that I am Sutton Poyntz.

I live at 1 Malt Cottages Puddledock Lane which is the end terrace. I am just curious as my next door neighbour is included and now I am not.

Thank you.

I added some thoughts for a reply, which might thank her for her enquiry but note that the Neighbourhood Area was agreed by the Borough Council in September 2016 following extensive local consultation, which we advertised widely. Her Title Deeds almost certainly refer to "the Parish of Preston with Sutton Poyntz"; almost the whole of Littlemoor will have title deeds with the same reference, as will the Preston Road down to Overcombe Corner and all the roads leading off. So this in itself is not a reliable guide to the boundary of Sutton Poyntz. The boundary was set to include those post codes with Sutton Poyntz in the address, which includes Puddledock Lane down to and including Rimbrow Close but not Barleycorn Cottage, Wheatsheaf Old Bakery, Malt Villa or Malt Cottages which have a Preston postcode. This border matches the point where the river valley closes to its narrowest.

Regards,

Bill

ITEM 4g – Issues arising from a request by LB for pre-agenda access to specific items of correspondence intended for the full Steering Group.

Colin, please could you add Bill's thoughts below to the documentation to be considered at our meeting, together with a note from me as follows:

Following Colin's response to Liz's request for copies of correspondence sent to the Steering Group, Bill has offered his thoughts on some matters of principle. I think it would be useful therefore when we meet next week to clarify the position with documents available to the Steering Group.

It might also be useful for us as a group to hold a discussion about how the Steering Group is functioning. As member of the Group we are all equally responsible for getting the Neighbourhood Plan process right and it is important for us all to be forthcoming at meetings. To date, all decisions at the Steering Group bar one (ref the minutes of the October meeting) have been by consensus and it is therefore both surprising and worrying that we have had comments from some Steering Group members expressing concerns that the process is not going well, and also reservations have been expressed about the Survey, which was agreed by all the Steering Group.

I anticipate that at the time of our January meeting the survey results may well still be being collated, therefore we could use the January meeting for such a discussion.

Katrina.

From: William Egerton

Sent: 13 December 2017 11:48

To: Katrina Blee

Cc: Colin Marsh; neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk

Subject: Re: Draft Agenda for December Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meeting

Katrina,

Here are some thoughts about Liz's request. They're just my own personal thoughts on some matters of principle, so I have not copied them to the wider Group, but if they are of any use as a trigger for debate, then I would be very happy for you to pass them on, or to edit them as you prefer before passing them on.

If Liz is meeting with her lawyer on a personal matter, that is of course entirely up to her. It's not obvious to me how that can then be 'beneficial to the group' but in any case if documents that are about to come into the public domain would be useful to her in her discussion, I imagine the Steering Group would be happy to release them as draft. That does not necessarily apply to documents that we as Steering Group members have privileged access to and which are not released into the public domain; I think the existence and summarised content of correspondence is reported via Minutes, but the wording of the correspondence itself has not been made public. If Liz wanted to use that sort of material for private use, she should apply to the Steering Group for permission, explaining why she needs it, but we would probably then need to contact the originators for permission.

On the other hand, if Liz thinks the Steering Group needs legal advice, then the only appropriate and collegiate action for her would be to come to the Steering Group to explain why she thinks advice is needed, so that the Steering Group can decide what to do, if anything. The Steering Group would very rightly censure Liz if she takes unilateral action on behalf of the Steering Group without any consultation or instruction.

Finally, there is the thought that Liz might be taking legal advice about a possible challenge against some

action or decision of the Steering Group. Again, Liz absolutely has the right to do this, and our documents that are in the public domain are entirely available for her to use in this way. However as a Steering Group member I would hope Liz would try to explain to the Steering Group more clearly than I think she has done why she thinks its activities are open to challenge, and what it should have done instead.

As I say, these are just my personal thoughts about principle, which I offer to you for use as you see fit.

Regards,
Bill

On 12/12/2017 18:12, Elizabeth Brierley wrote:

As this is an open forum I think I am allowed to discuss matters with my lawyer to get a legal perspective - the conversation would be entirely confidential and beneficial to the group. No matter it can wait until Friday.

Liz

From: "safcol@aol.com" <safcol@aol.com>

To: lizbrierley@yahoo.co.uk

Cc: katemblee@live.co.uk; susan_higham@yahoo.co.uk; sueelgey@hotmail.co.uk; hdllewellyn@gmail.com; tony_ferrari@btopenworld.com; kfjohnson@talktalk.net; safcol@aol.com; wmegeerton@gmail.com; rozandkeith@blueyonder.co.uk; billdgm@gmail.com; andy.hohne@hotmail.com

Sent: Tuesday, 12 December 2017, 17:03

Subject: Re: Draft Agenda for December Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meeting

Liz,

I will send all correspondence early Friday with the final agenda once steering group members have had an opportunity to comment, just in case there are any other items to add to the attachments. That way everything is kept together and it provides ample time for people to read and consider the correspondence prior to discussion at the meeting next Tuesday.

Since the various correspondence items are addressed to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group it is not appropriate to disclose them, as you intimate, at any meeting prior to the Steering Group on Tuesday evening, both as a matter of protocol and with due respect to the originators. Can I please ask that you respect this.

Colin

-----Original Message-----

From: Elizabeth Brierley <lizbrierley@yahoo.co.uk>

To: safcol <safcol@aol.com>

Sent: Tue, 12 Dec 2017 14:07

Subject: Re: Draft Agenda for December Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meeting

Thanks Colin,

Could you let me see items 4b, 4e, and 4f as I they are relevant to a meeting I am having this week? I believe 4a has already been circulated by the plaintiff.

Thanks

Liz

From: Colin Marsh

To: William Egerton; Bill Davidson; Huw Llewellyn; Liz Brierley; Tony Ferrari; Andy Hohne; Sue Elgey; Sue Higham; Katrina Blee; Keith Johnson; Keith Hudson; Colin Marsh

Sent: Tuesday, 12 December 2017, 9:13

Subject: Draft Agenda for December Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meeting

Please find attached.

Can you let me have any additional items by Thursday 14th December latest and I will produce a final agenda with attachments for distribution prior to the meeting..

Colin

ITEM 9 – ADVICE REGARDING DECLARATION OF INTEREST FORMS

See below Nick Cardnell's advice regarding interests forms.

So we can either publish them, or publish a summary of interests, or provide details upon request.

We will need to discuss this on Tuesday night as I recall that one or two members said they did not want their interests made public.

Regards

Katrina.

Hi Katrina,

PPG advises that a qualifying body (Neighbourhood Forum) should be open in the preparation of its neighbourhood plan.

In this context I would encourage you to either make available or publish any conflict of interest forms, if requested.

You should however follow data protection legislation, so if you seek to publish this data, that you redact any personal information such as address / email / phone ect.. but retain the name of the individual and the conflict that may exist. You should also check that any statements made do not inadvertently reveal / adversely effect any [protected characteristics](#) (equalities legislation).

Nick Cardnell

Senior Planning Officer – Planning (Community & Policy Development)

Dorset Councils Partnership serving:

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

Email <mailto:NCardnell@dorset.gov.uk>

<http://www.dorsetforyou.com/contactus>

Katrina Blee To:you + 12 more Details

Dear Liz,

They were all lodged with the original minutes secretary, Mark Cribb, but after he resigned were no longer available, so I requested them again from people. I think I have most, but some failed to declare their own residence so need to amend their forms. From memory the only members of the Steering Group with interests other than their own residence were yourself (ref your partner's field and small farm business) and Bill Davidson (ref the field he and his wife own along Plaisters Lane), if upon checking the situation is different, I will let you know.

We did discuss whether they needed to be published, I think at August or September meeting, some were not happy for theirs to be published, I was to check with Nick Cardnell, I will chase him for a reply.

Regards,

Katrina

Liz,

Reference, declaration of interests, I do not hold such a list. I recall that the Steering Group and sub-group members were asked by the chair to sign a form some time ago and recall doing so myself. I can check back on the references to this in the approved minutes if you wish?

I am about to send out the agenda so will add this as you request.

Katrina,

Can you help on this please.

Colin

Colin,

I can't find a definitive list of declared conflicts of interest. Do we have one? I know we are not minded (quite rightly) to publish forms with names addresses and signatures on them but as a group we should I think have access to a list showing what we have declared as our interests so that we can be aware. Names and lists of declared interests would be fine. Apologies if we already have one, and if we do could you let me know where to find it. Perhaps we should publish a list without signatures on the website. Could you add to the Agenda for Tuesday please?

Thanks

Liz