

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 19th December 2017 in the Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz, commencing 19.33 hours.

Present: Katrina Blee (chair), Liz Brierley, Bill Davidson, Bill Egerton, Tony Ferrari, Keith Hudson, Andy Hohne, Keith Johnson, Huw Llewellyn, Colin Marsh.

A total of nine residents attending in relation to Item 4a of the agenda were welcomed by the chair and all persons present were asked to briefly introduce themselves.

1. Apologies

Apologies had been received in advance of the meeting from Sue Elgey and Susan Higham.

2. Change of Order of Agenda to address item 4a.

The chair sought and obtained the agreement of the meeting to bring forward item 4a of the agenda. Reference was made to the correspondence from several of the residents present which stated objections to the inclusion in the Stage Two Survey of questions about local heritage assets and green space directly affecting their land and properties.

The chair provided a brief background to the process leading to the production of the Stage Two Survey for the benefit of the residents in attendance. She explained that key themes drawn from the first survey had been researched by topic sub-groups and the Place Appraisal developed. Sub-groups had suggested questions for the survey and these had been discussed at a full day workshop with Brian Wilson and Associates, the planning consultants to the Steering Group.

One resident commented on the information gap between the first survey feedback and second survey questions, particularly in relation to local heritage assets where respondents had stated the importance of protecting older heritage sites such as those from the Iron Age, Bronze Age etc. BE commented that some responses had also referred to the protection of built heritage.

The residents present were all concerned that no consultation had taken place and that there was no notification of the inclusion in the survey of their land as potential green space and considered this to be bad manners. They also questioned the value of including the scene in Silver Street as a heritage asset when the properties were of very different styles.

LB intervened to personally apologise for not contacting residents in respect of the proposed list of local heritage assets and green space. She expressed concern as to the accuracy of the minutes and recalled that at the previous Steering Group meeting a decision had been taken to contact affected residents prior to including the list of green spaces in the survey and had contested the inclusion of some questions on the basis that they were leading. These views were strongly refuted as factually incorrect by the other members of the Steering Group.

BE confirmed that in respect of the Local Heritage Assets, residents had, as agreed, been contacted prior to distribution of the survey. He went on to outline the background research on the Local Heritage Asset question and the basic stages recommended of, making proposals to the community followed by local authority consultation with affected parties and emphasised that the survey question was simply the first of those key steps.

One resident questioned the need for a list of heritage assets given that the village already has planning protection as a conservation area and was concerned about the impact on his ability to make changes to his property, while another questioned precisely what the criteria were trying to achieve.

Another resident stated that a major concern was the negative financial impact on land price of green space designation and this was echoed by other residents whose land had also been listed as proposed green space within survey question four.

In relation to the lack of prior notification of green space CM explained that the North Dorset template had been used as guidance, the first key stage being to identify possible green space, followed by assessment and then contact with the landowner, a process which aligned with advice from the Steering Groups consultants.

A number of points were made by residents in relation to what they viewed as an inappropriate process of making policy prior to building evidence which was demonstrated by sites being listed in the survey. The chair, KJ and other members acknowledged this and stated that the intention had been to identify potential areas for formal assessment at a later stage rather than propose specific sites at this stage.

One resident questioned the need for a Neighbourhood Plan before local government re-organisation in April 2019. TF explained the need to meet a 'window of opportunity' in view of changes to the local authority structure. He further noted that if the community did not take the opportunity to influence planning in the locality this would fall to a local authority more remote than at present as a result of the proposed re-organisation and clarified that the planning authority would no longer be Weymouth. BE added that although the Local Plan has very strong policies experience has demonstrated that these are not implemented in many cases.

Upon reflection there was a general recognition among Steering Group members that the inclusion in the survey of a list of potential green spaces and local heritage assets could be seen as leading respondents, although this had not been the intention. The survey had been prepared in good faith taking into account advice from the group's planning consultants and had been endorsed before publication by the whole of the Steering Group without objection.

TF proposed that any survey feedback on the listed local heritage assets be disregarded. On this point BE conceded that local heritage listing was not hugely important but he did not believe it was right to drop green space. AH then proposed that the green space listing feedback should also be set aside.

CM confirmed that biodiversity had been one of the factors in the selection of the proposed green space locations to which one resident responded that several landowners were already using their land with this in mind.

There was a general move towards disregarding the feedback in relation to Q4 (Green Space) and Q13 (Local Heritage Assets) when the surveys were returned. It was suggested that an opportunity existed to take a step back and seek to achieve common objectives in other ways by working together.

Based upon the proposals from AH and TF it was agreed by all present that part a) of both question 4 and 13 of the Stage Two Survey be taken into account in the analysis but any information arising from part b) in both questions was to be disregarded.

LB suggested that for consistency reference to specific views in question 5 should also be removed. This received a mixed response and so a vote was taken on the basis of disregarding survey feedback on 'key views'; seven members (and all residents present) voted for the proposal and three members (AH,KJ,KH) voted against.

At this point, item 4a having been addressed, those residents present chose to leave the meeting. LB and others invited them to come along to future meetings or consider joining the steering group and participate in the future work of the group.

It was subsequently noted by several members that the terms of reference would need to be consulted as to whether non-Steering Group members should have a vote, although it was observed that the outcome would have been no different if only members of the Steering Group had voted.

Action:KB

3. To confirm the minutes of the previous meeting

LB had previously given notification of her intention to challenge the accuracy of the minutes and the content of her e-mail had been circulated in advance. LB commented on various points in this respect; the minutes needed to reflect the names of the areas removed from the original list of proposed green spaces, the length of the list was causing concern and the housing and planning questions needed to be moved near the front of the survey. Other members considered that the minutes were an accurate reflection of what had happened and the chair pointed out that the meeting had recognised that there were both pros and cons of moving the housing and planning questions to the front of the survey and the survey sub-group had upon further consideration decided to retain the original A to Z order of questions by key topic. It was agreed to add the names of the green spaces removed from the list against the map references for clarity.

KB also suggested an amendment under 5.3, question 5, line 10 to read "... be adopted for the survey, limited to views ...", this was agreed.

The minutes were then adopted as an accurate record subject to the above changes being incorporated.

4. To Address matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting

BE reported on the grant application which had been adjusted and re-submitted to take into account some increased printing costs arising from work on the Stage Two Survey and Place Appraisal and to incorporate reduced consultancy costs. A decision was expected by the end of the week.

5. Correspondence

Agenda item 4a - The chair confirmed that she would formally reply to each of the

written objections received taking into account the outcome of the discussion referred to in sub-section 2 above.

Agenda item 4b – Responding to the concerns expressed in the correspondence as to the lack of communication with landowners the chair emphasised the need for the Steering Group to urgently address this issue. It was noted that the Steering Group had been concerned about requesting the views of landowners before all land ownership had been identified and that the advice given by the consultants to wait and see if a call for sites was required following the survey prior to consulting with landowners had been acted upon. BD expressed concern that landowners as a group had been repeatedly ignored or avoided and this had left a vacuum and dissatisfaction of the kind shown by those residents who had attended the meeting earlier. It was suggested that the Steering Group must engage with those landowners who had been identified at the earliest opportunity in 2018 while continuing with their efforts to identify the ownership of some plots. It was decided to contact and engage with landowners as a matter of priority following the completion of the consultation with residents. It was agreed to:-

- i) Table the draft letter to landowners prepared earlier in the year and consider this along with a process for consultation at the next meeting. **Action:CM**
- ii) Re-affirm the definition of 'landowner' and produce a draft list of landowners and land owned for the next meeting. **Action:BE**

LB suggested that a public advertisement be considered in order to identify unknown ownership of land. It was agreed to consider this at a later stage should the need arise.

Agenda item 4c - Acknowledgement of receipt of the Stage Two Survey by Historic England was noted.

Agenda item 4d - Acknowledgement of receipt of the Stage Two Survey by Nick Cardnell of Weymouth and Portland Borough Council was noted.

Agenda item 4e - Advice on the informal consultation process by Brian Wilson and Associates to be retained for future reference.

Agenda item 4f – The chair will respond to the resident at Malt Villas explaining why they were not included in the Neighbourhood Area. **Action KB**

Agenda item 4g – LB enquired whether anyone could openly gain access to the contents of the 'neighbourhood@...' address as well as the minutes on the village web site. BE confirmed that such content was accessible and suggested that a program such as 'Outlook' was probably the best way in which to facilitate this. It was agreed that access would be given upon request.

The chair expressed concern at the delay in residents correspondence being acknowledged, particularly when sent to the 'neighbourhood@' e-mail address and pointed out that such acknowledgement should make it clear that the correspondence received will be available in the public domain, redacted in accordance with data protection legislation requirements, and would be dealt with at the next Steering Group meeting. She further suggested that an acknowledgement of receipt of correspondence within two working days was reasonable and this was agreed. It was noted that due to the high volume of e-mails using this address a standard manual

response would be needed and it was agreed that the chair draft a standard acknowledgement and liaise with BE. **Action:KB**

BE agreed to look at the practicalities of automated or other forms of acknowledgement in relation to communications received at the 'neighbourhood@' address. **Action: BE**

Referring to the e-mail from LB, CM sought clarification as to whether to hold back all correspondence until the final agenda was issued and it was agreed by all those present to do so.

6. To Receive a progress report from the Consultation Survey sub-group

The chair asked each of those present for feedback on the reception that they had received on the doorstep to date. On the whole this had been positive with the few concerns relating to some people objecting to a follow up call, politely declining to complete the survey, or having found the survey long and as a result having only half completed it. LB reported that she had received the most negative response as indicated in the e-mail circulated to all steering group members.

AH asked for clarification on the status of the group of six houses at the very top of Plasters Lane which were outside the Neighbourhood Area. It was confirmed that these residents would not be able to vote in the referendum for reasons of electoral law but would be fully integrated into the consultation process.

The chair asked for volunteers to input the data arising from the consultation survey. There were several volunteers (SE, AH, HL, KJ, KH, LB) and AH agreed to co-ordinate the recording process. KB confirmed that CM and herself were keeping a record of the receipt of surveys and all collected surveys are to be passed to them for forwarding to AH on 6th January 2018. It was agreed that survey responses should be entered by two individual teams of two or more members who would enter data from one half of the surveys and then exchange these with the other team for cross-checking.

It was confirmed that KB had drafted a spreadsheet for use when inputting survey feedback although this would need amending to reflect the earlier decision to set aside some survey feedback on specific lists of key views, local heritage assets and green spaces. **Action:KB**

KB asked whether the steering group wished to invite Brian Wilson (consultant) to the next meeting in order to discuss the survey results. It was unanimously agreed not to do so. **Action: AH/KB/CM**

7. To Receive reports from sub-groups

The chair formally recorded a vote of thanks to Peter Dye who had resigned last month and noted the vacancies created as a result, which were:-

- Vacancy on the Place Appraisal sub-group.
- Place Appraisal Editor
- Consultation Statement co-ordinator
- Vacancy on Sports and Recreation sub-group

The possible addition of new steering group members following the attendance by several residents earlier in the meeting was noted.

In the absence of any volunteers for the Place Appraisal sub-group it was suggested that Mike Haine be approached to join BE on this sub-group in view of his current involvement in formatting the document. It was agreed to leave the appointment of an editor, to the sub-group. **Action:BE**

As no volunteers were forthcoming for the Consultation Statement co-ordinator position it was suggested that the latest revision of the consultation statement document be circulated in order that the requirements of the role were clearer. The chair stressed that this document was a requirement and that a volunteer would have to come forward as soon as possible. **Action:KB**

It was noted that the Sports and Recreation sub-group still retained two members and this was deemed adequate. As with other sub-groups additional future members will however be welcome.

It was confirmed that no sub-groups had met since the last meeting.

It was agreed that the topic of key views be devolved to the Housing and Planning sub-group. **Action:LB**

In view of the decision made earlier at the meeting to disregard survey feedback on Local Heritage Assets, Green Space and Key Views it was decided that the affected sub-groups should meet before the next meeting. Other sub-groups would not need to meet until the survey feedback was known.

8. To Review progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetable

The chair reported that the plan was on schedule and received the agreement of the meeting for carrying out the second planned knock up of residents. All collected surveys were to be passed to CM/KB for passing on to AH on the 6th January 2018.

Action: All Distributors/KB/CM/AH

The chair confirmed that the timetable would need to be amended to reflect the revised sub-group meeting arrangements (reference final paragraph under Item 7)

Action:CM

9. Declaration of Interest records (item requested by LB).

The chair referred to the advice received from Nick Cardnell (Weymouth and Portland Borough Council) that declaration of interest records may be published in full or summarised. It was noted that signatures must be redacted but names should remain. LB suggested a summary document registering interests be placed on the web site. After brief discussion it was agreed that the optimum solution was a hyperlink between a PDF copy of the declaration of interest form and the steering group or sub-group members name on the village web site.

Action:BE

It was agreed that the completion of Declaration of Interest forms was compulsory for all Steering and sub group members. The chair was in possession of some forms and would contact all members in order to verify the accuracy of their form or seek a

completed form where these were outstanding. These would then be passed to BE for inclusion on the village web site. **Action KB / BE**

The list of contacts on the village noticeboard was to be updated. **Action:CM**

10. Any Other Business

KB informed the meeting that she may not be able to be present at the next meeting. TF agreed to deputise as chair should the need arise.

TF suggested that receipt of survey returns be recorded by each distributor, however it was concluded that it was preferable to retain the current arrangement of CM and KB as collectors in order to minimise the possibility of misplaced surveys and distributors were reminded to return their distributor checklist after the closing date for the receipt of surveys.

In response to a question from AH regarding the concerns raised by LB in her most recent e-mail (18th December), LB indicated that these had now been addressed sufficiently by the meeting for the proceedings to move on.

A brief discussion took place on the issue of surveys to businesses and their completion by employees. Although there was some uncertainty as to the status of employees it was agreed that those employees working in the village for companies based here could complete both the Stage Two and/or Housing Needs survey as appropriate.

BE referred to the need to engage with businesses as well as landowners and it was agreed to address this at the January meeting.

Date and time of the next meeting.

The date and time of the next meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 16th January 2018 at the Springhead Pub at 19.30 hours.

The meeting closed at 22.18 hours.