

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 16th January 2018 in the Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz, commencing 19.35 hours.

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

A total of four residents attending as observers, some with a possible interest in joining the Steering Group 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 Bill Davidson. The chair also reported that Keith Johnson expected to arrive late for the meeting.

2. To Approve the minutes of the previous meeting.

A suggested amendment identified by AH had been circulated in advance and was read out by the chair. It was agreed to add a sentence at the end of paragraph 3 under item 6 to read "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."

A second amendment requested by BD was agreed as follows. Amend item 5, paragraph 2, sentence two to read "It was noted ... had been identified and that the advice given ... had been acted upon. Follow with an additional sentence to read, "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."

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

3. To Receive an update on any actions arising from the minutes of the previous meeting (not otherwise on the agenda)

Item 5 – Agenda item 4g. The chair noted that BE had circulated a proposal that involved the automatic transfer of incoming e-mails to a second dedicated address. LB questioned whether it would be easier to transfer data upon request to a memory stick or other form of storage. BE explained that he did not know how this could be achieved with e-mails and sought guidance from the meeting. LB agreed to seek advice on how such a transfer could be achieved.

It was agreed that the arrangement proposed by BE for a copy archive be actioned whilst LB investigated other possibilities for achieving the required outcome.

Action: BE/ LB

4. To Address any items of Correspondence

There were no items of correspondence.

5. To Receive an update on the Grant Application

The chair reported that the grant application had been approved in part. The traffic survey conducted by Dorset County Council had been disallowed as it was ineligible expenditure and a reduction of £210 for printing had also been made. As this had seemed rather arbitrary, the chair and BE had agreed to query this which BE has done and is hoping to speak to the relevant grants officer at Locality within the coming week. In response to a question from AH it was confirmed that the costs of the traffic survey would be absorbed by the Sutton Poyntz Society. TF felt that the printing issue was of greater concern in the absence of an explanation as it could become an on-going issue. The convoluted and restrictive grant application process was outlined by BE who noted that the lack of communication with the grants officers meant that the risk of having applications for grant monies rejected was inherent. BE confirmed the total amount of the grant reduction as £300 from the traffic survey and £210 of the printing making a total of £510. The chair confirmed that as a non-parished forum we were entitled to a budget allowance of £15k and asked how much of this had been spent to date; BE explained that he did not have the specific figures available and would confirm these later.

In view of the potential effects of the budget shortfall the chair proposed an item be added to the agenda for the next meeting to review the range of technical support packages available as an alternative to grant funding.

Action:CM

BE confirmed that the grant monies awarded had yet to be received although they were due today.

6. To Receive an update on receipt and/or confirmation of Declaration of Interest Forms and confirm arrangements for publication.

The chair confirmed that the Steering Group had agreed that all its members and sub-group members needed to complete a Declaration of Interest form. All forms had been received and some minor amendments and clarification were required to those of J and C Crisp, AH (spouse information) and KJ (land ownership). The intention was to provide these in pdf format to BE for publication on the website with the chair retaining the originals. SH was reticent about this due to the possibility of identity fraud and although the chair said that residential addresses in the first section of the form could be redacted, SH still felt that names would be associated with the property interest and therefore people could be vulnerable. It was finally agreed to seek the advice of Nick Cardnell (Weymouth and Portland Borough Council) as to whether it was acceptable to publish the declaration of interest details and redact both the residential and land ownership address.

Action:KB

KJ joined the meeting at this point.

7. To Review the Terms of Reference of the Steering Group in respect of maximum membership and voting arrangements.

This item had arisen following the last meeting when a number of residents had expressed an interest in joining the Steering Group. The chair reaffirmed relevant terms of reference of the Steering Group; the Sutton Poyntz Society was the Neighbourhood Forum, only members of the group could vote at meetings, a maximum of 12 members was currently permitted. Several people were interested in joining the Steering Group including some residents who were present. The status of the Sutton Poyntz Society in relation to the Steering Group was clarified and it was

confirmed that the latter consisted of non-members as well as members of the Society. HL sought clarification that membership of the Sutton Poyntz Society did not constitute a declaration of interest.

KB proposed that the Terms of Reference be amended to reflect:

- a) a revised maximum membership for the Steering Group of 18
- b) that sub-group members must also complete a Declaration of Interests form.

This was agreed without objection. BE and KB will liaise on the exact wording and proposed amendments will then be put to the Sutton Poyntz Society for ratification.

Action: KB/BE

In response to a question on dispute resolution with village residents affected by Steering Group decisions CM explained that whilst the group must listen and take note of concerns the Neighbourhood Plan process incorporated a formal objections stage which will be administered by the Local Authority. It was therefore agreed that such a dispute resolution is not appropriate for the Terms of Reference.

8. To Consider advance publication of agendas and draft minutes.

This item had been requested by the chair in the interests of openness and transparency so that the general public were made fully aware of the topics to be discussed in advance of the meeting and had early access to draft minutes following meetings. She went on to propose that in future:

- a) a more detailed agenda along with the draft minutes and attachments would be uploaded to the web site as soon as available with addresses and personal data on attachments being redacted as appropriate;
- b) the front page of the agenda is posted on the noticeboard by the village pond.
- c) draft minutes are published on the website as soon as they are made available to the Steering Group.

This was agreed.

Action: KB/BE/CM

The chair confirmed that a suitable acknowledgement had been drafted for use so that people are informed that their correspondence will be considered at the next Steering Group meeting and that their correspondence would therefore appear on the public agenda, with personal data redacted. Correspondents will receive an acknowledgement within two working days.

9. To Receive a progress report on the Stage Two Consultation Survey.

The chair reported that of the 526 surveys distributed 261 had been returned completed which was about 50%. The final figures would need to take into account some extra surveys issued to replace those lost by residents and those that had duplicated e-mail copies sent, such as the Evangelical Church and Wessex Water. It was agreed that where a household had returned a survey with a positive indication that it was for a specific number of people this would be counted as multiple survey returns. It was confirmed in response to a question from SH that where respondents had ticked more than one box, each of these was to be added to the count. LB sought confirmation that a much lower number of Housing Needs Survey forms had been completed and the meeting was reminded that if respondents answered no to

the first question on that survey they did not need to complete it, i.e. if they are not in housing need.

The chair thanked all of the distributors and considered this to be a fantastic response and hoped that the final report would be completed in time for the February meeting. AH noted that the data entry was being undertaken by three teams of two persons each. It was noted that in addition to internal team's cross-checking each other's entries the Sutton Poyntz Society as the Neighbourhood Forum had requested an independent audit of the results. A 10% random sample was suggested and Mr. John Allen who lives outside the area was to be contacted as the prospective external auditor. This was agreed. **Action:BE**

It was confirmed in response to a question by KJ that all additional comments should be recorded in the 'insert comments' box of the spreadsheet.

Liz Crocker (resident) asked how the Place Appraisal related to the overall Neighbourhood Plan and it was explained that this contained background information on the village that would underpin and probably form an annexe to the plan. A further question was asked regarding the reason for a separate Housing Needs Survey and it was explained that as a non-parished Neighbourhood Area it was necessary to obtain information on types of housing demand etc. in order to inform policy creation

Given the requirement to assess only those housing needs within the defined Neighbourhood Area the particular difficulties encountered as a result of Sutton Poyntz forming only part of a municipal area were explained. It was confirmed that the Housing Needs Survey (HNS) had been drawn up by consultants experienced in this particular field. The chair highlighted the possible need to have the HNS results analysed by the consultant.

10. To Review the draft list of landowners and agree final arrangements for consultation.

A draft letter prepared some time ago along with the map of identified landowners had been circulated in advance. The letter was agreed as suitable subject to inclusion of a brief addition after the second sentence of the first paragraph in order to make reference to the recent stage two survey.

BE confirmed that he believed the map of landowners was now complete. One contact address was unknown but a letter box was located at the site concerned.

It was agreed that the amended letter be circulated to each of the landowners on the list. **Action:BE/CM**

11. To Appoint the Consultation Statement co-ordinator

Since the current consultation statement had not been circulated it was decided to defer this item to the February meeting. KB would liaise with Peter Dye in order to obtain a current copy of the document for subsequent circulation. **Action:KB**

12. To Receive reports from sub-groups

a) Biodiversity and the Natural Environment

The report circulated by KB and CM suggesting an independent third party evaluation of potential greenspace was noted. It was recognised that at some point a short list of proposed local green space would need to be established subject to a positive response in the stage two survey. LB emphasised the importance of using valid assessment criteria and KB suggested that feedback from Nick Cardnell (Weymouth and Portland Borough Council) indicated the North Dorset model as one possibility and referred to Historic England guidance in respect of local heritage assets. BE suggested that Nick Cardnell may be able to advise on a suitable consultant to undertake a green infrastructure assessment as well as other assessments and the chair agreed to contact him in this regard. **Action: KB**

Liz Crocker (resident) emphasised that biodiversity criteria were only one part of green space assessment and wondered why the AONB did not in itself give sufficient protection. The chair explained that some green spaces may, if developed, have a low impact on the AONB but the community may feel that they should be preserved as green spaces. BE reiterated his comments from the last meeting that the local planning authority does not seem to apply its own policies strongly and related one instance where the AONB officer had advised that a development would have a detrimental impact on the AONB but the planning officer disagreed and recommended approval.

b) Heritage

BE reported that the Heritage sub-group had communicated by telephone and that minutes were being prepared. The sub-group had reaffirmed the idea of a list of local heritage assets as a good one and hoped that the information generated earlier would not be wasted. They recognised that the conservation area status gave a good level of protection but that a local list would be a useful addition. It was suggested that subject to village support for such a list in the survey returns the local authority may be able to assist with an assessment. BE commented that should assessments become a budgetary issue green infrastructure should take priority.

c) Housing and Planning.

The group had not met. TF emphasised the importance of addressing key views and LB referred to her earlier e-mail about adopting a collaborative approach and considered that since there was an overlap with green space and heritage assets a single consultant may be able to carry out the entire assessment process. It was questioned whether one person would possess the necessary range of expertise.

LB agreed to speak to the Conservation Officer about the best approach for these aspects, e.g. key views. **Action: LB**

CM reminded the meeting that no decision can be taken until the full results of the public survey are known and that any resulting assessment should be conducted under the guidance of an independent competent professional. The chair then summarised the key points of the discussion.

BE reported that Peter Dye had raised the issue of the deferred tree survey at the Sutton Poyntz Society meeting and suggested that one of the people who had quoted for this would be able to undertake the whole of the green infrastructure assessment.

This was noted and will be discussed when advice has been sought on both the criteria and expertise required.

d) Other Sub-group reports

Place Appraisal - BE reported that Mike Haine was prepared to continue in his current editorial role for the Place Appraisal without formally joining the sub-group. As no other new members of the sub-group were forthcoming KB volunteered to join the Place Appraisal sub-group.

The chair suggested that all sub-groups should now continue to meet and focus on developing an 'introduction' and reminded everyone that the Steering Group is now entering the policy writing stage which would begin once the results of the stage two survey were known.. TF suggested the need for a structured approach, however KB and CM considered that the priority was to firstly collate all available information and consider any additions to the Place Appraisal. It was agreed to re-circulate the template previously provided by Brian Wilson and Associates to assist sub-groups in their work. **Action: CM**

The chair suggested that a sub-group may need to be established to deal with an introduction to the Neighbourhood Plan along with a section on Vision and Objectives. This was left for future consideration.

13. To Review progress against the Neighbourhood Plan timetable.

It was suggested that sub-group evidence be collated and an introduction prepared in time for the March meeting of the Steering Group, possibly with policy outlines.. AH queried whether there was a good example Neighbourhood Plan to act as a model. It was felt that numerous good examples existed on-line, all with their respective merits.

14. Any Other Business

Each person was asked by the chair if they had any other business. One matter was raised by AH who was concerned as to any budget overspend. BE considered that we remained well within the budget and as previously agreed will provide an update on actual and projected expenditure in time for circulation with the agenda prior to the next meeting. **Action: BE/CM**

The meeting closed at 21.25 hours.

The date and time of the next meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 20th February 2018 at 7.30pm.