

# **Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group**

**Agenda for meeting on 20th February 2018 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 Keith Hudson)**
- 2. To Approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2018**
- 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 - Communication from Nick Cardnell (Weymouth and Portland Borough Council) regarding consultants for local heritage asset, green space and key view assessment. To be considered under item 10.**
  - Item 4b- Responses to Landowner Consultation letter received to date: to note and agree responses.**
  - Item 4c- Communication from Nick Cardnell ( Weymouth and Portland Borough Council) regarding publication of conflicts of interests. To be considered under Item 7.**
- 5. To Note resignations from sub-groups and receive an update on any new Steering Group members**
- 6. To Appoint a Consultation Statement Coordinator**
- 7. To Finalise publication of conflicts of interests information including suggestion by KB.**
- 8. Stage Two Survey/ Housing Needs Survey**
  - Item 8a to receive a report from the Survey Sub—Group (attached. Note record of meeting of 12/02/18 pre-circulated)**
  - Item 8b to receive schedules of survey feedback from each survey (pre-circulated on 15/02/18)**
  - Item 8c to consider how/ when to communicate results to the community**
- 9. To Receive sub-group reports:**
  - a) Place Appraisal**
  - b) Biodiversity and the Natural Environment (previously circulated record of meetings held 25/01/18 and 07/02/18 )**
  - c) Employment, Business and Tourism including IT/Communications .**
  - d) Heritage**
  - e) Housing and Planning**
  - f) Sports and Recreation ( additional members required)**
  - g) Transport (previously circulated record of meeting held 07/02/18 )**
- 10. To Agree arrangements for professional assessment of potential green spaces, key views and heritage assets and agree timeline for public consultation.**
- 11. To Agree arrangements for drafting of Neighbourhood Plan Introductory chapter to include review of Plan vision and objectives.**
- 12. To Review progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetable (attached).**

**13. To Receive a balance sheet on current income and expenditure (attached) and confirm a single point of accountability for future financial reporting and grant application processing.**

**14. To Review need for any technical support packages in lieu of grant funding**

**15. Any Other Business**

**16. Date and Time of the Next Meeting**

To confirm the date and time of the next meeting as Tuesday 20th March 2018 at 7.30pm.

ITEM 2 – Minutes of the Previous Meeting

**Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group**

**Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup> February 2018 at 7.30pm.

#### **ITEM 4 – CORRESPONDENCE**

##### **Item 4a Letter from Nick Cardnell – Weymouth and Portland Borough Council**

**From:** Nick Cardnell <[NCardnell@dorset.gov.uk](mailto:NCardnell@dorset.gov.uk)>

**Sent:** Monday, January 22, 2018 9:27:37 AM

**To:** 'Katrina Blee'

**Subject:** RE: Local Green Space Designation

Hi Katrina,

As a general rule we don't recommend consultants but direct Neighbourhood Planning groups to the RTPI consultants list. <https://www.rtpiconsultants.co.uk/#/>

Other smaller consultants not on this list can often be picked up in google searches. I would recommend seeking at least three quotes.



I would also mention that the Councils have appointed LUC <https://landuse.co.uk/> to undertake a Landscape and Heritage assessment in support of the Local Plan Review which could be a good start for your search.

**Nick Cardnell**

**Senior Planning Officer – Planning (Community & Policy Development)**

**From:** Katrina Blee  
**Sent:** 19 January 2018 22:46  
**To:** Nick Cardnell  
**Subject:** RE: Local Green Space Designation

Many Thanks, Nick. I had raised concerns about doing any assessment ourselves although the sub- group said it did use the HE guidance to which you refer.

We have decided that if there is support in principle in the Stage 2 survey results, which are currently being inputted, for protection of key views, green spaces, heritage assets and also a green corridor that we will use funding to have these professionally assessed, one of my actions is to ask you if you can suggest any consultants we could approach for these pieces of work. We are presuming we may need one for the green infrastructure and another for the heritage assets.

Any suggested contacts would be gratefully received.

Many Thanks,

Katrina

From: Nick Cardnell <[NCardnell@dorset.gov.uk](mailto:NCardnell@dorset.gov.uk)>

Date: 19/01/2018 16:53 (GMT+00:00)

To: 'Katrina Blee'

Subject: RE: Local Green Space Designation

Hi Katrina,

I have now received the following comments from our Conservation Team. Their comments refer to the heritage sub-groups local heritage assets note and scores.

- There is a brief description of how the scoring was undertaken but no description of what the ++/+/0/-/-- values were for each criteria. E.g. what was required to score a ++ in the age criteria and what was required for a --
- I am also unclear on how each of these scores were determined for each asset. E.g. why did the Pub, including roadside wall and tree only score 0?

- I am sure there is a set definition on how each criteria should be scored and without this I can really comment on the Heritage Asset selection.
- A description of each asset including a brief description of its age, aesthetic, historic, social and group value, would be required to truly understand the heritage assets.

Reading Pauls comments above and the note myself I would agree that further work is required. I would suggest that the subjectivity of the current assessment could be removed through a set of 'selection criteria' against which an asset can then be assessed. I would refer you to a handy guidance note on the local listing process prepared by Historic England which sets out an example methodology.

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/local-heritage-listing-advice-note-7/> I would hope that by following this note that the robustness of your supporting evidence can be improved and the process made more transparent for any objectors.

**Nick Cardnell**

**Senior Planning Officer – Planning (Community & Policy Development)**

**From:** Katrina Blee

**Sent:** 10 January 2018 13:25

**To:** Nick Cardnell; Bill and Ruth egerton; Bill Davidson; Liz Brierley; Colin Marsh; Andy Hohne; Sue Elgey; Susan Higham; Keith Johnson; Keith Hudson; Tony Ferrari; Huw Llewellyn

**Cc:** Jack Winsper; Brian Wilson; Julie Tanner

**Subject:** Re: Local Green Space Designation

That's a shame. We have applied for and received funding for this piece of work so can go down that route if necessary.

Thanks for the North Dorset note, actually the Biodiversity Sub-Group, of which I am member, already has this and the Locality one ....

There has been some upset about lack of consultation on potential heritage assets, green spaces in the survey - from landowners and householders who were concerned about land/property values and future restrictions protections might mean, but also felt that the inclusion of suggested lists was leading, and that the proposed assessment should have been consulted on at this stage, so I think we will probably use a consultant to assess so that it is seen as independent. The survey questions were designed not to be leading, and we had assistance and advice from our consultant in their preparation, but on balance, the Steering Group decided that as more could have been done before publishing the survey to engage with those householders/landowners potentially affected, we will set aside any answers to the tables of suggested locations for protection in the current survey and just record the answers to the principle of protection for green spaces, local heritage assets and also key views. We are thus having to revisit consultation regarding these three potential policy areas, but you are right; there will be different positions and of course there will always be people who disagree with draft or emerging policies.

Did you ever hear back from your conservation colleagues on the local heritage assets point?

I would encourage you to read the latest minutes which address the objections received, including those you were copied in on. You will also note from previous minutes that the whole Steering Group agreed the survey questions and process by consensus without the need for any voting or recording of dissent.

Objectors who wrote in have been replied to formally, and some of them also attended the last meeting and hope to come along next week too. Hopefully we can turn this in into a positive and encourage more people to become involved in the process.

Survey returns - we received approximately 50% completed surveys back, final numbers yet to be confirmed, so that is positive.

Thanks for the offer of checking any assessment work undertaken, that is useful. I may run by you what we intend to do re LH assets, key views and green spaces before we get too far along any new consultation, if that's okay.

Your advice and support is much appreciated.

I am sending this, for information purposes, to the whole Steering Group, and copying to a non-Steering Group member of the Biodiversity Group and also our two consultants.

Kind regards,

Katrina

**Item 4b – Responses to Landowner Consultation letter received to date.**

«name\_address»  
«email»

Dear «addressee»

The community of Sutton Poyntz is currently engaged in preparing a Neighbourhood Plan under the Localism Act of 2011. We have requested and gained general feedback from all stakeholders in our October 2016 survey, which has been very helpful. As you will be aware we have also just completed a more specific stage two survey aimed at residents and those working in the area.

We are now seeking to address specific issues related to current and future land use. As part of the information gathering process we are contacting owners of land within the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan area. We understand that you own some land outside the Development Boundary, as shown in the attached map; it would be really helpful if you would be prepared to share your thoughts in answer to the following questions:

1. Do you foresee any change in the use of the land that you own during the lifetime of the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan (next 18 years)?
2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, we would be grateful if you could please confirm the

extent of your land ownership and outline your plans or ideas. If you would prefer to discuss this directly with us we would be happy to set up an early meeting.

3. In order to help meet the aspirations of the community and its stakeholder partners -

a) What do you believe you or your organisation could offer that would help make Sutton Poyntz a better place in which to live and work?

b) Do you feel the Sutton Poyntz community could assist you in meeting your aspirations?

We would be pleased to receive your reply in writing, electronically or, as suggested above, at a meeting at a mutually convenient time. Your response would be welcomed by Friday 16<sup>th</sup> February in order to help us move the plan process forward.

If you would like to find out more about Neighbourhood Plans and/or what we are doing locally, some information is available on the following web sites:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2>

<http://www.suttonpoyntz.org.uk/neighbourhood>

Yours sincerely

Kate Blee

Chair

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

## RESPONSES

Colin Marsh 24 Jan

to neighbourhood

With reference to your letter of 23rd January 2018 we are able to confirm in respect of question one that we do not foresee any change of use of the land as identified in the attached map which forms the curtilage to our residence at 2 The Puddledocks.

Colin Marsh

Rita Oxy

---

**enquiries enquiries@punchtaverns.com [via suttonpoyntz.org.uk](http://www.suttonpoyntz.org.uk) 25 Jan**

to neighbourhood

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thankyou for your email dated 24<sup>th</sup> January 2018, this has been forwarded to our Legal and Estates department.

Should you need anything further please email them directly using [legalandestates@punchtaverns.com](mailto:legalandestates@punchtaverns.com)

**Kind Regards**

**Amy Kelly - Walley**

**Punch Contact Centre**

Tel: 01283 523689 / 01283 502222

**Punch:** Jubilee House - Second Avenue - Burton upon Trent - DE14 2WF

**William Egerton** 26 Jan

to neighbourhood

*Thank you for your letter. We can confirm that we have no plans for any change of use of the land we own behind Northdown Farmhouse.*

*Bill & Ruth Egerton*

---

**Peter Broatch** [via suttonpoyntz.org.uk](mailto:suttonpoyntz.org.uk) 29 Jan

to neighbourhood

Dear Kate,

Thank you for your email of 23<sup>rd</sup> January asking about future land use.

As regards change in land use over the next 18 years, and specifically land under our ownership (Northdown Farm), I would like to make the following observations:

- We are looking to eventually provide longer duration camping facilities in this area. To this end the most feasible land is at Northdown Farm, specifically the one field which we currently use for camping adjoining our track. We believe that this is visually screened from the village, and would not have a significant impact on the amenity of the local area. We would not envision adding significant permanent facilities, which unfortunately often turns many campsites into small towns. There would be some direct employment benefits, as well as increased business for the local pubs and shops.
- In association with the Osmington White Horse Restoration/Viewpoint group it has been mooted to provide a parking and viewpoint area at the entrance to Northdown Farm. We are generally supportive of this proposal. We think this could work well in conjunction with the provision of an 'eco café' on that site. I don't believe this would have any significant visual impact to any of the views noted in the consultation/questionnaire document, and it could be a valuable and popular asset for the local community(ies), as well as providing local employment.
- We do not imagine that any of our land at Northdown would be suitable for housing or similar development. Long term if there was a significant increase in the viability of farming then it may be that an agriculturally tied

dwelling would be appropriate at Northdown, with associated livestock buildings. This would most likely be centred somewhere near the end of White Horse Lane, however this is just conjecture at present.

In answer to your third question:

- The above mentioned viewpoint and café would be a benefit to the community.
- We believe that the continued use of Northdown as a pure grassland/livestock farm, as opposed to part arable, benefits the landscape and walkers. This grassland use is supported by operating camping there, whereas a more farming led approach may point to arable as the most profitable enterprise.
- Support from the local community, if it's thought appropriate, would make these projects more likely to come to fruition.

I hope the above is of interest, and I look forward to seeing the correlated data from the consultations when it is published.

Kind regards

Peter Broatch

Eweleaze Farm Ltd

---

**John Llewelyn** 13 Feb

to neighbourhood, pauldanceltd

Dear Sirs

Thank you for your letter of 23rd January.

We have now spoken to our planning consultant Paul Dance, who we have copied in on this email.

We understand that the community are keen to make sure that the village is able to provide employment and to be a place that young people can afford to live. To that end, we would expect the plan to provide a variety of solutions to enable SP to be able to provide that and to keep the community vibrant. We would be keen to facilitate that in whatever way we can. We understand that there is unlikely to ever be a need for large housing developments at SP but there may be requirement for affordable housing for rent or sale or for small scale developments to assist with the housing requirements.

We would be happy for Paul to come and talk to you or for you to work with ourselves/Paul in whatever way is best for you in order to achieve that aim.

We have, of course, already provided you with a copy of the plans from the Land Registry showing the extent of the land owned by the Seals at Sutton Poyntz.

Yours sincerely

John Llewelyn

**John Llewelyn**

29 Jan

to neighbourhood

Thanks Kate

I will come back to you very shortly once I have had time to discuss the matter with the Seals.

You mention consultation has already taken place with 'stakeholders', residents and people who work in Sutton Poyntz.

Just for clarity could you confirm:-

- 1 Who are the 'stakeholders'?
- 2 How did you ascertain the identities of those that worked there? Our tenants and agents have not been consulted but perhaps it is only certain kinds of people who work there who are classified as people who work there for the purposes of 'consultation'?

Look forward to hearing from you and hope you are well.

John

---

**JC Morris** 29 Jan

to neighbourhood

For the attention of Kate Blee and SPNP Steering Group

*Specific Issues with land in Sutton Poyntz - Mr and Mrs Morris.*

Thank you for your letter concerning the use of land to the North West of [redacted] and as shown [shaded green] on the enclosed map to your letter.

With regard to your Questions:

1. - The land was bought some years ago - and is defined as agricultural land - and was not for development. It is currently down to grass and is likely to stay that way for the next 18+years. Minor variants could be as an orchard or for the growing of vegetables, but nothing is yet planned. Essentially it is agricultural land and will stay that way.
2. - This is agricultural land, during my ownership it will remain that way. It was bought as a buffer against Development.
3. - a) Sutton Poyntz is a pretty good place to live at the moment and has been good place to live for the last 30 years in my case. The only problem we have at the moment [and this is governed by time factors out of everyones control] is that people are getting older. Many of my neighbours got rid of their cars to save the planet, but now with the bus timetable reduced and perhaps at inconvenient times they are locked in the village more than they would like. It would be nice if younger families could afford to live in the village, but until there are well paid jobs in Weymouth/Portland/Dorchester then the numbers are likely to be restricted.  
The use of the term "Affordable Housing" is often a misnomer. The government definition - "Affordable housing is social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market." In many cases in Dorset "Affordable Housing" has been built not to accommodate the people of Dorset but to accommodate families from Bristol or London.  
\_ b) I think that the Sutton Poyntz community is one of the finest in the country - and long let it remain so.

You have asked landowners with land outside the Development Boundary to share their thoughts. I also note that one of your Steering Group has written a "Declaration of Interest". Will all members of the Steering Group "with an interest" be declaring that interest.

**Richard Porter** 31 Jan

to neighbourhood

31st January 2018

Dear Kate,

Thank you for your letter delivered to me by hand regarding land that I own that is included in the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood plan area.

The purpose of the letter was to enquire as to how I see the future use of the land over the next 18 years. The land that I own constitutes two areas. One area east of the river Jordan adjoining the Old Bakehouse, and that west of the river fronting Puddledock Lane.

In answer to your question, as long as I live at the Old Bakehouse I have no intention of applying for or changing the use of any of the land from what it is now, a green area used by wildlife and occasional sheep grazing.

However, if during the next 18 years I sell the Old Bakehouse, which sadly is likely as I will be 92 in 18 years time, then I will have to think what benefits selling the land to the east of the river fronting Puddledock Road would have to my family. This land is currently outside the current development plan, but having a road boundary may be acceptable for development in the future. The land to the east of the river will as I see it always stay undeveloped and a green area.

That said, I have no plan to seek changes to its current use whilst I own the Old Bakehouse and land.

Yours

Richard Porter

---

**Liz Crocker** 13 Feb

to Katrina, neighbourhood, Hannah

Dear Kate and Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group,

Thank you for your letter on 23 January 2018, we welcome the engagement with landowners by the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Forum. I can confirm we are the owners of the land identified within the attached map.

The letter states that the Forum now seeks to address "specific issues related to current and future land use". Unfortunately the letter does not set out what these specific issues are or how the questions asked of land owners seeks to address them.

We are however keen for meaningful engagement with the Forum and have given due consideration to your questions. Unfortunately the timescales over which you seek answers/reassurances (18 years) makes it very difficult to provide meaningful answers. I would hasten to add that if you asked any home owner, or asset owner, what their plans were for the next 18 years it would be impossible to say. Decisions are influenced by many (often unpredictable) internal and external factors.

What we can confirm is that our land is currently used for small holding purposes, serving as the extended garden of [redacted], and given that our land is privately owned with no public access we do not require any additional help in meeting our aspirations.

Question three asks landowners to consider how they can help meet the aspirations of the community and its stakeholder partners. We would welcome clarification on what the aspirations of the community and stakeholder partners are, and what evidence is available to support this. We would also ask who are the stakeholder partners? We feel that landowners should also be considered as an important stakeholder going forward.

Best wishes,

Richard, Ann, Hannah and Liz Crocker

**Katrina Blee** [via suttonpoyntz.org.uk](http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk) 14 Feb

to Liz, neighbourhood, Hannah



Dear Liz and family,

Thank you for your response to the Steering Group's letter. This will be considered along with other responses received at the next meeting of the Steering Group on 20<sup>th</sup> February.

Kind regards,

Kate

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

*mail:* [neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk](mailto:neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk)

23 January 2018

Dear Mr & Mrs Cunningham

The community of Sutton Poyntz is currently engaged in preparing a Neighbourhood Plan under the Localism Act of 2011. We have requested and gained general feedback from all stakeholders in our October 2016 survey, which has been very helpful. As you will be aware we have also just completed a more specific stage two survey aimed at residents and those working in the area.

We are now seeking to address specific issues related to current and future land use. As part of the information gathering process we are contacting owners of land within the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan area. We understand that you own some land outside the Development Boundary, as shown in the attached map; it would be really helpful if you would be prepared to share your thoughts in answer to the following questions:

1. Do you foresee any change in the use of the land that you own during the lifetime of the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan (next 18 years)? No
2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, we would be grateful if you could please confirm the extent of your land ownership and outline your plans or ideas. If you would prefer to discuss this directly with us we would be happy to set up an early meeting. n/a
3. In order to help meet the aspirations of the community and its stakeholder partners -
  - a) What do you believe you or your organisation could offer that would help make Sutton Poyntz a better place in which to live and work? n/a
  - b) Do you feel the Sutton Poyntz community could assist you in meeting your aspirations?

We would be pleased to receive your reply in writing, electronically or, as suggested above, at a meeting at a mutually convenient time. Your response would be welcomed by Friday 16<sup>th</sup> February in order to help us move the plan process forward.

If you would like to find out more about Neighbourhood Plans and/or what we are doing locally, some information is available on the following web sites:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2>

<http://www.suttonpoyntz.org.uk/neighbourhood>

Yours sincerely

*K. Blee*

Kate Blee  
Chair  
Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Dear Alison,

That would not be too much of a problem. We are wanting to collate replies as soon as possible, and it would be useful to have your reply prior to our meeting on 20th February ideally, if this is a problem, our next meeting is 20th March, so something from you by around the 16th March would be acceptable.

Many thanks,

Katrina.

---

**From:** Alison Creighton (nee Wyatt) <Alison.Creighton@wessexwater.co.uk>

**Sent:** 08 February 2018 14:54

**To:** Katrina Blee

**Subject:** Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Kate

Further to your letter of 23<sup>rd</sup> January, I am currently collecting comments from the various different parts of Wessex Water in order to respond to your questions.

I hope to get back to you by 16<sup>th</sup> February, as requested but I would be grateful if you would let me know if this deadline could be extended at all, just in case I don't have all relevant replies by then.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,  
Alison

**Alison Creighton**  
**Estates Officer**  
**Wessex Water**

**Terry Pegrum**

14 Feb

to neighbourhood

Dear Kate,

I would be pleased to share my thoughts on the future of the land I own in Sutton Poyntz, at a meeting at a mutually convenient time.

Please suggest dates and times.

Yours Sincerely

T Pegrum

J. Hyde

I foresee no change in the use of the above land; it is part of my garden and I expect it to remain so.

J. Hyde

30.01.2018



3.2.2018.

Dear Mrs Blee.

Thank you for your letter as you say, we own land outside the Development Boundary.

In answer to your enquiry - no change of use will take place.

Yours Sincerely

Margaret & Norman Brown.



Dear Katrina

Thank you for your letter requesting that we share our thoughts on several questions relating to our plot of land. Our comments to the questions are as follows:

1. Yes

2. As you are aware we have applied for planning permission to build one dwelling for ourselves. If this application is unsuccessful we are considering a number of other options.

3. a)

We do not know what the aspirations of the community are as we hear a variety of views. Some of these views are conflicting. We feel one dwelling on this plot would be an improvement. The previous owners of the new dwelling to the north removed the hedge without permission. We have started a new hedge and intend to complete this hedge to the full extent of the northern boundary.

b)

Yes by moving the development boundary.

Yours sincerely

Bill.

Thu, 15 Feb 2018 20:29

Katrina Blee  
To:you Details

Here you go. I have thought of a solution which might be reassuring for everyone. I suggest we publish on the website an excel spreadsheet of SG members with a name column and then columns listing interests putting the actual address of any land ownership but not stating whether this is their residential address or not and say actual forms are held by me and can be viewed on request. You can add this suggestion to the agenda if you like.

Katrina

---

**From:** Nick Cardnell <[NCardnell@dorset.gov.uk](mailto:NCardnell@dorset.gov.uk)>  
**Sent:** 07 February 2018 16:39:57  
**To:** 'Katrina Blee'  
**Subject:** RE: declaration of interests

Hi Katrina,

I would continue to advise you that private addresses should be identified in the interests of transparency – this is however your choice.

The purpose of the form is really to safeguard the steering group from accusations of bias / conflicts of interest at any later stage.

Data protection is also an issue. Current and future data protection rules should be followed. I am aware that the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) becomes enforceable in May 2018.

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

**From:** Katrina Blee  
**Sent:** 01 February 2018 14:52  
**To:** Nick Cardnell  
**Subject:** Re: declaration of interests

I looked at these but the point is they do not identify the councillors private address. The form we used has the name and address, then list the interests, one member in particular is concerned about identity fraud, so we suggested redacting the address attached to the name and keeping the address only in the interests part, but then someone suggested that we might be able to just say 'have interest in property or land within the NP area' but I was not sure that this was transparent enough, hence my question.

Attach one of our forms, so you can see what I mean.

Katrina

---

**From:** Nick Cardnell <[NCardnell@dorset.gov.uk](mailto:NCardnell@dorset.gov.uk)>  
**Sent:** 01 February 2018 14:35  
**To:** 'Katrina Blee'  
**Subject:** RE: declaration of interests

Hi Katrina, I would suggest applying a similar level of detailed as supplied by Weymouth & Portland Councillors. This would include private residential addresses. Nick

<https://moderngovdcp.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/mgMemberIndexGroup.aspx?g=WPBC&m=WPBC>

**From:** Katrina Blee  
**Sent:** 30 January 2018 14:51  
**To:** Nick Cardnell  
**Subject:** declaration of interests

As some of our SG members are concerned about identity fraud, is it sufficient to publish declarations of interests by just citing 'owns land or property within the NA' without specifying the address?

Many thanks.

Katrina.

#### **ITEM 8a REPORT FROM THE SURVEY SUB-GROUP**

### **Stage Two Survey (STS) and Housing Needs Survey (HNS) Distribution Report**

#### **The Process**

Following agreement of STS, HNS and covering letter at Steering Group Meeting on 21 November 2017, the Stage Two Survey Sub-Group met on 26<sup>th</sup> November with BE to finalise the proof copy of the surveys. BE attended to assist with the incorporation of the map.

The Survey Sub-Group met again on 30<sup>th</sup> November to prepare distribution packs.

A total of 15 volunteer distributors had been identified, each of whom was allocated between 12 and 21 packs.

Each pack contained a delivery crib sheet including instructions, first and second knock up slips, a distributor record sheet and the required number of survey packs, together with 5 spare STS and 6 loan copies of the Place Appraisal.

The survey packs contained one HNS and two STS together with a covering letter. These were put in envelopes for ease of distribution and to protect privacy.

The STS and HNS were each numbered consecutively by hand to ensure all returns could be accounted for as genuine. The surveys were placed in packs randomly in order that there was no traceability to any household or person. Surveys were numbered purely to track them back from distributors (all distributed entirely anonymously). Note that 6 surveys had their numbers scribbled out by respondents and were renumbered 601 to 606.

A master sheet was produced to record which survey numbers were allocated to each distribution to ease the process of preparing the packs and to highlight any discrepancies with returns.

From 1<sup>st</sup> December 2017, distribution packs were made available and each distributor briefed verbally. This included a reminder of the dates for knock ups agreed by the Steering Group. (5 to 17th December 2017 and 1st to 5th January 2018).

Return points given were KB and CM residences at either end of the village, some surveys were returned initially to distributors. All returned surveys were recorded on a spreadsheet by KB and CM independently which identified the survey number, whether returned blank, a name and address if given and any requests to count the return as more than one (e.g. for couples).

Some residents returned whole packs even with blank surveys they did not need. Others just returned the one they had completed. Some distributors took out one STS knowing there was only one person in the household; most recorded this on their record sheet. Distribution packs were prepared in error for the Mission Hall, Evangelical Church and Wessex Water (these organisations were emailed or posted a copy of the surveys for information as were other stakeholders).

The Survey Sub-Group met again on 6<sup>th</sup> January 2018 to receive distributors' record sheets, returned loaned Place Appraisals and unused spare STSs and to combine the returns spreadsheet and check these against the physical hard copies. All STS and HNS surveys were then passed to Andy Hohne with a copy of the returns spreadsheet, distributors' record sheets returned to date and a list of minor queries. A few late returns were received up until 8<sup>th</sup> January 2018 and passed on to Andy Hohne.

KB prepared an initial draft of an input spreadsheet to be used to capture the results of the STS. After trialling the input of 5 surveys, AH made various amendments to the spreadsheet and wrote some brief notes to assist with the inputting and help ensure consistency of input wherever possible.

6 members of the Steering Group offered to assist with the inputting of the returned surveys. AH distributed a spreadsheet, the notes and 100 STS to each of 5 members, retaining 106 for himself.

The plan was for the 6 members to work in 3 teams of 2, one inputting before passing their spreadsheet and STS to the other for checking (and visa versa). Because the inputting took far longer than expected, an additional 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> member of the Steering group helped with the checking.



Key points with regards the inputting were:

- Every comment on a survey must be captured, even if the comment was not included in the relevant “comment” boxes.
- Every survey number must include a survey status comment, the alternatives being returned completed, nothing received back or returned blank.
- A “1” was placed in the relevant strongly agree / agree (etc.) cell in the spreadsheet, unless it was clear from a survey that it was intended to be from multiple respondents. In this case the relevant number of respondents was included.
- For questions 4, 5 and 13 the responses for “part b” (the list of locations) were ignored (in accordance with the Steering Group meeting of December 2017) and therefore not recorded.

AH prepared an input spreadsheet for the HNS and input all these. These were checked by a member of the Steering Group.

All STS and HNS were input and checked by the end of January, with all spreadsheets and surveys returned to AH.

AH then carried out various further checks to improve accuracy and consistency. Along with finding various errors, the main amendments were as follows:

- Increase the count to reflect a STS intended to be from multiple respondents (not all the inputters had increased the count);
- Where a respondent ticked multiple boxes or ticked over two boxes, the count was halved for each (eg scoring 0.5 for each if a respondent ticked agree and disagree for the same question).
- Complete the survey status comment for the “spares”.

**The queries** from AH from checking the surveys are as follows:

STS - for questions 4, 5 and 13 (the questions where the location lists responses were ignored), a handful of respondents failed to put a tick in part “a”, but did complete “b”, therefore their responses will not be recorded. For example sample number 205, question 5.

HNS – the boxes in question 7 are misaligned therefore AH believes there is a high probability that respondents did not always tick the box they meant to (number of bedrooms). In addition, due to the slightly confusing wording of question 3, there was inconsistency with the types of responses – some answered with a tick, some with a number.

## Survey results

### STS

The count is as follows:

	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
Distributed	533	
Not Returned	253	47.5
Returned Completed (physical number of returns)	253	47.5
Returned Completed (number of respondents)	267	50.1
Returned Blank	31	5.8
Renumbered by us (original number scribbled out by respondents)	6	

Check totals:

Distributed	533	Not Returned	253
Plus Numbers Scribbled Out (therefore renumbered)	6	Plus (Physically) Returned Completed	253
		Plus Returned Blank	31
		Plus 2 asked to be duplicated (surveys 25 and 49)	2
<b>Totals</b>	<b>539</b>		<b>539</b>

## HNS

The count is as follows:

	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
Distributed	245	
Not Returned	191	78.0
Returned Completed (physical number of returns)	31	12.7
Returned Blank	20	8.2
Returned Blank except for a "no" or N/A response to question 1	6	2.4
Renumbered by us (original number scribbled out by respondents)	3	

Check totals:

Distributed	245	Not Returned	191
Plus Numbers Scribbled Out (therefore renumbered)	3	Plus Returned Completed	31
		Plus Returned Completely Blank	20
		Plus Returned Blank other than a "no" or N/A response to Q1	6
<b>Totals</b>	<b>248</b>		<b>248</b>

## External audit

The external audit of the surveys is still outstanding and is due to be completed by the end of February.

K.Blee, A. Hohne, C. Marsh  
 Survey Sub-group  
 12<sup>th</sup> February

2018



# SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

## RECORD OF SUB-GROUP MEETING

<b>Topic sub-group</b>	<u>Heritage</u>
<b>Dates of Meeting</b>	<u>15/1/2018</u>
<b>Time of meeting from</b>	
<b>Location of Meeting</b>	<u>By phone</u>
<b>Present:</b>	<u>Bill Egerton, Caroline Crisp, Jill Kelsey</u>

### Key Discussion Points

BE explained that representations had been made to the Steering Group by a few villagers, concerned mainly at the impact of possible Green Space designation on their properties, and the fairly informal method that had been used to create a list of candidate spaces. The same concerns applied to the lists of Key Views and to Heritage assets. As a result of these representations, the Steering Group had concluded that a more formal methodology would be needed to create short lists, involving subject experts. The lists included in the Stage 2 Survey would not be used, and the responses to these lists in the Survey would be ignored.

As a result, a different method of compiling a list of candidate Locally Important Heritage Assets would be needed, should the response to the Survey indicate village support for the principle of such a list. Two possible methods were discussed;

- The first option would be to include in the Neighbourhood Plan a Policy identifying the need for such a list, but leaving the compilation as a future task for the Local Authority – this approach had been adopted in various Neighbourhood Plans that had been seen as examples;
- The second option would be to employ an expert to compile a short list, using criteria from the Historic England advisory note, and perhaps tapping in to local knowledge.

The second of these options was preferred, as there was some doubt over whether the Local Authority would ever be in a position to create the list. However, it was uncertain whether the Steering Group has sufficient funds to employ a Consultant on this topic.

It was agreed that the village's Heritage already has reasonably good protection as a result of its Conservation Area status. As such, a Locally Important Heritage Asset list would be useful to have but not essential. The (reluctant) view of the Heritage Subgroup was that priority should be given by the Steering Group to employing experts to compile a Green Infrastructure list, including Green Spaces and Key Views. Only if funds suffice should an additional study of non-listed heritage be done.

# SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

## RECORD OF SUB-GROUP MEETING

<b>Topic sub-group</b>	<u>Heritage</u>
<b>Dates of Meeting</b>	<u>13/2/2018</u>
<b>Time of meeting from</b>	<u>2 p.m to 3:15 p.m.</u>
<b>Location of Meeting</b>	<u>Northdown Farmhouse</u>
<b>Present:</b>	<u>Bill Egerton, Caroline Crisp, Jill Kelsey</u>

### Key Discussion Points

BE explained that the village response to the Stage 2 Survey had given solid support (about 80%) to the idea of a list of Locally Important Heritage Assets; the votes on specific candidate assets had been discarded. It was agreed that if the Steering Group has sufficient funds, an external study to compile a draft list would be highly desirable. The wording of a Policy relating to Locally Important Heritage Assets will depend on whether such a study can be undertaken.

The main task now for the Subgroup was to draft a Heritage Policy or Policies, and to start drafting a Heritage chapter for the Neighbourhood Plan. The Subgroup examined a few sample Neighbourhood Plans that had chapters on Heritage: Gillingham, Churchill & Blakedown, Holymoorside & Walton, Arundel, Exeter St James, Clifford by Leeds. From a short initial look, the Gillingham example was particularly liked. These would be distributed and the Subgroup members would use them to generate ideas for a structure for the Heritage chapter [**Action all**].

The relevant part of the current (2015) Local Plan was also examined. It was concluded that the existing Policy, ENV4, was fairly weak in the protection it gives. In addition it was concluded that the Conservation Area appraisal (which was published as part of the 2008 Local Plan and carried forward implicitly into the 2015 Local Plan) lacks any clear definition of the important features that characterise the village. These would also be distributed, along with relevant parts of the National Planning Policy Framework, so that Subgroup members can produce ideas for a strengthened statement on the most important characteristics of the village, and also consider wording for an improved Heritage Policy [**Action all**].

The next meeting was set for 2 p.m. on Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> March.





		SG MEETING.
EXTERNAL AUDIT OF PUBLIC SURVEY RESULTS TO BE COMPLETED	01/2018	EXTERNAL AUDITOR
CONSIDER ARRANGEMENTS FOR CONSULTATION WITH LANDOWNERS	16/01/2018	STEERING GROUP
DISTRIBUTE CONSULTATION LETTER TO ALL LANDOWNERS IDENTIFIED ON THE LIST.	01/2018	BE/CM
SUB-GROUPS TO COLLATE EVIDENCE AND PREPARE A DRAFT INTRODUCTION FOR THE RESPECTIVE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SECTION AND BEGIN TO DRAFT POLICY ONCE THE STAGE TWO SURVEY RESULTS ARE PUBLISHED	01 TO 03/2018	ALL SUB-GROUPS
CONSIDER PUBLIC CONSULTATION FEEDBACK RESULTS AND ANALYSIS AND AGREE NEXT STEPS	20/02/2018	STEERING GROUP/SUB-GROUPS
CONSIDER FEEDBACK FROM LANDOWNERS AND HOW THIS WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICY.	20/02/2018	STEERING GROUP