

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 17th April 2018 in the Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz, commencing 19.33 hours.

Present: Mike Blee, Bill Davidson, Peter Dye (Chair), Bill Egerton, Andy Hohne, Keith Johnson, Huw Llewellyn, Colin Marsh, Liz Pegrum.

A total of six residents/landowners were in attendance and were welcomed by the chair who invited them to comment on any matters on the agenda in addition to those for which they may have specifically chosen to attend.

1. Apologies

Apologies had been received in advance of the meeting from Sue Elgey, Tony Ferrari, Keith Hudson. The meeting were informed of the resignation of Susan Higham due to ill health. The chair asked that a vote of thanks to Susan be recorded in respect of her valued contribution to the work of the Steering Group.

2. To appoint a vice chair

In order to cover for potential future absence the chair reported that he had spoken to Tony Ferrari who was prepared to take on the role of vice-chair subject to the agreement of the Steering Group.

3. To Approve the minutes of the previous meeting.

PD outlined his role as chair in terms of leading meetings and providing focus. In order to provide an overview he would not become involved in the sub-groups and saw his primary role as an external scrutineer who would stand back from the process detail and challenge and test outcomes. He would however provide a leading input into the Place Appraisal document and the Consultation Statement. In referring to the code of conduct he requested that internal disputes be raised with him in the first instance in order to try to seek a resolution at an early stage.

The minutes of the meeting held on 20th March 2018 were agreed as a correct record subject to the following amendments.

- Section 9b, paragraph 2, sentence 3, to read “HL proposed ... was agreed with one abstention (BD)”.
- The latter sentence to be immediately followed by an additional sentence of “BD asked that the population estimate of 456 as mentioned in the Place Appraisal be used consistently for the newsletter and on the web site and BE agreed to action this.”
- Final sentence of section 9e to read; “LP commented that advice from the consultant that density of housing rather than specific numbers should be included within the Neighbourhood Plan appeared to be contradicted by the Loders Neighbourhood plan which had included specific numbers and had been ‘made’.”
- BD requested that the comment attributed to himself in sentence 2 of Any Other Business should in fact be attributed to MB.

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

The chair noted that all actions from the previous meeting were either to be addressed elsewhere on the agenda or those actions had been completed. This was agreed.

5. To Address any items of correspondence

Item 5a – In receiving the e-mail count it was noted that e-mails were publicly accessible and the main point of recording them was for traceability purposes. BE questioned whether this needed to be a regular agenda item. It was agreed that mention of this process of tracking e-mails should be made in the Consultation Statement.

Item 5b – The letter from Blue Cedar Homes was considered. Some members considered that it was appropriate to invite this developer to attend the Steering Group, while others felt that this would have limited value, particularly in view of the Development Boundary proposals. The chair felt that allocation of a specific time slot at a future Steering Group meeting would demonstrate good will. It was finally agreed to support the proposal by LP to seek more information on the intentions and specific proposals of Blue Cedar Homes with a view to a possible future meeting.

Action:PD

6. To Receive an update regarding consultation with landowners

PD reported that he had written to all landowners with land outside of the development boundary and any replies received had been circulated with the agenda. The responses were being recorded in a spreadsheet. Relevant landowners had also been sent the consultant reports on Local Green Space and (when available) the report on Key Views. All responses were similarly being recorded. After some discussion regarding the optimum means of updating the spreadsheet it was agreed that PD should act as the single point of accountability for this. BE proposed that the spreadsheet be sent out each month with the agenda.

Action:CM

7. To Receive Consultants reports on the assessment of Key Views and Local Green Spaces

7.1 Local Green Space. The chair introduced the Local Green Space report produced by the consultant's and requested the response of the Biodiversity sub-group. CM explained that the group had only considered a few minor corrections of a factual nature by e-mail round and these had been incorporated into the final report. In commenting on the report BE considered that there needed to be much greater focus on green infrastructure and that the assessment criteria could have been broadened beyond the basic NPPF criteria such that areas such as the 'Open Gap' would have been more likely to have been recommended for designation. He offered to circulate some information distinguishing between green infrastructure and local green spaces.

Action:BE

L Rookes who owned the 'Open Gap' land to which reference had been made reported that she had not received any communication from the Steering Group or a reply to her communication to the neighbourhood@ e-mail address. PD apologised

on behalf of the Steering Group and explained that there was still plenty of time to provide responses. He agreed to provide copies of all previous communications to landowners and to try to trace the e-mail communication referred to.

Action:PD

Liz Crocker (resident) commented that she had shared the consultants survey with Nick Cardnell (Weymouth and Portland Borough Council) who was satisfied with the criteria used and questioned why BE wished to broaden these criteria. Commenting on the question of the open gap, PD noted the importance of separating the issues associated with the development boundary from those of local green space.

In referring to land area G10 in the consultant's report Liz Crocker identified several corrections with reference to her e-mail to the Steering Group dated 16/4/2018 and asked for the evidence to be shared with landowners. All landowners present supported this request. It was agreed that a detailed response to these points be addressed by the Biodiversity sub-group prior to discussing the specific landowner concerns and making a decision whether to recommend inclusion of local green spaces inside or outside the development boundary and the focus that this should take.

Action:Biodiversity sub-group/Steering Group

L Rookes noted that most of the open gap land was in Preston rather than Sutton Poyntz, to which BE responded by noting that there had never been a 'legal' boundary and this was the first time that a defined boundary had been considered. PD summarised the next steps as follows; ensuring that all landowners had seen the consultant's report; the biodiversity group were to address each landowner's response as appropriate, to consider whether to focus on designation within or outside the development boundary and take into account the impact of designation of local green space on other policies, returning to the SG with specific proposals.

Liz Crocker noted that 3 of the 14 LGS areas considered were privately owned. CM asked Liz Crocker why she was against LGS designation for G10. With reference to previous correspondence she reminded the group that designation has a financial implication for land owners, that LGS does not guarantee land management practices and that there are existing levels of protection for the land such as AONB status and it is outside of the development boundary; she asked the group to set out the added value of Local Green Space designation. PD commented that it was important to define what it was hoped to achieve by the designation of local green space in the final analysis; he agreed that it would be beneficial to meet with landowners in the coming months and offered to facilitate these meetings to help maintain focus on the purpose of proposals and provide a structured approach to address these issues.

7.2 Key Views. LP referred to the report and to the minutes of the Housing and Planning sub-group meeting on 4th April and expressed personal dissatisfaction with the objectivity of the report, for example certain views such as that from the beacon had not been included on the initial schedule and there had been a failure to involve landowners during the assessment process. She expressed the view that those sites included must be seen as chosen fairly and that failure to do so would cause landowners to 'put up barriers' and in this respect urged caution when considering 'key views'. The chair recognised the potential for such a counter-productive response and commented that there were many known views but protection of these would be limited in practical terms. LP commented that there were a number of

important views looking into the village and some new views to be incorporated such as that across the village pond and proceeded to list a number of these with reference to the sub-group minutes, making specific reference to some 'sweep views'.

BE felt that there were two distinct classes of view to consider, those looking into and those looking out from the village, since both would be impacted by development. He also felt that the policy should include those views from outside the Neighbourhood Area boundary, although he recognised that this was contrary to the advice from the consultant's. It was felt that green infrastructure should be taken into account and in this respect BE gave some examples from the North Dorset criteria that were most likely to be adopted by the West Dorset and Weymouth and Portland local authorities. The chair considered that there was adequate time to revisit the issue of key views and asked the meeting to consider whether it was better to focus on some principal key views rather than trying to cover everything.

LP recognised that the sub-group had differences of opinion on this issue with some members expressing the view that no key views should be included. She referred to a list of principal key views as outlined in the Housing and Planning sub-group minutes (V0, V2, V8, V10, V12A, V13, V15) as a basis for a compromise. BD noted his disappointment that he had not been consulted as a landowner and had only seen the report as a result of being on the Housing and Planning sub-group. The chair posed the question as to whether the focus should be on the "key key views".

BE suggested that now the report had been produced it may be appropriate to consider the original survey feedback on key views. LC disagreed on the basis that the original questions were unfair and leading, although this was contested by CM on the basis that this was a matter of opinion and that both the local authority and consultants had not raised any concerns in this respect when asked to review the draft stage two survey.

The chair proposed that the consultant's report with suggested amendments be considered alongside feedback from landowners once these had been identified and contacted, in order to engage in a broader discussion. He noted that main points for such a discussion were whether to include views both into and out of the area, the issue of reducing the list of key views to a few principal ones and the green infrastructure considerations.

MB noted the imminent publication of the revised Local Plan by the local authority and the need to take this into consideration.

The chair asked that the Housing sub-group provide him with an up-to-date copy of the Key View Report and identify the landowners involved to allow him to contact them for their comments and feedback.

Action:LP and PD

8. To receive sub-group reports including the final draft Neighbourhood Plan sections.

a) Place Appraisal – BE confirmed that this sub-group had not met since the last Steering Group meeting and nothing had been progressed. The chair suggested that he meet with BE and CM in order to identify the next steps.

Action:PD,BE and CM

b) Survey/Consultation – CM confirmed that there had been no meeting since the last Steering Group. BE informed the meeting that his input would be limited in the coming seven weeks as a result of being called for Jury service. It was noted that the Consultation Statement was the responsibility of this group and it was agreed that CM and PD retain joint responsibility for this.

- c) Biodiversity and the Natural Environment – CM reported that the group had not met but had reviewed the consultant’s reports on Local Green Space by e-mail round and found it to be objective.
- d) Employment, Business and Tourism – AH had circulated a report earlier in the day. He noted that no policies were proposed following advice from the consultant and that there would be only action points.
- e) Heritage – BE reported that an updated draft in the common format was being produced and noted that due to a lack of funding a professional heritage asset assessment was looking increasingly unlikely and consequently this aspect may have to be limited to an aspiration or action point within the Neighbourhood Plan. It was also proposed to include heritage and history information provision as part of the Plan. He also made reference to a heritage working paper that it was proposed to publish.

On a general note the chair emphasised the need to ensure that the objectives aligned with the vision and policy within each section of the Neighbourhood Plan.

- f) Housing and Planning – LP noted that the sub-group needed to address the issue of holiday homes/lets in terms of policy following the receipt of feedback. CM who had raised this issue explained that this should be included since there was significant feedback on the issue in the first public survey; he noted that this may take the form of a policy, an aspiration or a rationale for the subject not being included. MB confirmed that he had recently circulated the decision on the St Ives policy. Some members questioned the scale of the problem relative to other villages such as Osmington, although it was noted that this may change over the life of the plan. John Crisp considered that the criteria defining second homes do not seem reasonable nor workable in Sutton Poyntz where, in the residency case, working in London during the week would fail the test. For this reason he suggested that the Neighbourhood Plan should not make firm policy on second homes. The chair considered that this topic should be commented upon within the plan and this was a matter for the Housing and Planning sub-group to discuss and return to the Steering Group with specific recommendations.

Action:H and P sub-group

The chair expressed concern as to the level of evidence in support of the housing policies, in particular whether the suggested 20 new homes could be accommodated within the existing defined development boundary. He stated that it would be necessary to show that there was sufficient room within the current development boundary and to better understand what the ‘red lines’ were. BE considered that research could be undertaken based upon current housing densities in order to demonstrate that adequate space existed and it was agreed that it would be necessary to prove this to the examiner. The chair emphasised that policies would need to add value and be both justifiable and evidence based if they were to pass the scrutiny of the inspector. In this respect it was important when using the results of surveys to tease out the rationale and the evidence. The implications of policy decisions also needed to be fully understood.

In summarising the chair emphasised that the plan must not impede development in comparison to the current rate of build and stressed the importance of avoiding incompatibility of policies between the different sub-groups. . It was agreed that the draft policy would be reviewed on this basis and that an analysis would be conducted to assess the actual capacity for new houses within the existing Designated Development Boundary.

Action:H and P sub-group

- g) Sports and Recreation – KJ referred to the draft policy previously circulated and noted that no changes had been made. One item of feedback from MB had questioned the viability in the absence of an obvious source of finance of an aspiration to draw up a list of assets of community value. This matter was left open for further consideration.
- h) Transport – CM reported that there had been no further meeting since the last Steering Group in the absence of any feedback on the draft policies and aspirations.

9. To consider the incorporation of the draft vision and objectives into the Neighbourhood Plan.

CM reported that no further feedback comments had been received and re-affirmed that the objectives should evolve from the sub-group draft policies. The chair reminded sub-groups to revisit the objectives and ensure that these aligned with the vision. It was agreed that PD and CM meet to propose arrangements for the incorporation of the vision and objectives into the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

Action:PD and CM

10. To Consider the arrangements for the production of a draft Neighbourhood Plan.

MB commented in relation to the timetable that we appeared to be falling slightly behind the projected schedule for April to July and that moving the timetable 'one month to the right' for this period should address this such that the plan would be back on track by August 2018.

The chair noted that in view of funding issues we would now need to do more work ourselves but was of the opinion that this should not impact the timetable significantly. CM suggested that we progress this by collating the information that already existed into a basic framework, noting that this would be underpinned by the work undertaken in the Place Appraisal. John Crisp in his capacity as a member of the Housing and Planning sub-group requested a deadline for policy submissions and the chair proposed that this these should be completed in time for the Steering Group meeting on 15th May. It was agreed that the chair and secretary meet to prepare an initial framework for the draft Neighbourhood Plan before the next meeting.

Action:PD/CM

11. To Consider the impact of changes to Grant Funding rules

The chair confirmed that following changes in the funding rules the Neighbourhood Forum would now be limited to a maximum of £9k under the current arrangements and that a total of around £700 was the maximum eligible funding that could be requested before the £9k limit was exceeded. He reported that TF had explored funding options through the local authority but without success so far. It was noted that the National Lottery and other funding sources were an option but it would take time to process applications.

It was suggested that the best use of the remaining accessible funding would be to use 3 x half days of consultancy for an overview of the draft Neighbourhood Plan, Regulation 14 consultation proposals and the Basic Conditions Statement and to seek a small source of funding for printing loan copies of the draft Neighbourhood

Plan. It was noted that the Place Appraisal would probably have to be finalised without further consultant input. PD will discuss these proposals with the consultants.

Action:PD

BE reported that Groundworks Ltd who administer the grant funding applications had just rejected some printing cost invoices associated with the stage two survey since the dates on the invoices preceded the grant award date by one day. The amount involved was in excess of £900 and BE suggested that the only viable source to cover this shortfall was the Sutton Poyntz Society unless the issue could be resolved or other funding sources identified.

In summarising the situation the chair suggested that in the first instance he would seek to resolve the issue of the rejected invoices by speaking to Groundworks.

Action:PD

The chair stated that pending an outcome to these discussions, planning should be on the basis that a total of only £780 remained available to complete the task.

12. To Review progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetable

It was agreed that the timetable be amended slightly as noted under item 10.

Action:CM

13. To Review the Draft Consultation Statement

CM had provided further updates to the Consultation Statement. It was suggested that CM retain this role with PD providing an overview. BD requested that all dates should be given in full and asked that 16/2 be amended to include the year (2018). Liz Crocker (LC) made a number of observations regarding inclusion of comments of any weighting applied to the survey results, a clearer explanation of how policies had been arrived at and clearer definitions for example in relation to terms such as 'significant'. CM informed the meeting that the report was work in progress and suggested amendments would be incorporated; he asked LC and others who had any comments to forward these by e-mail in order that they could be considered for inclusion. BE stressed that the consultation statement referred to the informal stages of consultation and that there would be formal opportunities to respond, such as at the Regulation 14 consultation stage of the process.

Action:Liz Crocker

14. To receive a report on income and expenditure.

A written report prepared by LP had been circulated in advance. In the absence of any comments the chair advised the meeting that all work carried out by Brian Wilson (consultant) had been invoiced and accounted for. The report was accepted by the meeting.

15. Any Other Business

The chair asked each member present if they had any items of other business. No issues were raised.

The meeting closed at 22.04. hours.

The date and time of the next meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 15th May 2018 at 19.30 hours.