

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 19th June 2018 in the Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz, commencing 19.31 hours.

Present: Mike Blee, Peter Dye (Chair), Bill Egerton, Sue Elgey, Tony Ferrari, Andy Hohne, Keith Hudson, Keith Johnson, Huw Llewellyn, Colin Marsh and Liz Pegrum.

A total of four residents/landowners (Hilary Davidson, Anne Crocker, Liz Crocker and Lyn Grant-Jones) were in attendance.

1. Apologies

Bill Davidson had given his apologies in advance.

Mike Blee gave his advance apologies for the July meeting.

2. To Approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 15th May 2018

These were approved subject to the following amendment proposed by Liz Crocker:

Delete sentence 2, paragraph 4, page 5, which reads "It was not clear, however, that there was a means of doing so other than LGS designation"

It was agreed that future minutes should have the pages numbered.

Action:CM

3. 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 addressed elsewhere on the agenda or had been completed.

4. Update on Grant Funding.

LP stated that the Treasurer of the Sutton Poyntz Society had confirmed that there had been no further expenditure and no receipt of the promised council grant monies. BE reported that the sum of £3.2k from the Local Authority was reported to be in transit and also that the £730 grant application through Groundworks had been rejected on the basis that claims were required to exceed £1k. It was agreed that BE urgently clarify the situation with Groundworks and follow up as to the whereabouts of the Local Authority grant monies.

Action:BE

5. To Receive an update on Income and Expenditure

The chair confirmed that no additional expenditure was being incurred until the grant monies had been received. He noted items of outstanding work as reported previously and that a sum near to £1k would be required in the near future for consultancy services.

6. To Receive an update regarding Consultation with Landowners.

Punch Taverns - The chair reported that in addition to the correspondence previously circulated further contact had taken place regarding a possible meeting. In view of the aspiration to list the Springhead Pub as an Asset of Community Value, the policy on provision of a children's play area in close proximity to the pub and the position in the pub grounds of the defined development boundary

he considered it vital to engage with this landowner in order to clarify their aspirations in relation to the future use of the land.

Wessex Water – Nothing further had been heard regarding Key Views and Local Green Spaces. It was noted that LP had obtained details of another contact regarding the consultation process. The chair asked that she use this opportunity to clarify Wessex’s potential development ambitions for the site. **Action:LP**

Meeting with Terry Pegrum (owner of Pudding’s Field) – The chair reported on a meeting earlier that evening with Steering Group members attended by Terry Pegrum and his representative Richard Henshaw relating to his land holding which was outside the Defined Development Boundary (DDB). The landowner believed that the site offered an opportunity to provide affordable housing for the local community and address the current shortfall in the five-year housing supply, as well as meeting some of the village’s aspirational needs. A detailed note will be circulated to the Steering Group.

Action:CM

On a more general note the chair stated his belief in the value of talking to the owners of land outside the DDB regarding their aspirations even if it did not directly impact draft policy. He noted that the current housing policy proposals did not seek to influence development outside of the DDB and that, unless the Neighbourhood Plan sought to change the DDB or issued a call for sites, then the ‘Local Plan’ policy would take precedence. He stated that he found the overall consultation process to be useful and would be seeking further meetings with other landowners.

Action: PD

7. To Review and Approve draft Neighbourhood Plan sections for Regulation 14 Consultation.

The chair noted that the section on Sports and Recreation was being held back due to the consultation being initiated with Punch Taverns but that two completed sections; that on Employment, Business and Tourism; and Getting Around (Transport) were to be considered at this meeting.

Employment, Business and Tourism contained no policies, only a number of aspirations which were outlined by the chair. The draft section was agreed for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan for the Regulation 14 consultation. **Action: CM**

Getting Around contained three policies and a number of aspirations which were outlined by the chair. CM confirmed that the policy wording had been reviewed by Brian Wilson (consultant) and further noted that the sub-group had discussed whether the off-road parking policies should be transferred to the housing section and had decided that it integrated better with other parking related policy elements in this section. BE expressed some concern as to the viability of policy GA1 in relation to finance.

The draft section was agreed for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan for the Regulation 14 consultation. **Action:CM**

8. To Receive sub-group reports

- a) Place Appraisal – The chair noted that the Place Appraisal was on track and considered that a draft Neighbourhood Plan was required prior to completing section 6. BE considered that the challenges and opportunities in this section could be considered and matched to specific

proposed actions. In seeking a broader view on this issue BE asked that members of the Steering Group give consideration as to what they felt was required in section 6.

It was agreed that the Place Appraisal sub-group meet to discuss this aspect and PD suggested that the views of our consultants be sought in this respect. **Action:Place Appraisal sub-group**

- b) Biodiversity and the Natural Environment - CM reported on the recent publication of the draft revised Local Plan proposals relating to biodiversity and green infrastructure. He noted the emphasis on achieving 'net gain' and the general intent of the green infrastructure proposals in creating a network of stepping stones and buffer zones including local green spaces. The summary of intent on Green Infrastructure and Local Green Space paper discussed at the May meeting had been revised and the sub-group had concluded that the proposals aligned directly with the intent of the policies in the biodiversity section of the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

The chair reported that he had written to each of those landowners who had commented upon the Local Green Space proposals and included the biodiversity sub-group response. Those affected landowners present were invited to comment. In response Liz Crocker circulated a hard copy of the e-mail sent on 7th June (pre-circulated electronically) and emphasised three issues; the provision of sources of evidence relating to impact on land value, the way in which the Crocker family had positively managed the land concerned and the potential loss of goodwill arising from LGS designation. LC further stated that she had not received the letter of response but acknowledged that it may have been overlooked within the numerous e-mail attachments. In relation to her statement that the steering group should follow a policy consistent with that on negative impact on house prices the chair stressed that whilst this may have been a view expressed by an individual member of the group it was not a group policy. He further noted that the impact on land values was not a criterion within the NPPF but should be highlighted along with any contrary evidence as a potential implication at the formal consultation stage. LC raised a number of contextual issues relating to the evidence provided by the biodiversity sub-group as follows:-

Bird returns – CM confirmed that these related to a site on Puddledock Lane which was a contributor to the local Garden Bird Watch scheme.

Map relating to species index – draft map to be provided.

Action:CM

Wessex Water fish survey data – the reasons for omissions were clarified as certain species not being detected in some sampling periods.

Garden Bird Watch – request for the streets on which reporting sites were located. **Action:CM**

The chair requested that the final draft section on biodiversity be presented at the next meeting for endorsement by the steering group and should address the wider implications (including the potential financial impact) of designating green space as well as any contextual issues.

- c) Employment Business and Tourism – this was dealt with under item 7 above.
- d) Heritage – BE reported that the Heritage section had been simplified, re-drafted and circulated. Regarding the proposed heritage assets survey he was able to confirm that Kim Sankey who will undertake the survey will use all of the criteria stated in the Historic England guidance. Referring to a paper that had been circulated in advance of the meeting he commented upon the impact of listing in terms of no extra planning burden, benefits to the planning authority, underpinning a weak conservation appraisal, highlighting other important features of structures and encouraging care by stressing the importance of a building. He also noted that although very little information exists on the impact on property values the one paper that he had found suggested that values would increase as a result of listing. In recommending that the assessment proceed he noted that it would provide a professional appraisal at a much reduced

cost. LP suggested the need for other quotes and it was confirmed that two other quotes had indicated a cost of £3k to 3.5k as opposed to the circa £1k in this proposal.

Due to her workload it was noted that Kim Sankey would not be able to complete the assessment before September which would result in a delay to the issue of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. One suggestion was to add the list of properties at a later date, however, LC stressed the importance of informing and consulting with affected property owners given the previous experience following issue of the stage two survey last December, a view supported by LP. CM considered that a general note to the community was acceptable since formal consultation was to follow. LC stressed the importance of providing a bespoke report for each affected property and allowing time for informal consultation.

BE and PD agreed that two areas of primary concern were the need to have grant money in place and time pressures.

The chair concluded that it would be a mistake to delay the process unnecessarily and proposed that BE and himself provide clear guidance on the process to be undertaken, ensure that finance was available and agree an acceptable timetable prior to giving the go ahead for the assessment. A vote was taken and this was agreed with two votes against (AH and LP).

Action:PD and BE

- e) Housing and Planning – LP confirmed that a re-draft of the section for the draft Neighbourhood Plan had been completed and was about to be circulated to the sub-group for comment. It was confirmed that in the absence of feedback the list of eight key views proposed recently would be incorporated. An example format was requested and CM agreed to forward the 'Getting Around' draft for reference.

TF reflected on the economic viability question that had been raised at the earlier meeting with a landowner and questioned the strength of the evidence base for the housing policy. LP considered that this was not an issue as no policy was proposed on the DDB and so it would not be necessary to prove that housing capacity existed within the boundary. PD confirmed that the advice of the consultant was that such an approach was entirely acceptable. LP commented that the allocation of sites had been considered and was felt by the sub-group to be so potentially divisive for the community that it was best avoided. BE commented that economic viability was proven by the fact that the village had grown in the last 20 years. TF stressed the importance of looking at viability through the eyes of the developers and again emphasised the importance of an evidence base. CM stated that it was important that the justification for the policy should be explained in the draft Neighbourhood Plan during the formal consultation process. LC felt it particularly important to explain why there was no policy on the DDB.

Action:LP

- f) Sports and Recreation – this was addressed under item 7.
- g) Transport (Getting Around) – this was addressed under item 7.

9. To Receive an Update on Progress with the Production of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan

The chair confirmed that this was continually being updated and that as policy sections were agreed these would be incorporated. The draft was available on Drop Box.

10. To Review the Draft Consultation Statement

Further amendments had taken place and the document was available on Drop Box. LC noted a number of points in relation to the section on Heritage Assets, Key Views and Local Green Spaces

where she considered that a better balance was needed. It was agreed to take this into account in the review of the document.

Action:PD and CM

11. To Review Progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetables

The chair noted the intent to have the draft Neighbourhood Plan ready for distribution in August and considered that issue in July for the 'screening' process may be difficult to achieve and that September was more realistic. He further commented that production of the Housing and Heritage policy sections were critical to meeting the scheduled timeline. In summary he felt that the timetable could be met although we may have to 'cut our cloth' to do so. It was noted that much depended upon receiving the necessary finance as most of the remaining work would need to be undertaken by the consultants.

12. To Address Items of Correspondence

The chair reported that he had written in positive terms to Blue Cedar Homes and had received a reply (circulated) to the effect that there was no longer an interest in this option and they would not be pursuing the matter.

13. Any Other Business

No items of other business were raised.

The meeting closed at 21.28 hours.

The date and time of the next meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 17th July 2018 at 19.30 hours.