

# **Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group**

**Agenda for the meeting on 17th July 2018 to be held in the Blue Duck Bar of the Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz commencing at 7.30pm.**

- 1. To Receive Apologies (Apologies in advance from Mike Blee, Sue Elgey and Andy Hohne)**
- 2. To Approve the Minutes of the previous meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> June 2018 (minor amendment requested by Mike Blee on a point of clarification).**
- 3. To Receive an update on actions arising from the previous meeting (not otherwise on the agenda).**
- 4. To Receive an update on Grant Funding.**
- 5. To Receive an update on any income and expenditure.**
- 6. To Receive an update regarding consultation with Landowners (minutes and correspondence attached) including meeting with Christopher Seal on 6<sup>th</sup> July.**
- 7. To Review and Approve for Regulation 14 formal consultation the draft Neighbourhood Plan section (policies and aspirations) on Sports and Recreation.**
- 8. To Receive sub-group reports:**
  - a) Place Appraisal**
  - b) Biodiversity and the Natural Environment**
  - c) Employment, Business and Tourism including IT/Communications**
  - d) Heritage**
  - e) Housing and Planning**
  - f) Sports and Recreation**
  - g) Transport**
- 9. To Receive an update on progress with the production of the draft Neighbourhood Plan**
- 10. To Receive an update on the Draft Consultation Statement.**
- 11. To Review progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetables (attached).**
- 12. To Address items of correspondence.**
- 13. Any Other Business.**
- 14. Date and Time of the Next Meeting.**

To confirm the date and time of the next meeting as Tuesday 21<sup>st</sup> August 2018 at 7.30pm.

## ITEM 2 - APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Mike Blee has requested that the beginning of sentence 2, paragraph 3 of sub-section 6 on page 2 be clarified regarding to whom the statement is attributed.

Suggest that the words "It was ..." be substituted with "The landowner..."

# Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> May 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 15<sup>th</sup> 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 Puddings 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). It was 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

3

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 7<sup>th</sup> 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

4

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.

## 5

### **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 17<sup>th</sup> July 2018 at 19.30 hours.**

## ITEM 6 Meetings with Landowners

### Minutes of meeting with Terry Pegrum

# Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

## Meeting with Landowner (Terry Pegrum, owner of Puddings Field, Plaisters Lane)

Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> June 2017 in the Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz, commencing 18.06 hours.

**Present:** Richard Henshaw (Planning Consultant, Intelligent Land), Terry Pegrum (Landowner)

Steering Group members – Mike Blee, Peter Dye (chair), Tony Ferrari, Keith Hudson (from 18.30 hours), Keith Johnson (from 18.15 hours), Colin Marsh, and Liz Pegrum.

### 14. Apologies

Apologies had been received in advance of the meeting from Sue Elgey, Bill Egerton, Huw Llewellyn, Bill Davidson, and Andy Hohne.

### 15. Declaration of Interest

Liz Pegrum declared an interest as the wife of the owner.

### 16. Presentation

TP opened by stating his aspirations of being able to benefit the village and young working families through co-operation with the neighbourhood planning process in a forward looking approach. He wanted to discuss the vehicles and mechanisms for achieving this and some proposals would be presented by Richard Henshaw on his behalf. A handout was distributed.

Richard explained his background as the Planning Policy Manager for East Dorset prior to becoming a consultant some 4 years ago. The following is a summary of the key points of the presentation.

Local and National Policy -

- UK Government focus is on putting the right houses in the right places, a question of balance.
- Revised NPPF to be published in July will place onus on local government to provide housing and will result in increased tensions with local communities.
- Locally, Weymouth and West Dorset need to deliver 15,500 dwellings over 15 years. Since there is no 5 year housing land supply, pressure will be placed on development boundaries.
- Conflict arises since 95% of people are housed satisfactorily and 5% are not.



PD asked about the effects of potential National Park status.

RH stated it was not easy to predict but experience suggests an increase in house prices which will force out local people. This could be alleviated by a bespoke policy where all new development were 100% affordable and in small pockets e.g. Peak District.

TF questioned whether the village would fall within the National Park boundary.

RH stated the need to justify that the housing identified to be provided in the Neighbourhood Plan is deliverable. Many plans fail because sites do not have a realistic prospect of delivery. There are many reasons why sites do not come forward, including viability, ownership, planning constraints amongst many. It is important to have confirmation from landowners of identified sites that they are willing to deliver the development to meet the needs of the Plan. Additionally, there is a need to take account of the pressures placed upon the amenity of adjoining properties and potential loss of garden spaces and incidental open space.

- The conservation area is important in terms of heritage and RH questioned whether an appraisal had been prepared to identify what specific heritage features were of importance and those that were not?
- Conservation areas should not be seen as preservation areas.
- A heritage assets survey needed to be underpinned with a plan
- People are protective of settlement boundaries but they may require changing to meet new needs as space within it is depleted.
- Important to take control of your boundaries and lead on the decisions rather than have these forced upon you.
- Affordable Housing – the Rural Exceptions policy allows 100% affordable housing where a need exists. TP is interested in providing affordable housing.

Neighbourhood Plan –

- RH asked what the Steering Group were aiming to achieve in preparing a Neighbourhood Plan e.g. land for facilities, housing for local people? What information could be provided to help in the production of the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan? A timetable would also help?

Affordable Housing Need -

- Useful contact is Paul Derrien the West Dorset housing enabling team leader.
- 1700 people on the register which hardly changes since there are too few affordable homes for allocation
- 81 households on the register in the Sutton Poyntz/Preston area but this figure is artificially low since many young people living at home are probably not registered and some in need are uncomfortable engaging with authority.

## The Site (Puddings Field)-

- RH understands the history but this has created an opportunity for something different – propose heavily subsidised land to enable affordable housing to be built and available in perpetuity.
- Control of how housing is used and meets local needs – options of shared equity, social rented, subsidised low cost, etc.
- PD asked ‘in view of the land being outside the Defined Development Boundary (DDB) and in the absence of a call for sites how would the NP enable the community to take part. . RH proposed a policy within the plan to specifically identify Pudding’s Field as a location to provide affordable housing for local people in perpetuity.
- RH stated that a position of no development is contrary to what the government wants. The NP should aim to deliver development to meet local needs by taking control through policy. It is to shape the nature and location of development, not prevent it.
- Current policy of restricting development to within the DDB means selling to outside people rather than exerting control by pursuing the ‘affordable option’.
- In the absence of a policy within the NP on affordable housing the Local Plan will take precedent.

MB stated that the community had declared its position and the Local Plan states that villages of below 500 population would not be considered for this type of housing development. This is compounded by the appeals inspector stating that the village was not sustainable.

RH stated that the Rural Housing Exception can override this and consider smaller settlements. What is sustainable is open to interpretation and if the village were non-sustainable there would not be any development at all, which was clearly not the case.

PD noted that as the draft NP did not address these issues, only the Local Plan (and associated policies) would determine where and if development would occur outside the DDB.

- RH stated that the evidence may conflict with what views communities express and this creates difficult decisions. One option is to go back to the community and ensure there is an understanding of the implications of the policies that are being proposed.

Offer -

A number of issues were highlighted and questions asked.

- RH commented on the value of using Community Land Trusts who would allocate housing to applicants and ensure that the local community were involved in the decision making in order that concerns such as the right to buy were addressed. He noted that West Dorset Council were a leader in the UK in this area.
- CM asked for any examples where the policy proposals advocated had been incorporated into a Neighbourhood Plan. RH suggested that this would need to be researched.

- MB noted that the recent Housing Needs Survey had identified those in need as predominantly people with no mortgage who were looking to downsize rather than the groups identified by RH. RH referred back to the information provided by Paul Derrian which shows a high level of local need. Those who already have a property asset who can afford a smaller dwelling are not classified as being in affordable housing need.
- RH commented that high quality design as required in an AONB could be achieved with affordable housing, for example at Abbotsbury.
- RH did not believe that the impending Unitary Authority changes would impede the neighbourhood planning processes. TF challenged this on the basis that the Weymouth Town Council would become the owners of the Neighbourhood Plan and might not be minded to support the process. RH believed that the defined neighbourhood plan area would be the driver and would continue to exist. . Neighbourhood Plan areas often cover a different geography to a Parish or Town Council. However, legal advice will need to be taken to advise as to the ownership of the NP. MB noted that this contradicted the advice given by our own consultant who indicated that we must submit a plan by April 2019. RH believed it would be prudent to ensure the NP is progressed, but the new Town Council would not automatically result in the Plan being abandoned if it was adopted by April 2019.

In summary RH asked the group to consider the opportunity. TP stated that the original proposal was not of the best design but what he wanted to do now with the site was to benefit those people who had not been as lucky as those of us who can afford to live in the village now, and to give people with young families a real chance to get on the housing ladder via an affordable scheme, preferably shared equity. He was being open and honest as he had throughout the planning processes on this site and would welcome further discussions.

RH concluded by stating that the key question was meeting 'need'.

CM requested an e-copy of the handout. TP agreed to arrange this

The meeting closed at 19.20 hours.

# Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

## Meeting with Landowner (PJ Seal Estates and their representatives)

Minutes of Meeting held on Friday 6th July 2017 in the Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz, commencing 12.02 hours.

**Present:** Landowners representatives - Christopher Seal (PJ Seal Estates), Paul Dance (Planning Consultant), Geoff Buckland (Building Consultant)

Steering Group members – Peter Dye (chair), Bill Davidson, Tony Ferrari, Andy Hohne and Colin Marsh.

Residents/observers – Dave Burge, Jez Cunningham and Maureen Morris.

### 17. Apologies

Apologies had been received in advance of the meeting from Mike Blee, Sue Elgey, Bill Egerton, Keith Hudson, Keith Johnson, Huw Llewellyn and Liz Pegrum.

### 18. Introduction

The chair outlined the background to the meeting and referred to the formation of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group 2 years previously, the designated Neighbourhood Area, the surveys undertaken in order to ascertain the aspirations of the village population and the process of consultation with landowners. In respect of the latter he welcomed the opportunity to talk to representatives of PJ Seal as a major landowner in the neighbourhood area.

Each of those present was asked to briefly introduce themselves.

### 19. Presentation

In inviting comment on the aspirations and views of PJ Seal Estates the chair noted that the village survey had resulted in a preference not to change the Defined Development Boundary (DDB) and consequently not to adopt a call for sites. A preference to influence the style and character of buildings within the DDB as opposed to considering development outside of the DDB was shaping current policy, however, the views of landowners were important and must be taken into account.

Christopher Seal explained that PJ Seal Estates had reduced its land holding within the Neighbourhood Area from 600 to 200 acres over the last two years and were interested in identifying possibilities for future use of the remaining land. He invited Paul Dance to outline some potential options for consideration.

Paul Dance explained that all of the land owned by PJ Seal Estates was outside of the DDB, however they were prepared to work with the village to seek mutually beneficial development options such as allocation of a

development site for housing possibly in return for provision of a recreation area or an affordable housing option. Based on previous experience in other small villages (later confirmed in response to a question as Hilton, near Ilminster) one option was to build some housing for sale in perpetuity at a fixed 80% of the market value. The benefit to the community would be to restrict occupation to villagers, their relatives and those working in the village with a possible extension to adjoining villages. It was suggested that the stock of houses and their occupancy allocation would be decided by the parish council. In return the agreement would seek to allocate open market housing for the remainder of the development.

The chair identified the additional complexities with this particular neighbourhood area due to it being of non-parish status and affected by major local government re-organisation directly involving the Weymouth and Portland Borough Council. He commented that other land owners had discussed non-affordable housing options and made brief reference to land covered by the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) but this was not expanded upon by the landowner.

Geoff Buckland explained that he had been involved in the White Horse Lane development which he felt had been positively received by the village. He highlighted a number of points as follows:-

- It was better to change the DDB within the Neighbourhood Plan rather than allow others to do so.
- The option of demolition of properties on existing sites and the building of multiple properties on that site was limited by the availability of viable sites from a developers prospective.
- Concern was expressed for younger people who could not afford housing.
- If development were allowed the area may benefit from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
- Planning permission is likely to be granted on land outside of the DDB as recently demonstrated.

In response to questions Paul Dance confirmed several points

- The figure of 80% of the market value for 'affordable housing' was not fixed and was given as a typical example.
- It was important to distinguish between affordable and social housing, basically in term of ownership versus rental.
- It was not viable for developers to exceed 10 units.
- PJ Seal are willing to discuss possible development sites with the steering group such as that north of Puddledock Lane.

The chair commented upon the policy challenge for the steering group of shaping development within the existing DDB as called for by residents against a call for sites approach favoured by landowners. It was accepted that development space within the DDB was 'tight' and that whilst not being minded to undertake a call for sites any such decision would require further public consultation as ultimately in any discussions the village must know what is on offer. The importance of maintaining an open gap between Preston and Sutton Poyntz was strongly emphasised.

Christopher Seal asked about the impact of the use of adjacent land for camping and it was noted that this had not resulted in any significant problems and had in fact resulted in some economic benefits, for example for the Springhead pub. CS explained that this was one option being investigated near Chalbury, possibly using mobile Shepherds huts. Maureen Morris noted that the 28 day use did provide an element of certainty relating to such use.

The chair confirmed that the Blue Cedar Homes enquiry regarding provision of a retirement home had been retracted further to the offer of a meeting with the steering group. AH asked whether retirement homes could be 'affordable'; Paul Dance explained that affordable was primarily aimed at first time buyers but much would depend on the rules of any agreement.

Geoff Buckley commented that the profit that developers make had to account for costs incurred such as the CIL, mitigation plans, etc. In response to a question by AH it was confirmed that for developments over 10 units a third would need to become affordable and below 10 units the rental may not cover the investment, hence open market discounted property would be the more favourable option and would give the village greater control, given that there would need to be housing growth. He suggested that 2 or 3 units on a site were necessary to be financially viable. It was emphasised by the chair that any large scale development would have a destructive impact on the village.

In summary the chair left the door open to further discussing specific options. He noted that the 'ball was very much in the steering group's court' and that they would have to consider all of the various options including a call for sites and that these would ultimately be open to formal regulation 14 consultation, when all stakeholders would have the opportunity to comment. He concluded by noting that the meeting had been extremely valuable and positive and the more that we communicate in future the better for all concerned. He asked that any confidences affecting other landowners be respected.

The meeting closed at 12.50 hours.

## **Invitation to Peter Broatch**

Peter Dye

To Peter Broatch

Dear Peter,

Thank you for your continuing contribution to the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Planning process, particularly your comments on the draft policies relating to Key Views and Local Green Spaces.

We have recently held separate meetings with two local landowners about future development within the Neighbourhood Plan Area.

This involved a small group of Steering Group members and lasted around an hour (both meetings were held in the Springhead Blue Duck Bar).

The discussions proved both informative and constructive, and we would very much like to offer you the same opportunity.

The day and time would very much be your call. If you are interested, I will make the necessary arrangements.

Yours Peter

**ITEM 7 Approval of section on Sports and Recreation for Regulation 14 formal consultation**

**SPORTS AND RECREATION**

**Strategic Objective**

Sustain and improve those community facilities and assets which create community integration and a better quality of life.

**Introduction**

Sutton Poyntz is a small but vibrant community which has many active interest groups (history, arts, social, etc) as well as community centred events such as the biennial Sutton Poyntz Street Fayre and monthly Coffee Mornings. Residents recognise the real benefits that this brings in terms of community cohesion but also appreciate the challenges and areas for improvement that exist (1,10). For example, there are no indoor or outdoor sports facilities without travelling into Weymouth or Dorchester. The policies in this plan seek to address these issues relative to future development and deal specifically with:

- Protecting those assets considered important to the community to prevent their loss to residential development.
- Support for the development of facilities that will benefit the whole community and particularly younger people who are vital to our future sustainability.
- Identification of a suitable location for a children's play area.

Specific community aspirations have been identified regarding assets of community value, interim arrangements for a children's play area, history/nature trails and recreational use of the public rights of way, better utilisation of the waterworks museum and provision of additional community facilities.

**POLICY SR1 – PROTECTION OF COMMUNITY ASSETS**

**Planning permission for proposals, including change of use, that result in the loss of the following as community assets in Sutton Poyntz will not normally be permitted.**

- *The Mission Hall*
- *Springhead Public House*
- *Waterworks Museum*

Change of use of these facilities will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where it has been clearly demonstrated that:

- there is no local need for them or they are no longer viable; and
- no appropriate alternative community use is needed or would be viable.

**Proposals designed to modernise or extend community facilities for public use, including to increase their capacity, will generally be supported.**

*National Policy Planning Framework (13) paragraphs 69,70 apply.*

*Local Plan Policies (14) COM 2 and 3 apply.*



### **Justification for Policy SR1**

A recent consultation exercise (11) has identified the above facilities as being of significant value to the community, in each case with over 90% support. Many of these facilities have received consistent recognition as being vital to the sustainability of the community in previous surveys (10) and provide key social and amenity benefits to all. Loss of any of these facilities would have a significant detrimental impact on the community and in many cases create social isolation.

### **Summary of Intent for Policy SR1**

The above policy aims to recognise those facilities of recreational value to the community that are of importance, such that their loss would have a significant detrimental impact on the sustainability of the village and the social well-being of residents. These sites are identified as priorities for protection from planning applications that propose a change of use or do not seek to develop them for the benefit of community provision.

### **POLICY SR2 – ENHANCEMENT OF COMMUNITY SPORTS AND RECREATION FACILITIES.**

**Proposals to use land within, or adjacent to the centre of, the village as a public children's play area will be supported, unless they conflict with other Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan policies.**

*National Policy Planning Framework (13) paragraph 73 applies*

*Local Plan Policy (14) COM 4 applies*

### **Justification for Policy SR2**

The mixed opinions expressed in the first public consultation regarding a sports field and a children's play area (10) resulted in specific questions being asked in the Stage Two Survey (11). The results show public support for some facilities and not for others and the former have been incorporated into this Neighbourhood Plan. A small majority favoured the provision of a children's play area with several respondents identifying the Springhead Pub garden as a logical location. There was also a good level of support for a village green and community allotments and these proposed new facilities have been included below as aspirations for the community.

### **Summary of Intent for Policy SR2**

Concerns relating to the lack of provision of facilities for younger people have been a consistent theme in earlier village surveys (35,10) and the need to attract families to the village is recognised. The lack of recreation facilities, particularly for younger children is a disincentive for families with children to choose to live in the village and needs to be addressed in terms of community sustainability. It has been suggested that the use of the small play facility at the Springhead Pub be adopted subject to agreement with the tenants and owners and this would also provide a suitable area for a longer term permanent public facility.

## **COMMUNITY ASPIRATIONS**

Several recreation-related issues were raised following the public consultation surveys (36,10) that represent community aspirations for future action. Several public facilities are regarded as important to the sustainability of the community and could be protected by nomination as Assets of Community Value (ACV). The provision of a children's play area is supported by the community (36) and in view of the need to secure land to accommodate this a short-term option exists to negotiate on a formal basis the shared use of the existing facility in the Springhead Garden. The network of public rights of way (25) are a key feature that give Sutton Poyntz a sense of place (1) and could be incorporated into a series of guided walks centred on the village that promote recreational interest in the history, ecology and literary connections within the area. The Waterworks museum is under used largely due to problems of staffing and so provides an opportunity for resourcing through community volunteers as part of an arrangement with Wessex Water plc which could enable a broader use of the facilities for other community purposes, such as a café, additional meeting venue, local produce sales or arts and crafts exhibitions.

## **ANNEX 1: COMMUNITY ASPIRATIONS IN RELATION TO SPORTS AND RECREATION**

### **AP1 – Nomination of Assets of Community Value**

The Neighbourhood Forum shall register the following facilities as Assets of Community value with the Local Authority under the provisions of the Localism Act 2011.

- The Village Pond
- The Mission Hall
- Springhead Public House
- Waterworks Museum
- Veterans Wood
- Area of Land in front of 97 Sutton Road

If any of these facilities are offered for sale, the Neighbourhood Forum shall undertake a public consultation to decide whether to exercise the right to bid.

### **AP2 – Provision of a Children's Play Area**

To explore the provision of a children's play facility in the short term in co-operation with the Springhead Pub to assist the delivery of Policy SR2.

### **AP3 – Visitor Guides**

Develop guides for local history, nature, literature trails and consider provision of personal guidance through the services of registered local volunteers.

### **AP4 – Promote the Use of Public Rights of Way for Recreational Purposes**

- AP4.1 Provide maps and guides to promote the use of the network of public rights of way and incorporate these into themed walk guides.
- AP4.2 To identify suitable cycle routes in the area and link these into the National Cycle Network

### **AP5 – Waterworks Museum**

Promote with Wessex Water plc extended opening of the Waterworks Museum through community volunteers and greater community use of the visitor area facilities, for example as a small café, outlet for local arts and crafts.



SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN TIMETABLE H1 2018

Biodiversity, Heritage and Housing & Planning sub-groups to meet to consider revised approach to green space, local heritage assets and key views respectively in view of the decision at the December Steering Group meeting on questions 4,5,13.	January 2018	RESPECTIVE SUB-GROUPS
Further return visit to remind residents of the survey return deadline and attempt collection of completed surveys	1/1/18 – 5/1/18	Survey distributor
Collate public consultation feedback (Surveys and Housing Needs Survey plus Distributor Returns Summary)	06/01/2018	KB/CM
All feedback surveys to be passed to AH by KB/CM along with a data analysis spreadsheet.	06/01/2018	KB/CM/AH
Data entry volunteers to be divided into two teams each of whom will enter half of the data from the surveys and then exchange with the other team to cross-check the entry.	01/2018	AH to co-ordinate volunteers from 19/12/2017 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
External audit report on stage two survey and housing needs survey published ready for March Steering Group meeting.	28/02/2018	Survey Sub-Group
Draft newsletter no 4 presented by Survey Sub-Group for endorsement by Steering Group	20/03/2018	Survey Sub-group/Steering Group
Responses to survey comments passed to Sub-groups	03/2018	Survey Sub-group
Consultants site visit re designation of Key Views and Local Green Spaces	21/03/2018	BW/TG plus EP,BE, CM,JW
Request for comments from SG members on each of the draft Neighbourhood Plan sections and Vision/objectives	21/03/2018 to 04/03/2018	SG Members
Consultation meetings with landowners facilitated by Chair	04/2018	Steering Group
Distribution of Neighbourhood Plan Newsletter No 5. to all stakeholders.	29/03/2018 to 03/04/2018	Survey Sub-group/Steering Group
Responses from SG members on Neighbourhood Plan draft sections and	05/04/2018	CM

Vision/objectives collated by CM and sent to respective sub-groups.		
Sub-groups to meet and agree response/re-draft of NP sections	05/04/2018 to 17/04/2018	Sub-groups as appropriate
Steering Group to agree core content for draft Neighbourhood Plan and agree arrangements for drafting of full plan.	17/04/2018	Steering Group
Steering Group to receive Independent Assessment of Key Views and Local Green Space.	17/04/2018	Steering Group
Steering Group to agree plan for completion of the Neighbourhood Plan following changes to grant funding arrangements.	17/04/2018	Steering Group
Draft Place Appraisal to be updated based upon feedback including that from the Stage Two Survey	April/May	PD/BE/CM
First draft structure of Neighbourhood Plan to be produced	Prior to 15/05/18	PD/CM
Landowner responses to LGS and Key View consultation to be considered.	Prior to 15/05/18	H and P and Biodiversity sub-group
Consultation meetings with landowners. 19 <sup>th</sup> June (Terry Pegrum) and 6 <sup>th</sup> July (Christopher Seal). Proposed meeting with Wessex Water plc.	June/July	PD/Steering Group
Approval of draft Neighbourhood Plan sections on Employment and Getting Around	19 June 2018	Steering Group
Approval of draft Neighbourhood Plan section on Sports and Recreation	17 July 2018	Steering Group