

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Agenda for the meeting on 28th August 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 Sue Elgey, Keith Hudson)**
- 2. To Approve the Minutes of the previous meeting held on 17th July 2018**
- 3. To Receive an update on actions arising from the previous meeting (not otherwise on the agenda).**
- 4. To Address any items of Correspondence (Wessex Water plc and Brian Wilson)**
- 5. To Receive an update on Grant Funding and Income and Expenditure.**
- 6. To Comment on the Revised Weymouth and Portland Borough Council Local Plan (link -<https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/planning-buildings-land/planning-policy/west-dorset-and-weymouth-portland/local-plan-review/pdf/issues-and-options.pdf>) and consultants comments)**
- 7. To Consider proposals for the monitoring of the 'made Neighbourhood Plan' (proposal attached)**
- 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 Consider a draft Neighbourhood Plan policy briefing to the Neighbourhood Forum (September 2018 see attached e-mails)**
- 11. To Receive an update on the Draft Consultation Statement.**
- 12. To Review progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetables (attached).**
- 13. Any Other Business.**
- 14. Date and Time of the Next Meeting.**

To confirm a revised date and time of the next meeting as Tuesday 25th September 2018 at 7.30pm.

ITEM 2 – MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

DRAFT Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 17th July 2018 in the Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz, commencing 19.30 hours.

Present: Peter Dye (Chair), Bill Davidson, Bill Egerton, Keith Hudson, Keith Johnson, Huw Llewellyn, Colin Marsh and Liz Pegrum.

John Crisp (Housing and Planning sub-group) was also in attendance.

1. Apologies

Received in advance of the meeting from Mike Blee, Sue Elgey, Tony Ferrari and Andy Hohne.

2. To Approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 19th June 2018

An amendment on a point of clarity had been requested by Mike Blee

It was agreed to amend the second sentence of the third paragraph under section 6 on page 2 to read “The landowner believed that the site ... aspirational needs” **Action:CM**

It was also agreed to correct the date of the meeting to read ‘19th June 2018’ as opposed to 19th May 2018.

LP asked that an apostrophe be inserted into “Puddings” so as to read “Pudding’s”.

The minutes as amended were proposed as a true record by BD, seconded by BE, and agreed unanimously by the meeting.

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

Before continuing with normal business, in view of some recently publicly expressed views the chair stated that he wanted the following comments to be placed on the public record.

- There is no evidence that anyone is trying to slow down the Neighbourhood Plan process and there are some indications that we could be moving too fast.
- We need to keep an open mind as to ideas from other neighbourhood forums and plans. . Insisting that we are different is insular, unproductive and could ultimately undermine the validity of the process

- There have been no conflicts of interest in the Steering Group's deliberations that have not been declared. There are different views and strong opinions, but we need to work together to achieve a consensus rather than marginalising individuals. Owning land in the Neighbourhood Area does not disqualify participation in the Steering Group or invalidate individual views and opinions.
- The Steering Group has a leadership role which involves much more than 'rubber stamping' the majority views of the village but being proactive and ensuring the implications and potential contradictions of policy decisions arising from public consultations are clearly explained, if necessary, through further consultation.
- We must look to producing a Neighbourhood Plan that can be supported by the vast majority of stakeholders; a 51% to 49% split (either way) will not deliver a happy or contented community.
- Given our stated aim of achieving a better, stronger and more forward looking community it is important to try to achieve a broad consensus through compromise during the policy making process.

The chair went through each of the actions from the minutes of the June meeting.

Numbering of pages of the minutes – action complete.

Grant funding – BE confirmed that the local authority grant of £3.2k had been received and Groundwork had approved the claim for £730 expenditure. LP confirmed that an invoice for £220 for outstanding consultancy work had been received from Brian Wilson and authorised for payment by the chair. The chair confirmed that this would enable further consultancy services to be procured. HL proposed a vote of thanks to Councillor Tony Ferrari for securing the grant funding and this was seconded by BE and fully supported by the meeting. The chair noted that TF had also been responsible for securing finance to undertake work around the village pond on behalf of the Sutton Poyntz Society.

Contact with Wessex Water – the action on LP was now closed. The chair confirmed that he would continue to seek a meeting with Wessex Water over their concerns with some of the draft policies.

Meeting with Terry Pegrum – an agreed record of the meeting had been previously circulated

Meetings with landowners – the chair confirmed that he would continue to engage with landowners and will subsequently report on the meeting with Chris Seal - the minute for which had been pre-circulated with one minor amendment. He had invited Peter Broatch to meet the Steering Group and noted that Punch Taverns had declined a meeting in the absence of a call for sites. LP suggested that the owners (Diment) of the land at the bottom of Old Bincombe Lane should also be consulted. This was agreed.

Action:PD

Meeting of Place Appraisal sub-group – the chair noted that the sub-group had not met pending guidance from Brian Wilson as to what precisely was required for the update and where the focus should be placed.

Section on Employment, Business and Tourism - this had been incorporated into the draft Neighbourhood Plan although comments by Nick Cardnell (Senior Planning Officer, (Community and Policy Development,) Dorset Councils Partnership) may lead to minor changes.

Biodiversity information – CM confirmed that a map covering these points had been sent to the Crocker family and no response received.

Heritage – progress would be addressed under the sub-group reports

Housing and Planning - progress would be addressed under the sub-group reports

Balance in narrative of Consultation Statement - this was work in progress.

4. Update on Grant Funding.

BE stated that approval of the allocation of £730 had taken us up to the £9k grant limit. This allocation covered 3 consultancy invoices of £220 each and £70 for printing. In response to a question from LP regarding the previously disallowed application the chair was of the opinion that this matter had now been satisfactorily resolved. He further stated that providing we adhere to the schedule of work agreed earlier it will be possible to fund completion of the Neighbourhood Plan from the local authority grant. He also reported that Nick Cardnell will initiate the SEA screening and that, given the Steering Group's stated vision and aims, and the absence of a call for sites, it was felt that this could be completed by September 2018. BE questioned what level of paperwork would be required to administer the council grant, although the chair did not feel this would be too onerous and was expected to be comparable to that previously encountered with Groundwork.

5. To Receive an update on Income and Expenditure

LP reported that £3.2k had been received into the bank with a further £730 awaited and with expenditure of £220 for consultancy this would leave a projected balance of £3710.

6. To Receive an update regarding Consultation with Landowners.

The chair reported on a very useful meeting with Christopher Seal on 6th July. Various proposals had been outlined by the landowner including specific potential development sites such as north of Puddledock Lane along with the use of fields for camping; these were contained in the detailed minutes of the meeting.

Regarding future meetings, Punch Taverns had declined the offer of a meeting and a response was awaited from Wessex Water and Peter Broatch. An action was placed on the chair to contact Hugh Diment with regard to a

meeting in relation to his land.

Action:PD

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

The chair noted that the Regulation 14 process would provide a major opportunity for consultation with stakeholders. Regarding the section on Sports and Recreation the chair noted the feedback from Wessex Water which stated that the museum was part of an operational site and should not be included as an Asset of Community Value (ACV). It was also considered more appropriate to broaden the potential location for a children's play area from 'near the Springhead' to one 'near the centre of the village'. These two topics formed the policy element of the section and had been highlighted for ease of reference. The chair recommended that the Wessex Water museum remain on the list of ACV's in order to provide an opportunity for wider consultation. The section was unanimously approved for inclusion in the draft Neighbourhood Plan for Regulation 14 consultation having been proposed by CM and seconded by BE.

The chair confirmed that he would now send the various responses to Wessex Water in respect of their recent communication.

Action:PD

8. To Receive sub-group reports

The chair agreed to address the report on Housing and Planning first.

Housing and Planning - LP reported on the meeting held immediately prior to the steering group and which followed circulation of the most recent draft policy and took account of comments made by Nick Cardnell. The following issues were discussed:-

Nick Cardnell was concerned as to the use of the term 'up to 20 homes' and suggested 'at least 20 homes'. The sub-group were not comfortable with this wording and were keen to see a commitment to a specific number of homes so as to better reflect the public view. It was agreed that more evidence was needed to support a figure of 20 and that reference to the historic building rate would be a primary source. The chair felt that, as an analysis had concluded the Defined Development Boundary (DDB) contained sufficient capacity for 20 homes a build rate of one home per year could be achieved over the next 18 years (i.e. up to 2036). As this was equivalent to the build rate over the last thirty years, such a policy could be defended.

LP reported that the sub-group had discussed the implications of not calling for sites and no change to the DDB in terms of the five-year housing supply rule application as opposed to a three-year rule which would be easier to meet.

The chair commented on the suggestion introduced by Nick Cardnell and supported by Brian Wilson that a monitoring function should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan such that if the housing policy was not being met during the life of the plan a review of how to achieve this would be triggered. He was supportive of this idea and felt that the village would want to have such a role in implementation of the plan, for example through the Neighbourhood Forum. HL and KJ expressed some concern as to the practicality of such a monitoring role while BD considered it vital for the village to be pro-active in this respect in order to prevent the local authority having to take the lead. LP was concerned as to who exactly would carry out the monitoring role in order to be representative. CM felt that any monitoring function should relate to all policy areas, not just housing. BE noted that by the time the plan was made a Weymouth Parish will exist and perhaps they would manage the plan but could delegate the monitoring role to the Neighbourhood Forum. In summary the chair considered that a monitoring section within the Neighbourhood Plan was sensible and might provide an on-going role for the Neighbourhood Forum. Reference to the rationale for this should be included in the introductory section.

Action:PD

LP referred to the policy on design and style issues and the need for a consultation process aligned to the conservation area plan. BE agreed to provide the most recent copy of the latter.

Action:BE

A key challenge for the sub-group was how to get the council to do its job with regard to the conservation area by strengthening the wording around the policy on 'style and design' with the possible addition of a policy on review. JC felt that ultimately it came down to the planning department doing its duty and it would help to talk to the planners about the wording of policies which would assist them in their function. It was agreed that LP and JC meet with the planners in this respect.

Action:LP and JC

PD suggested that Nick Cardnell and Brian Wilson be consulted as to the precise wording of policies although Nick Cardnell had been generally positive about the draft plan.

The sub-group had discussed the flooding policy and felt that further evidence on the extent of past flooding events was needed. LP suggested that the policy was quite long and could be condensed down. It was suggested that the Biodiversity sub-group as the originators of this policy provide further input following this feedback.

LP asked whether consultation with landowners should be included as a policy. The chair suggested that this would be adequately covered by the Consultation Statement and Regulation 14 consultation process.

It was agreed to remain silent on the issue of 'affordable housing' or rural exceptions.

LP noted the need to refine the policy detail on Key Views.

LP agreed to produce a further draft and circulate this for comment.

Action:LP

HL questioned the importance of the figure of 20 new homes over the period of the plan and the degree of slack that existed given the response in the stage two survey. The chair confirmed that since the figure was based upon firm evidence of one new home per year over the last 20 years it was appropriate and such a policy could not be seen as obstructing development.

KH stated the need to look at the big picture and recognise the economic benefits of development. It was agreed that large scale development was not projected in Sutton Poyntz and BD suggested that the lack of infrastructure was a key limiting factor in this respect.

JC tendered his apologies and left the meeting at this point.

Place Appraisal – The sub-group had not met but would do so pending advice on the content of section 6 from the consultants.

Biodiversity and the Natural Environment – CM referred to the sub-group response to the letter from Wessex Water in relation the threat to the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the preference to underpin this designation with an additional layer of protection of Local Green Space (LGS). Whilst recognising the future constraints that LGS designation may place on operational development plans, it was noted that no proposals currently existed and it was suggested that a possible change in the LGS boundaries may form a basis for compromise, particularly in relation to the water meadow. LP expressed concern that the tendency for Wessex Water to be slow in their response would cause a potential delay in any meeting and this would impact the overall neighbourhood plan timetable. CM did not feel that this would be an issue since the process would simply overflow into the formal Regulation 14 stage. The chair felt it important to try to seek areas of common ground which would be beneficial during formal consultation, however, it was also important not to delay the process unnecessarily and he requested that the Housing and Planning together with the Biodiversity draft Neighbourhood Plan sections be submitted for approval at the August meeting

Action: LP and CM

Resulting from his meeting with Nick Cardnell the chair was able to confirm that as stated in the latest Local Plan Review ‘any new elements of green infrastructure identified within neighbourhood plans (including local green spaces), will form part of the green infrastructure network.’

Employment Business and Tourism – this had been addressed at the last meeting.

Heritage – Following confirmation of receipt of the local authority grant monies BE had unsuccessfully attempted to contact Kim Sankey (consultant) regarding the local heritage asset report and would continue to try to make contact as a matter of urgency.

Action:BE

Sports and Recreation – this had been actioned earlier in the meeting.

Transport (Getting Around) – the draft may require some fine tuning following feedback comments from Nick Cardnell. PD suggested that as with other policy areas assistance from Brian Wilson could now be called upon subject to ensuring that the chair is copied on any communications.

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

The chair was of the opinion that the draft Neighbourhood Plan would be ready to go out for formal consultation in October, in line with the agreed timetable. Following the meeting with Nick Cardnell it had been suggested that including the community aspirations within the same section of the draft as policies may detract from the impact of the latter and they may be better placed in a separate section. CM noted that a revised draft had been produced reflecting this and was accessible on Drop Box.

10. To Receive an Update on the Draft Consultation Statement

Further amendments had taken place and the revised document was available on Drop Box. This would continue to be updated, for example in relation to the meetings with landowners, prior to a full review.

Action:PD and CM

11. To Review Progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetables

The chair provided a brief overview of the timetable and noted that the decision by the local authority to undertake the SEA screening would enable us to realign with the schedule and begin the Regulation 14 consultation in October.

12. To Address Items of Correspondence

CM reported that there were no items of correspondence other than those which had been addressed earlier in the meeting..

13. Any Other Business

No items of other business were raised by those present.

The chair confirmed that following the meeting with Christopher Seal it had emerged that PJ Seal Estates had been the landowner who had initiated contact with Blue Cedar Homes and subsequently instructed them not to progress the enquiry.

The meeting closed at 21.21 hours.

The date and time of the next meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 21st August 2018 at 19.30 hours.

ITEM 4 – CORRESPONDENCE

From: Brian Wilson
Date: 9 August 2018 at 14:42:00 BST
To: Peter Dye
Cc: neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk
Subject: Re: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Peter,

My reading is that Wessex Water are making two arguments.

1. We're already a SSSI, so LGS designation is superfluous.

It's correct that SSSI is a powerful designation protecting the site and that Natural England would object to any development proposal. That designation is, of course, related to being an important site for specific and rare/threatened flora or fauna.

It is also the case that Government guidance asks NP groups to at least consider whether LGS designation would add anything on sites that are already protected in some way or other. However, it does not go so far as to preclude them from adding LGS designation.

It could equally be argued that as the site is already designated (SSSI), why are Wessex Water concerned about having a further layer of designation. Surely it makes no practical difference to them.

Whilst SSSI offers a nationally recognised designation on flora or fauna grounds noted above, local communities might still feel that they wish to demonstrate how important a site is to them (locally) and they may feel that LGS recognises other characteristics e.g. recreation, beauty, tranquility or historic value. (If you're adding LGS solely or largely for wildlife value, then it probably is superfluous to SSSI.)

2. LGS designation could interfere with undertaking our statutory duties.

It would be interesting to explore with Wessex Water what any such works might be and where they would take place on the site. I'm guessing they would be fairly minor and to some water management features such as pipework, drains, etc. It might be possible to draw the LGS boundary to steer round these.

This could become an issue at examination, if not resolved beforehand. If the LGS designation is included in the submitted version of the NP document and if Wessex Water formally raised their concern again at the subsequent consultation stage run by the local planning authority (Regulation 16), the examiner would have to take a close look and reach a view, whether or not it actually interfered with statutory duties. The examiner could decide to delete LGS designation on these sites.

It's possible that the works involved would be so incidental in nature that LGS designation is not a real constraint. Or that Wessex Water could be given permission to undertake their works under the 'special circumstances' rule that applies to development on designated sites. This is straying into specialist territory where I will not pretend to have a complete answer.

Nonetheless, I hope this helps your thinking.

Brian

Brian Wilson Associates
07505 139 068

WESSEX WATER

From: Ruth Hall
Date: 22 August 2018 at 08:35:55 WEST
To: Peter Dye
Cc: neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk
Subject: RE: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

Hello Peter

I wanted to let you know that I am working to set up a meeting. Two of the members of staff have been on leave so it has been difficult to find a date.

I will be in touch asap.

Regards

Ruth

Ruth Hall

Planning Liaison

e-mail:

Web: www.wessexwater.co.uk

From: Peter Dye
Sent: 09 August 2018 11:21
To: Ruth Hall
Cc: neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk
Subject: Re: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Ruth,

Thank you for getting back to us and for your comments.

It would be very helpful if we could take up the offer of a meeting in Bath, ideally during the window 16-27 August, if this is convenient?

Yours Peter

On 9 Aug 2018, at 10:01, Ruth Hall wrote:

Dear Peter

I have recently returned from maternity leave and Gillian has asked me to respond to you following discussions with the estates and environment departments.

With regards to Areas G1 and G2, we feel that we are already committed to maintaining the land by the SSSI designation, which offers far stronger protection in law than the designation of the land as a Local Green Space (LGS). We are required to maintain the status of the SSSI or would face enforcement action. Natural England only de-designate SSSIs on very rare occasions. In addition we are anticipating an incoming performance commitment for the next investment period which will ensure that we will maintain and improve our SSSI owned land status. We feel that the Local Plan Group such focus the LGS designation on the triangular field outside of our landholding.

We feel that the Neighbourhood Plan Group should be mindful of imposing planning restrictions which may hinder Wessex Water in fulfilling its statutory purpose. Works are planned at the site next year and there is also potentially the need to undertake improvement works on the River Jordan sections as a result of one of the environmental investigations in the Asset Management Plan.

We would be willing to host a meeting at our Claverton Down offices in Bath if you wished to discuss matters further.

Regards

Ruth

Ruth Hall

Planning Liaison

e-mail:

Web: www.wessexwater.co.uk

From: Peter Dye

Sent: 18 July 2018 09:20

To: Gillian Sanders

Cc: neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk

Subject: Re: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Gillian,

Please find attached our biodiversity sub-group's response to your comments about the proposed Local Green Space designations.

We would very much welcome a meeting to discuss these issues.

The Steering Group's belief is that the village and Wessex Water are working to achieve the same outcome, indeed, we feel that there is already a strong and productive relationship in place. Nevertheless, the community is keen to see this strengthened and additional safeguards introduced - consistent with the emerging green infrastructure policies likely to be introduced following the Local Plan Review.

Yours Peter

ITEM 6 – LOCAL PLAN REVIEW (Correspondence)

From: Brian Wilson

Date: 19 August 2018 at 17:05:26 WEST

To: Peter Dye

Cc: neighbourhood@suttonpoyntz.org.uk

Subject: Re: Fwd: WEST DORSET, WEYMOUTH & PORTLAND LOCAL PLAN REVIEW (g) - GENERAL

Dear Peter,

Yes, I agree. I cannot see any significant implications for Sutton Poyntz as a result of recently published Local Plan preferred options document.

Your NP document should relate to the existing (adopted version) Local Plan. Although, I cannot now find a timescale document on the Dorset For You website, it will likely be another year or so before the revised version of their Local Plan is adopted.

That said, it would certainly be useful to say that, whilst you've conformed with the current version of the Local Plan, you have also taken into consideration the preferred options for its revision. We will certainly need to say that in the Basic Conditions Statement, but you might wish to say it in the NP itself.

I will be on holiday for the first week in September (3rd to 7th). By all means send me some completed sections in mid September, if you have them ready by then.

Kind regards,
Brian

Brian Wilson Associate
07505 139 068

On 18/08/2018 08:11, Peter Dye wrote:

Dear Brian,

Please find attached the latest iteration of the Local Plan Review. You may already have seen it.

As I read it, there are no implications for Sutton Poyntz or the NP Area.

I'd welcome, however, any comments you might have, particularly the extent to which we should reference this document in our NP.

My intention is to provide you with the draft NP with our 'final' policies by the end of September.

This should allow the formal consultation process to begin in October - once we have addressed your comments/proposed changes..

Would it be helpful to let you have the individual sections in advance or wait until the whole document is ready?

Not surprisingly, Biodiversity and Housing are still in discussion but the other sections have been agreed by the SG.

Yours Peter

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sutton Poyntz Society <society@suttonpoyntz.org.uk>
Subject: Fwd: WEST DORSET, WEYMOUTH & PORTLAND LOCAL PLAN REVIEW (g) - GENERAL
Date: 10 August 2018 at 16:38:07 BST
To: Peter Riley, Hilary Davidson, "Cunningham, Jez & Jean", Chris Hubbard, "Kelsey, Steven & Jill", "Greet, Jackie", Terry Pegrum, Shirley Davies
Cc: Peter Dye, Colin Marsh

Dear all,

Formal notification of the Local Plan Review consultation. I imagine we think this is different from the function of reviewing planning applications, and therefore the Society Committee will still want to consider this and make a representation. If so, I presume our September Committee meeting might be the appropriate time. However, we may possibly want to consider it jointly with the Steering Group. I would welcome thoughts on the most appropriate way ahead. I have copied this to Peter and Colin both for the benefit of Steering Group members and so they can think about the idea of a joint meeting.

Regards,
Bill

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject: WEST DORSET, WEYMOUTH & PORTLAND LOCAL PLAN REVIEW
(g) - GENERAL
Date: Fri, 10 Aug 2018 15:04:49 +0000
From: Strategic Policy <strategic@dorset.gov.uk>

Dear Sir or Madam

WEST DORSET, WEYMOUTH & PORTLAND LOCAL PLAN REVIEW

Consultation commences on Preferred Options for the review of the adopted Local Plan today (13th August) and runs until 8th October.

We are sending you this letter because we are formally required to contact you and the proposals may have implications for your area.

More information is available on our website or alternatively please get in touch using the contact details below.

Yours sincerely

Strategic Policy

ITEM 7 – PROPOSAL FOR MONITORING OF THE ‘MADE’ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Proposed section to be included in NP

1.7 Management and Monitoring

A successful Neighbourhood Plan requires provision for monitoring and management functions. Management will normally be undertaken by the Local Planning Authority, while the monitoring function traditionally falls to the parish.

Considerable effort has been expended in creating the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan. Residents have engaged in consultation, discussion and research activities to produce a set of policies that could be supported by the community in a public referendum. There is a danger that this commitment may be negated because of imminent organisational and administrative changes. It is therefore vital that residents understand how the plan will be managed and monitored when it is 'made'.

The Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Forum is unique in being a rural non-parish body. Under the local government arrangements in place when the forum was established in 2017, the Weymouth and Portland District Council would have managed the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan (once made), as part of the Weymouth and Portland Local Plan. It would have been reasonable for the District Council to have delegated the monitoring role to the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Forum.

However, with the creation of the Unitary Authority on 1 April 2019, the Weymouth and Portland District Council will disappear and Sutton Poyntz becomes part of Weymouth Town Council. Since it is not possible to have a non-parish forum within a parish, the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Forum will cease to exist with the creation of Weymouth Town Council. At the same time, the Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (incorporating the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan) will become the responsibility of the new Unitary Authority.

There is a danger that the management of the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan could be undermined by ineffective monitoring. The Weymouth Town Council is unlikely to be able to offer the level of oversight that would have been provided by the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Forum, however, by retaining the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Forum Steering Group, the Weymouth Town Council would benefit from its unique knowledge in developing effective and relevant local policies taken to a successful public referendum.

We propose therefore to retain the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Forum Steering Group, for the duration of the Neighbourhood Plan, to monitor the effectiveness of its policies and submit an annual report to the Local Planning Authority. To this end, at least one indicator has been included within each policy to allow progress to be monitored. The annual report will also include an assessment of progress made with the village's aspirations – as identified in Section 5 (Community Aspirations).

ITEM 10 – PROPOSED MEETING WITH THE SUTTON POYNTZ SOCIETY

WEST DORSET, WEYMOUTH & PORTLAND LOCAL PLAN REVIEW (g) -
GENERAL

Fri, 10 Aug 2018 17:06

Peter Dye

To Sutton Poyntz Society society@suttonpoyntz.org.uk

CC Peter Riley, Hilary Davidson, Cunningham, Jez & Jean, Chris Hubbard, Kelsey,
Steven & Jill, Greet, Jackie, Terry Pegrum, Shirley Davies, Colin Marsh

Dear Bill,

I will need to look at the document in detail but it would seem appropriate to discuss the contents at the SG meeting scheduled for 28 August.

I will discuss this with Colin.

I'm not persuaded that we need a joint meeting to consider a collective response but we will know more once the SG has had the opportunity to consider the document.

However, your question does prompt me to suggest that the SG should brief the SPS Committee on the specific policies to be included in draft NP, before the formal consultation process begins - perhaps at your September meeting? The discussion would also include the question of who undertakes the NP monitoring role (once the plan is made).

Yours Peter

On 10 Aug 2018, at 16:38, Sutton Poyntz Society <society@suttonpoyntz.org.uk> wrote:

Dear all,

Formal notification of the Local Plan Review consultation. I imagine we think this is different from the function of reviewing planning applications, and therefore the Society Committee will still want to consider this and make a representation. If so, I presume our September Committee meeting might be the appropriate time. However, we may possibly want to consider it jointly with the Steering Group. I would welcome thoughts on the most appropriate way ahead. I have copied this to Peter and Colin both for the benefit of Steering Group members and so they can think about the idea of a joint meeting.

Regards,
Bill

ITEM 12 Progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetable

SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN TIMETABLE

TARGET ACTION	MONTH & YEAR																										
	2017			2018												2019											
	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
Produce final draft Place Appraisal	█	█																									
Consultant to produce draft Housing Needs Survey .	█	█																									
Draft and agree questions for next public consultation	█	█																									
Begin first draft NP including draft policies	█	█																									
Sub-groups to continue to build evidence base	█	█																									
Steering group endorse PA, HNA and public survey docs.		█																									
Distribution/access of each of the above documents			█																								
Response to each of the above consultation received by 5/1/18				█																							
Summary and analysis of responses by Steering Group				█	█																						
Landowner consultation				█	█	█	█																				
Production of draft NP by SG				█	█	█	█	█																			
May/June SG considers and agrees areas for NP re-draft								█	█																		
SG agree draft NP and send to LPA for SEA screening									█																		
Draft NP sent to all stakeholders										█																	
Feedback from LPA on SEA – expect no full SEA required											█																
Proceed to formal Reg 14 six week consultation												█	█														
SG responds to consultation feedback /records response													█														
Redraft and finalise NP/other docs,/consultation statement														█													
SG endorse NP and submit to LPA															█												
LPA six week consultation period																█	█										
LPA considers responses and reviews																	█										
LPA appoints examiner																		█									
Examination period																			█	█	█	█					

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 Vision/objectives collated by CM and sent to respective sub-groups.	05/04/2018	CM
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 th June (Terry Pegrum) and 6 th 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
Proposed meeting with Wessex Water on LGS	August 2018	PD/ Biodiversity sub-group
Heritage subgroup walk around with Kim Sankey (consultant) regarding list of Local Heritage sites	23/08/2018	Heritage sub-group/KS
Approval of draft Neighbourhood Plan sections on Biodiversity, Housing and Planning and Heritage.	30/9/2018	Steering Group
Revised Draft Neighbourhood Plan to Brian Wilson for Review	1 st Week of October	PD/CM
Approval of Draft Neighbourhood Plan for Regulation 14 Consultation Process.	16/10/2018	Steering Group

