

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Agenda for the meeting on 25th September 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 Colin Marsh, Tony Ferrari, Keith Johnson) and to confirm the resignation of Mike Blee.**
- 2. To Approve the Minutes of the previous meeting held on 28th August 2018 (to consider amendments to the minutes as proposed by Andy Hohne).**
- 3. To Receive an update on actions arising from the previous meeting; not otherwise on the agenda. (Draft section on Monitoring attached)**
- 4. To Address any items of Correspondence.**
- 5. To Receive an update on Grant Funding and Income and Expenditure.**
- 6. To Receive sub-group reports:**
 - a) Place Appraisal (report on meeting of 03/09/18).**
 - b) Biodiversity and the Natural Environment (draft record of meeting with Wessex Water on 13/09/18)**
 - c) Employment, Business and Tourism including IT/Communications**
 - d) Heritage (including approval of the Heritage section of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Consultants report and covering note as previously circulated on 07/09/18 attached)**
 - e) Housing and Planning (updated draft section to be circulated)**
 - f) Sports and Recreation**
 - g) Transport (record of meeting of 31/08/18 previously circulated)**
- 7. To Receive an update on progress with the production of the draft Neighbourhood Plan.**
- 8. To Receive an update on the Draft Consultation Statement.**
- 9. To Review progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetables (attached).**
- 10. Any Other Business.**
- 11. Date and Time of the Next Meeting.**

To confirm the date and time of the next meeting as Tuesday 16th October 2018 at 7.30pm.

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

DRAFT Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 28th August 2018 in the Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz, commencing 19.33 hours.

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

A total of five residents were also in attendance.

The Chair apologised for the failure to provide public notification on the village web site of the change in the date of this meeting. In future the web site should advise anyone wishing to attend Steering Group meetings to contact the secretary in advance to request the agenda and associated papers. **Action: BE**

1. Apologies

Received in advance of the meeting from Sue Elgey, Keith Hudson, Huw Llewellyn and Liz Pegrum.

2. To Approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 17th July 2018

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as a correct record and subsequently endorsed by the Chair.

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

The Chair went through the actions arising from the minutes of the July meeting.

Amendments to the minutes of the July meeting – action complete.

Consult with Hugh Diment (landowner) – The Chair had written to Hugh Diment but had not yet received a reply. BE suggested that the Pressley family may have an e-mail address for Mr. Diment. The Chair had also written to Peter Broatch and was awaiting a reply.

Responses to Wessex Water – these had been sent and further communication received with the offer of a meeting which was being pursued.

Inclusion of a section within the Neighbourhood Plan on ‘monitoring’ – to be dealt with under item 7 on the agenda.

Conservation Area Plan documentation – BE confirmed that this had been forwarded to LP as requested.

Housing sub-group meeting with Local Authority Planning Department. – this action is still outstanding.

Production of a draft Housing and Planning section for the Neighbourhood Plan – this action is still outstanding.

Formal approval of draft Neighbourhood Plan sections on Biodiversity and Housing and Planning –delayed until the next meeting pending a meeting with Wessex Water and further work by the H and P sub-group.

Heritage Assessment – to be addressed under the sub-group report.

Amendments to the Consultation Statement – to be addressed under Item 11

4. To Address any items of Correspondence

The Chair explained that a further communication had been received from Wessex Water expressing their opposition to the designation of Local Green Space and to the designation of the Waterworks Museum as an Asset of Community Value, on the basis that they believed it would interfere with their operational duties. In view of this response an informal meeting had been sought to attempt to seek agreement on a way forward prior to the formal Regulation 14 process. CM explained that designation of some areas as Local Green Space was needed to underpin the areas of SSSI in view of the perceived threat to the latter and that designation was not seen as affecting operational functions in view of the 'special circumstances' caveat; a view supported by the consultant. Liz Crocker (resident) suggested that there was a need to be cautious so as not to detrimentally impact the positive relationship between the village and Wessex Water. In acknowledging this comment CM noted that this was a two-way process and the village did give a great deal to Wessex Water in return.

BE proposed that if a way forward could not be found the use of Green Infrastructure as a less rigorous alternative may be an option.

The Chair suggested that it was hoped to meet with Wessex Water within the next four weeks.

5. To Receive an update on Grant Funding and Income and Expenditure

BE reported that one grant payment had been received and an invoice paid. This left a balance of available expenditure of around £3.9k.

BE confirmed that Terry Pegrum intended to step down as Treasurer of the Sutton Poyntz Society.

6. To Comment on the Revised Weymouth and Portland Borough Council Local Plan

Having reviewed the Local Plan and spoken to Brian Wilson (consultant) the Chair was of the view that the revision had no significant impact upon the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, although it should be referenced where appropriate in the document.

BE stated that having looked at the fine detail he believed there were some significant points. He gave an example in relation to the AONB which previously stated, 'taking into account' but in the revision stated, 'development

could only take place if it did not conflict with the Dorset AONB plan', which was much stronger. Other members who had read the revised plan suggested that it would have no significant impact.

The Chair suggested that the view of Nick Cardnell be sought in relation to any local impact that the plan revision may have.

Action: PD

7. To Consider proposals for the monitoring of the 'made' Neighbourhood Plan.

The Chair expanded upon proposals which he had made in a note which had been circulated with the agenda. He identified two key issues in relation to monitoring; who will own the process and how will it be managed. He suggested that it would not be possible to have a non-parish forum within a parish once the new Weymouth Town Council had been formed. Feedback from both Nick Cardnell (Weymouth and Portland Borough Council) and Brian Wilson (consultant) had indicated that it would be important to have a plan for monitoring of the policies to ensure that they were effectively implemented. In this respect, the Chair envisaged a role for the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, although he recognised that others believed that this was a role for the Sutton Poyntz Society in the future. The key at this stage was to identify a means of monitoring and raising issues with the relevant management authorities, which would be a Dorset wide entity not the Weymouth Town Council.

In addition to monitoring organisation and measurements MB suggested there was also a need for a "process" to follow through on monitoring actions. BE believed that as the Sutton Poyntz Society was the constituted Neighbourhood Forum it was the appropriate democratic body to undertake such a proposed monitoring role a view supported by BD. The Chair noted that the Steering Group was created as part of the Neighbourhood Forum and was also a 'democratic body'.

In supporting a role for the Steering Group CM suggested that the body that had researched and developed the policies was best placed to adopt the monitoring role.

BE suggested that the Weymouth Town Council should decide the monitoring process.

Liz Crocker (resident) questioned how monitoring indicators within the Neighbourhood Plan would work in practice, citing biodiversity and housing as examples where they would be difficult to apply. The Chair suggested that monitoring may lead to a review during the life of the plan with action being triggered if targets were not being met, however he stressed that he was open to alternative ideas. CM added that both policies and aspirations would need to be monitored.

Liz Crocker expressed concern that the monitoring body could become a policy police and suggested that this was not a role that the Sutton Poyntz Society would welcome given the recent history in relation to planning

matters. Others made the point that the key issue was holding the Local Authority to account.

It was agreed that the discussion had provided a useful basis for further exploration of ideas and that the Chair would incorporate these points in the draft plan and also seek the views of Nick Cardnell and Brian Wilson.

Action: PD

8. To Receive sub-group reports

- a) Place Appraisal – The sub-group had met some time ago to incorporate the feedback from the public survey into the plan and further work was on hold pending advice on the content of section 6 from the consultants. This had now been received with a recommendation to leave the content as it was i.e. the challenges and opportunities etc. posed for the Neighbourhood Plan. Nick Cardnell had suggested that the Place Appraisal could be used as part of the body of evidence in support of the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

It was agreed that the Place Appraisal sub-group should meet with Mike Haine in order to refine the document.

Action: Place Appraisal sub-group

- b) Biodiversity and the Natural Environment – CM reported that following feedback from the Local Authority and Brian Wilson the draft section in the Neighbourhood Plan had been updated and was now ready for approval by the Steering Group pending a meeting with Wessex Water.
- c) Employment Business and Tourism – AH reported that some minor changes had been made to this section of the draft Neighbourhood Plan following feedback received from the Local Authority and Brian Wilson.
- d) Heritage – BE explained that it was intended that the heritage policy would include a 'List of Important Buildings' for the Local Authority to take note of. Following contact with Kim Sankey (consultant) a walk around had been conducted based upon the initial list of assets that had been identified as part of the study she had conducted for the AONB. As a result, she had compiled an amended list which will form the basis of a full written report. To save time and costs the Heritage sub-group would provide the introductory section. Once the report was ready KS had offered to meet with householders to discuss the report and address any inaccuracies or omissions.

Liz Crocker expressed several concerns; affected householders had received only 12 hours written notice of the walk around, the existence of an initial list suggested that there was no zero baseline of all properties as a starting point and the presence of Steering Group members raised concerns as to possible bias.

It was explained that the initial list had been based on the AONB study pre-work and that Steering Group members had been present as a matter of courtesy and to provide a record. The Chair believed the process had been conducted with transparency, it being in the interests of the Steering Group to ensure that procedures were followed since there would be

several stages of scrutiny, primarily the regulation 14 consultations, the inspector's appraisal and the public referendum.

Liz Crocker stressed the importance of the record of the walk around being made public, the need for property owners to meet with Kim Sankey in relation to individual affected properties and the clarity of the appeals process.

Regarding appeals BE stated that the Steering Group would not generate the final list, but the Planning Authority would construct a list based upon the final consultant's report and therefore any appeal must be to them.

AH asked for the list of properties which had been identified during the walk around to be provided. CM considered this would not be helpful and that it was best to let the process take its course and allow Kim Sankey to produce her report containing the list which would then be made available in a few weeks. It was confirmed that 34 letters had been issued to potentially affected householders and a list of around 25 properties deemed suitable had resulted.

A number of actions were agreed as follows:-

To clarify the process for the production of an official list of 'Important Local Buildings' and identify precisely who makes that list.

Action: PD

To share the report from Kim Sankey with the Steering Group and affected householders for comment and subsequent discussion at the September Steering Group meeting.

Action: PD and CM

It was confirmed that each of the 34 householders who had been contacted originally would receive either a copy of the report or notification that their property had not been included on the list of heritage assets.

To clarify with Nick Cardnell how the owners of affected properties with continuing concerns can raise these with the Local Authority and the formal appeals process to be followed. **Action: PD**

- e) Housing and Planning – LP had reported prior to the meeting that a draft H&P section would be provided for the October meeting. PD agreed to speak to LP about progress in view of the very tight timescale and the importance of this topic to the overall process. **Action: PD**

- f) Sports and Recreation – no further action reported.

- g) Transport (Getting Around) – CM reported that several updates to the draft Neighbourhood Plan policies had been made following feedback from the Local Authority and Brian Wilson. One outstanding issue was the wording of the car park policy and whether this should relate to a specific site or be a general statement of policy. The former would require the agreement of the landowner and the Chair had agreed to approach Christopher Seal to ascertain his position. On a general point of discussion, it was noted that

the bus service had been included as an aspiration and that its retention was subject to usage.

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

The Chair noted that the biodiversity, heritage and housing and planning sections were to be finalised with a view to presenting a complete draft Neighbourhood Plan for endorsement by the October Steering Group meeting. Since it was necessary for the consultant to provide an overview prior to this meeting the final draft sections would need to be in place prior to the September Steering Group meeting. Housing and Planning was the main priority for completion and although still on schedule there was now very limited flexibility. It was concluded that any delays in producing the heritage section must not be allowed to derail the completion of the overall Neighbourhood Plan.

The Chair confirmed that following initial feedback on the heritage assets it would be necessary to consider a separate meeting with affected households.

Action: PD

10. To Consider a draft Neighbourhood Plan policy briefing to the Neighbourhood Forum.

The need for a briefing had been raised by the Sutton Poyntz Society as the Neighbourhood Forum. The key issue to be decided was the precise timing. It was agreed that the Chair would arrange to deliver the briefing on a mutually convenient date once the draft Neighbourhood Plan was complete.

11. To Receive an Update on the Draft Consultation Statement

Updates were on-going.

Action: PD and CM

12. To Review Progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetables

Reference to timescales is made in sub-section 9 above. In discussion with Nick Cardnell the Chair had received confirmation that to remove any uncertainties we must complete the Regulation 14 process and submit the Neighbourhood Plan draft before the new unitary authority comes into being and consequently the October deadline must remain.

13. Any Other Business

Only one item was raised. Hannah Crocker (resident) asked about notification of meetings being placed on the village noticeboards. CM confirmed that an agenda was placed on the noticeboard near the pond but not the one at the Cartshed due to access issues and lack of space.

The chair reaffirmed that an agenda and attachments could be sent to people upon request.

The meeting closed at 21.26 hours.

The date and time of the next meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 25th September 2018 at 19.30 hours.

E-mail relating to amendments requested by Andy Hohne.

Colin Marsh To:Andy.hohne + 2 more Details

Andy,

Any proposed changes will need to be addressed at the September meeting. My notes do not entirely support these points and reference on such matters of intricate detail are best addressed by the full Steering Group when persons to whom they are attributed will have an opportunity to be present.

Of course, if we can resolve this with input from the chair prior to the meeting that would be constructive.

Colin

-----Original Message-----

From: Andy Hohne

To: Colin Marsh

Sent: Mon, 3 Sep 2018 18:44

Subject: Re: Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group minutes - August 2018

Colin. Thanks for the minutes. I have a couple of points to add please. These both (believe it or not) relate to the **Heritage section, 8(d)**.

Firstly, towards the end of the 4th line after "AONB." please add "In addition the Heritage group added at least 2 more properties to Kim Sankey's original list".

Secondly, at the end of Peter's action re his clarification with Nick Sankey, please add ", although PE did stress that the NP committee should try to resolve any concerns / objections "internally", ie without recourse to a formal process".

Thanks.....andy

ITEM 3 – Matters Arising – Update on suggested draft section on Management and Monitoring.

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. 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 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.

The Weymouth Town Council may be unable to offer the level of oversight that would have been provided by the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Forum, with its unique knowledge in developing relevant local policies. There are two alternative candidates to undertake this task, the Neighbourhood Plan Forum Steering Group or the Sutton Poyntz Society. The former has no constitution, policies or planned existence beyond April 2019. The Sutton Poyntz Society has been in existence for forty years, but its constitution and policies do not align with the Neighbourhood Plan. The simplest solution would be for the Sutton Poyntz Society to replace its existing policies by those set out in the Neighbourhood Plan. Consideration should also be given to adopting the associated aspirational goals. In doing so, the Sutton Poyntz Society could properly claim a democratic mandate in championing policies and aspirations formally agreed the community.

We propose therefore that, subject to the changes described above, the Sutton Poyntz Society undertake the monitoring role for the duration of the Neighbourhood Plan (to 2036), assessing the effectiveness of its policies and submitting an annual report to the Local Planning Authority. At least one indicator has been included within each policy to allow progress to be assessed. Monitoring should also involve progressing the village's aspirations and continued liaison with stakeholders. The engagement with householders, landowners, farmers, developers, businesses and employees during the planning process has proved (in general) positive and beneficial. Even where there has been disagreement, it has led to improved understanding and constructive discussion. This process should not end just because the Neighbourhood Plan has been made.

ITEM 6 – Sub-group Reports

b) Biodiversity and the Natural Environment – Record of meeting with Wessex Water.

SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

RECORD OF MEETING

Purpose – Consultation meeting with Wessex Water regarding Local Green Space and other policy proposals in the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan.

Date of Meeting 13/09/2018

Time of meeting from 10.00 **to** 11.40

Location of Meeting – Wessex Water Offices, Claverton, Bath.

Present: Peter Dye (Chair of Steering Group), Colin Marsh (Chair of Biodiversity and Natural Environment sub-group), Ruth Hall (Planning Liaison Officer, Wessex Water), Alison Creighton (Estates Officer, Wessex Water) and David Jones (Regulatory Environmental Scientist, Wessex Water).

Key Discussion Points

- PD gave a brief overview of the current status of the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan noting the impending changes to the structure of local government and the pressure this has placed on the timetable for formal consultation under Regulation 14 of the Localism Act. He explained that as with other landowners and major stakeholders the meeting was an opportunity for face to face consultation to help pave the way for the formal process. The issues to be addressed were Local Green Spaces (LGS), Assets of Community Value (ACV) and potential sites for a village car park.
- **Local Green Space proposals.** CM circulated a document (attached) on key points for consideration as a basis for discussion and referred to a document circulated earlier which set out the rationale for the green corridor and LGS proposals. It was explained that the proposals were intended to align with the UK Government 25 year environment plan and the Weymouth and Portland Borough Council Local Plan. The River Jordan formed a natural north-south green corridor with adjacent rights of way and was surrounded by varied habitat much of which was owned by Wessex Water. This formed a basis for the provision of biodiversity islands and buffer zones to protect against harmful development and LGS designation was one of the ways in which these areas could be protected. An independent consultant's assessment had identified four parcels of land in Wessex Water ownership as meeting the NPPF criteria for LGS designation. Wessex Water had objected to these proposals in earlier correspondence on the basis of duplication of protection and the impact on their statutory duties as a water supply company.

Two of the proposed areas were covered by SSSI. CM explained that LGS would extend protection beyond biodiversity to other aspects important to the community such as beauty and amenity value without, it was felt, creating an unnecessary administrative burden. There were also concerns, as previously communicated that the inclusion in the compartment of a triangular field (not owned by Wessex Water) to the eastern boundary could compromise the SSSI status due to its deterioration in recent years. DJ considered such action to be very unlikely. He pointed out that Wessex Water were exceeding their targets on SSSI status landholdings and working towards self-monitoring status and encouraged the community to approach Natural England regarding the perceived unfavourable status of the 'triangular field'. He went on to explain that Wessex Water acted as steward for many areas of land under multiple designations (SSSI, AONB, etc.) and was currently involved in a project on the impact of water abstraction on the ecology of the River Jordan. The concern was that the designation of LGS would add layers of administrative complexity without providing additional protection or other benefit. DJ and AC referred to the history of successful collaboration of Wessex Water with groups such as the Sutton Poyntz Biodiversity Group.

PD explained that the Neighbourhood Plan provided an opportunity for the involvement of the whole community in protecting and shaping the local environment. He stressed the importance of the wider picture, including the other proposed LGS sites along the River Jordan corridor. Taken together, these elements provided the Green/Blue framework that lay at the heart of the village, determining the built environment and underpinning community life. The LGS should be addressed as a whole and not be discarded - even where other types of protection existed. AC and DJ reiterated Wessex Water's concern that LGS designation would increase bureaucracy and potentially impede future operational planning applications. However, they considered that if the LGS policy wording could address the latter concerns this could offer an acceptable way forward.

PD believed that it was important to address these concerns, while ensuring that the draft policies incorporated all aspects of green infrastructure across the neighbourhood area. He felt that a suitable solution could be found, particularly as operational planning restrictions were the primary concern as opposed to any non-operational development.

PD asked that Wessex Water provide the necessary contact e-mail addresses to allow this work to be taken forward.

- PD raised the issue of the **Waterworks Museum as an Asset of Community value**. AC understood that it had been agreed to remove this due to conflict with statutory provisions and explained the objections arising from such an asset being located on an operational

site. PD and CM explained the background to this in terms of how the museum was valued by the community who wanted to preserve it for the future in view of the threat from reduced usage following the retirement of John Willows, the involvement of community volunteers being one possible option. AC noted that this was a matter for on-going discussion as it involved numerous complex issues including public liability.

- Regarding the consultant's report on proposed **Non-Designated Heritage Assets** which recommended inclusion of the Waterworks inspector's house and cottages, DJ did not envisage any cause for objection.
- **On-road parking** was discussed in relation to possible sites for a suitably designed car park. AC stated that such a facility could not be located within the grounds of the operational site and she could not see an alternative site on company owned land.

Actions

PD summarised the following actions:

- 1. The Steering Group would redraft the Neighbourhood Plan narrative and policies to reflect the discussions on Local Green Spaces.**
- 2. The Housing and Planning policy section should refer to the potential for future operational development on the waterworks site.**
- 3. The Sports and Recreation policy should be amended to reflect the importance of the waterworks museum to the community and the willingness to work with Wessex Water to find ways to retain it, acknowledging that the ACV process would not achieve this aim.**
- 4. Construct a general policy on the provision of a village car park, subject to responses from other landowners.**
- 5. The community would approach Natural England regarding the perceived unfavourable status of the 'triangular field', noting Wessex Water's shared interest in resolving the issue.**

Note:

Two other matters unrelated to the Neighbourhood Plan were discussed – replacement of the Wessex Water sponsored seat near the Beacon and details of the Watermark grant arrangements.

d) Heritage

SECTION 4: HERITAGE

Strategic Objective

To improve understanding of the heritage in and around our village, and thereby:

- a) to protect that which is important and lends most to the village's distinctiveness; and
- b) to provide better information to those who live in and visit the village, and to planners.

Background to Policy

Sutton Poyntz lies in an area extremely rich in prehistory, and has its share of more recent treasures. A Working Paper has been prepared as background to this Neighbourhood Plan document, building on a number of sources.

Map 4 in the Place Appraisal is a summary of Listed Buildings and Monuments. They comprise four main groups:

- Prehistoric (Bronze and Iron Age) monuments, mostly just outside the Neighbourhood Area, but with the village forming an important part of the view enjoyed by walkers;
- Field systems, boundaries and lynchets, of a variety of dates;
- The Osmington White Horse celebrating George III's fondness for Weymouth. This is also just outside the Neighbourhood Area but the village is an important part of the view;
- 12 Listed Buildings of a good variety of types: 2 farmhouses, one range of farm buildings, a mill and mill house, a Victorian waterworks building that houses a rare type of water pump, and a variety of workers' cottages by the village pond and along Silver Street.

What makes Sutton Poyntz special?

The historic core of the village mainly hugged the western bank of the River Jordan, and contains all the Listed Buildings although other more recent buildings outside the core have heritage significance. This is the area that visitors come to enjoy, but there are some locations that are of particular importance:

- First, there is the pond area, with the header pond for Sutton Mill, a number of old worker's cottages on one side, and the village pub and glorious views up the valley on the other side. This is the area that a Borough Chief Planning Officer once called "the jewel in Weymouth's crown";

- Silver Street, hugging the bank of the stream south from the pond, is very rare; a line of worker's and artisanal cottages with no vehicle access, on a footpath that was once a thoroughfare through the village and is now paved by slabs used by students of the stone-mason Eric Morris;
- At the top end of the pond there is a cluster of attractive old workers' cottages, most combined internally to create larger houses. There is also the Waterworks site with a pair of late 19th C cottages built for senior staff members, the slightly earlier industrial buildings designed by Thomas Hawksley, and a really delightful mill house that is more likely 18th C than later.

A number of unlisted buildings and built features within the village core are evidently of some age; many of these provide context to the Listed Buildings. Outside the core, there are a scattering of older dwellings that are not listed, as well as a group of 1930's houses, mainly but not all designed by E Wamsley Lewis (founding President of the Weymouth Civic Society), that sought to recreate a rural style using local materials.

Policies

POLICY HE1 – PROTECTING ARCHAEOLOGY

Any development proposal on currently undeveloped land in the Neighbourhood Area should be accompanied by an archaeological assessment.

Related policies – NPPF Paragraphs 128 and 141; Local Plan Policy ENV4 and its preamble.

Justification for Policy HE1

Almost the whole of the Neighbourhood Area is in an area designated in the Local Plan as of Archaeological Potential; the current Local Plan (paragraph 2.3.8) states that an archaeological assessment “may be required” for development in such areas. Given that the developed area of Sutton Poyntz is closely ringed by ‘Monuments’ listed in the Dorset Historic Environment Record (see map below), an archaeological assessment should be the norm.

Summary of intent for Policy HE1

This Policy is intended to ensure that important archaeology is not destroyed unwittingly, and that less important heritage can be identified and recorded before it is destroyed.



**Extract from Dorset Explorer map,
showing known 'Monuments' around village centre**

POLICY HE2 – DEVELOPING A LIST OF LOCALLY IMPORTANT HERITAGE ASSETS

A Locally Important Heritage Asset list should be developed for the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Area, and then given protection as specified in Local Plan Policy ENV4. Evidence [Reference 8] has been prepared on a provisional list of heritage assets and is offered as an annex to this Neighbourhood Plan.

Related policies – NPPF paragraphs 129 to 141. Local Plan Policy ENV4 and preamble

Justification for Policy HE2

The NPPF recognises the importance to local communities of buildings that not of sufficient importance to merit Listing, but nevertheless contribute importantly to their own locality. The current Local Plan also recognises the need to protect locally important heritage assets, particularly where they contribute to an area's distinctiveness; the Local Plan encourages local communities to work to identify such locally important heritage assets. Conservation Area appraisals for villages in West Dorset (such as Osmington) and for Weymouth Town already contain such lists, but this has not been done yet for the outer areas of Weymouth. This Policy would bring the Sutton Poyntz Conservation Area up to the better practice well established elsewhere in Dorset.

Sutton Poyntz contains a number of unlisted buildings that appear to be of significant age, as well as groups of buildings that provide important context to the Listed Buildings. There are also buildings of lesser age but architectural interest as examples of an attempt to recreate a rural style with local materials.

The concept of this Policy was well supported by the village in the Stage 2 Survey, with almost 80% voting in favour.

Summary of intent for Policy HE2

In the words of Historic England’s Guidance Note on Local Listing, this list of locally important assets will provide a “sound, consistent and accountable means of identifying local heritage assets to the benefit of good strategic planning ... and to the benefit of owners and developers wishing to fully understand local development opportunities and constraints”. This list with the evidence used to assemble it will provide better information than the Conservation Area appraisal on its own can do.

Community Aspirations for Heritage

The appraisal for the Sutton Poyntz Conservation Area, first written by the Borough Council in 1972 and extended in 1979 and 2000, is rather brief and lacking in detail; equivalent documents for other Conservation Areas in Dorset contain much more detail on the features of the village that are of greatest value. A revised document should give much greater clarity on what features of the Conservation Area are of real significance, and therefore what genuinely needs protection. We believe this would be of great benefit both to developers and to the Planning Authority.

The provision of better information on the village’s heritage was a repeated request by residents in the Stage 1 Survey. The village’s History Group has been intending to create the text for a new History Display for the village; funding may already be available.

AP1 – We will work with the Borough Council to try to find a way of producing a revised Appraisal document for the Sutton Poyntz Conservation Area.

AP2 – We will seek to provide more information within the village on the village’s heritage and history, for the benefit of residents and visitors.

References

1. Scheduled Monument data on the Historic England website;
2. Data on non-listed Monuments, available on the Heritage Gateway website;
3. Listed Buildings information on the Historic England website;
4. The Historic Environment tab on the Dorset Explorer map;
5. The Appraisal for the Sutton Poyntz Conservation Area, to be found in Appendix 3 of the 2008 Weymouth & Portland Borough Local Plan;
6. Eric Ricketts’ book “The Buildings of Old Weymouth”, Part 3.
7. Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Place Appraisal, 2017
8. Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Heritage Assessment, Angel Architecture Ltd., September 2018

Covering letter issued 7/09/2018

SUTTON POYNTZ LOCAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Please find attached the report prepared by our consultant, Kim Sankey, on potential local heritage assets in the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Area. I would be grateful if you could pass any comments about the report and its recommendations to Bill Egerton, Chair of the Heritage Sub-Group, as soon as possible but no later than 25 September 2018 when the report will be discussed by the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.

We have provisionally arranged for the consultant to meet with the Steering Group and householders to address any specific questions and provide more detail on the analysis and methodology, should the need arise.

I agreed at the last Steering Group Meeting to research the impact on property values of local heritage listing, to clarify the listing process with specific reference to the right of householders to appeal and to identify the potential impact on planning.

Impact of Local Listing - House Values

The question of house values is complicated by the fact that all the properties within the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Area are within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and many (the greater proportion) are within a Conservation Area. A comprehensive report, commissioned by English Heritage, suggests a positive impact of conservation areas on house values, while recognising that valuing built heritage is challenging. The report found that there was an average price premium of 23% for properties within a conservation area and that even under the most testing conditions there was still a premium of 8.5-9.5%. The report also found that house prices grew on average more rapidly within conservation areas. Not surprisingly, a higher proportion of nationally listed and locally listed heritage buildings are to be found within, rather than outside, conservation areas. Any efforts to distinguish the specific contribution of listing to higher house values is going to be problematic. However, there is no evidence that local listing has a negative effect on property values, particularly as a recent national survey has concluded that houses with historic features attract a higher price.

Impact of Local Listing - Householders

There are several routes to creating a local heritage list. Proposals can be submitted by the public and other interested parties. Inclusion of a suggested list within a Neighbourhood Plan is only one approach, although it can be valuable in establishing the community's view while offering householders an early opportunity (through the formal consultation process) to challenge a proposed listing. Whichever route is followed, it falls to the Local Planning Authority to decide what assets are to be included in a local heritage list. Once a list is validated, owners of local heritage assets will be informed that an asset is to be included, together with a description of the criteria for listing and an indication of the criteria it is considered that the asset meets. Householders may challenge the inclusion of an asset by demonstrating why it does not meet any of the assessment criteria. If appropriate, the Local Planning Authority will consider removing the asset from the list.

Impact of Local Listing - Planning

The NPPF and Historic England guidance make it very clear that the presence of a building on a local heritage asset list has no effect on whether a planning application is needed for a development. Unlike Listed Building status, or location within a Conservation Area, local listing has no impact on the definition of which developments are “permitted”.

Where a planning application is submitted that might affect the “significance” of a local heritage asset, the developer is required to provide information on the impact, and the Planning Authority is required to consider the impact and to protect the assets significance. Developments within Conservation Areas already have the same requirements for information and assessment. The big difference, where locally important heritage assets are concerned, is in the degree of understanding of the significance of the specific asset. For Sutton Poyntz, significance is currently documented in a brief Conservation Area appraisal that lacks any specific details on individual buildings. The objective of a local list is to provide more specific detail that identifies individual buildings and shows the ways in which they contribute to local character.

As Historic England writes: “Inclusion on a local list delivers a sound, consistent and accountable way of identifying local heritage assets to the benefit of good strategic planning for the area and to the benefit of owners and developers wishing to fully understand local development opportunities and constraints. Local lists thus complement national designations in building a sense of place and history for localities and communities. Local heritage listing is intended to highlight heritage assets which are of local heritage interest in order to ensure that they are given due consideration when change is being proposed.”

Peter Dye

Chair Steering Group

07 September 2018

Attachment:

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Heritage Assessment – Report dated September 2018

stage two survey results are published		
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 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
Distribution of consultants report on list of non-designated heritage assets to affected property owners and SG with a covering note incorporating research on impact on property values.	07/09/2018	PD/Heritage sub-group
Meeting with Wessex Water to discuss Local Green Space policy proposal	13/09/2018	PD/CM
Further amendments to draft policy sections for the NP on Heritage, Biodiversity and Housing & Planning	29/08/2018 to 25/09/2018	Relevant sub-groups
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