

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Agenda for the meeting on 16th October 2018 to be held in the Blue Duck Bar of the Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz commencing at 7.30pm.

1. **To Receive Apologies (Received in advance from Andy Hohne and Keith Johnson)**
2. **To Approve the Minutes of the previous meeting held on 25th September 2018.**
(to consider amendments to the minutes as proposed by Bill Egerton and Andy Hohne).
3. **To Receive an update on actions arising from the previous meeting; not otherwise on the agenda.**
4. **To Address any items of Correspondence (Response from Christopher Seal regarding provision of a village Car Park).**
5. **To Receive an update on Grant Funding and Income and Expenditure.**
6. **To Receive sub-group reports:**
 - a) **Place Appraisal.**
 - b) **Biodiversity and the Natural Environment**
 - c) **Employment, Business and Tourism including IT/Communications**
 - d) **Heritage (including progress on the Heritage section of the draft Neighbourhood Plan, minutes of 3rd October 2018 and a report on the open meeting held on 4th October 2018 (approved minutes to follow))**
 - e) **Housing and Planning (confirmation of two additional sub-group members and approval of the H & P section for inclusion in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Attached minutes of the sub-group meeting on 04/10/2018 and questions to be addressed by the Steering Group).**
 - f) **Sports and Recreation**
 - g) **Transport**
7. **To Agree arrangements including timescales for the Regulation 14 consultation on the draft Neighbourhood Plan (advice note from the Chair).**
8. **To Receive an update on the Draft Consultation Statement.**
9. **To Review progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetable (attached).**
10. **Any Other Business.**
11. **Date and Time of the Next Meeting (to consider an additional Steering Group meeting on Tuesday 6th November 2018).**

To confirm the date and time of the next regular meeting as Tuesday 20th November 2018 at 7.30pm.

ITEM 2 – MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE MINUTES

Bill Egerton 28/09/18

There were seven representations questioning the methodology and/or accuracy. You might like to list them: Fox Cottage, White Horse Cottage, Rose Cottage and Albert Cottage in Silver Street, Staddles, Wyndings, and Bellamy Cottage (who only wanted to make some minor corrections). There were also two verbal representations, from Cob Cottage and Spinneys, welcoming the report.

I think there was only criticism of one photograph, which was taken standing on a low-loader trailer that happened to be parked outside the property

Andy Hohne 02/10/18 and response by the Chair 07/10/18

Sun, 7 Oct 2018 12:37

Peter Dye To:you + 10 more Details
Dear Andy,

Thank you for your comments on the draft Minutes which we will certainly discuss at the next Steering Group Meeting.

However, as you are not able to be there, I'll offer my immediate comments.

The two options mentioned at para 6.d line 17 were the 'left of arc' and 'right of arc' possibilities. I propose that we add **“(amongst other possibilities)”** immediately after “the draft policy should include....”

I did indeed agree that an absent Steering Group member should be able to record their vote on an issue - in the interest of allowing as many views as possible to be taken into account in our decision-making - noting that our Terms of Reference require a member to be present if their vote is to qualify, or for the meeting to be regarded as quorate.

I propose, therefore, that we replace the line **“The Chair agreed to consider this.”** by a new line **“The Chair agreed that the vote of an absent member, expressed in advance of a meeting, should be considered in any decision-making.”**

Steering Group members will have their own perspective, but I feel we should allow dissenting (or supportive) views to be discussed (and recorded), even if the member involved is absent from a meeting and therefore precluded from exercising a substantive vote.

Yours Peter

On 2 Oct 2018, at 11:30, Andy Hohne wrote:

Having just read the minutes, I have 2 issues:

6d. Heritage assets. We did not agree that the SG would only have two options following the meeting with Kim (namely produce a list ourselves or require the local authority to produce one).

AOB and whether absent committee members can vote. Peter, after some discussion you agreed an absent member could vote, not that you would consider it.

Thanks. Andy.

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

DRAFT Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 25th September 2018 in the Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz, commencing 19.33 hours.

Present: Peter Dye (Chair), Bill Davidson, Bill Egerton, Andy Hohne and Liz Pegrum.

A total of sixteen residents were also in attendance.

The chair apologised for the failure to provide an agenda on the website. In future copies of the agenda would be posted on the website as well as the village noticeboard.

Action: BE

1. Apologies

Received in advance of the meeting from Colin Marsh, Sue Elgey, Tony Ferrari and Keith Johnson.

Two members, Mike Blee and Keith Hudson, had resigned from the Steering Group. The chairman proposed a vote of thanks for their efforts over the past year. This was unanimously approved.

2. To Approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 28th August 2018

Three corrections had been proposed. It was agreed to make the following changes:

Para 8(d), Page 4, Line 5: Add "A number of additional important local buildings were added to the list and some discarded in consultation with members of the village Heritage Subgroup."

Para 8(d), Page 5, Line 16: Add "although the Chair did stress that the Steering Group should endeavour to resolve any concerns and/or objections without recourse to a formal process."

Para 7, Page 3, Line 19: Delete "a view supported by BD."

Action: CM

The minutes of the meeting were approved as a correct record, subject to the changes detailed above.

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 August meeting.

4. To Address any items of Correspondence

There were no items of correspondence to consider.

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

BE reported that the only outstanding invoice was for Kim Sankey's report on potential local heritage assets.

BE confirmed that Andy Hohne had taken over as Treasurer of the Sutton Poyntz Society.

6. To Receive sub-group reports

- a) Place Appraisal – The sub-group had recently received feedback from the consultants on the draft Place Appraisal. The proposed changes were not extensive. The aim was to provide Mike Haine with a revised draft to enable him to finalise the document during October. Recognising that the Place Appraisal was a historic document, LP asked whether anomalies between the Place Appraisal and the subsequent Neighbourhood Plan should be corrected, for example in the section on key views. It was agreed that where the two documents diverged significantly, a qualifying note to this effect should be considered. **Action: BE & PD**
- b) Biodiversity and the Natural Environment – Following the meeting with Wessex Water Authority, the draft section in the Neighbourhood Plan had been updated and was now ready for approval by the Steering Group.
- c) Employment Business and Tourism – No further action reported.
- d) Heritage – BE briefed the meeting on the heritage assessment report provided by the consultant (Kim Sankey). A total of 26 properties within the village had been identified as potentially suitable for local listing. The report had been distributed to the affected householders with a covering letter explaining the process involved and the implications of listing, seeking responses. Although several positive replies had been received, five householders had objected to their inclusion in the list, criticising the methodology and accuracy of the analysis. During the meeting, at least six householders reiterated this criticism. Concern was also expressed that the photographs employed in the report had been intrusive. The Chair apologised if any individual householder felt that their privacy had been compromised, this had certainly not been the intention. All the responses received to date had been forwarded to the consultant for comment. It was agreed to organise a meeting between the consultant and the Steering Group, together with all interested householders, as soon as possible and ideally within the next fortnight. The aim would be to clarify the methodology employed, the benefits and dis-benefits of listing and to correct factual errors and/or provide additional information in the individual property reports. It was hoped that written replies to the points raised with the consultant would be available in advance. Once this meeting had been

held, the Steering Group would be in a better position to determine whether the draft policy should include a list of proposed local heritage assets or merely require the Local Planning Authority to produce such a list (together with the criteria to be employed). The chair would seek Brian Wilson's advice on the best way forward to meet the village's aspirations that a local heritage asset list be produced and whether it was appropriate to include the report (together with any corrections and/or comments) as part of the Regulation 14 consultation.

Action: PD & BE

- e) Housing and Planning – LP updated the meeting on her recent meeting with Nick Cardnell before discussing the revised H&P draft section and the individual policies. H&P1, H&P2 and H&P3 were agreed, subject to some refinement in wording and additional supporting material. There was concern, however, that the policy on flooding (H&P4) was not relevant, indeed, it was questioned whether the policy was required at all – given that it appeared simply to reiterate national legislation. The Chair agreed to discuss this question with the Biodiversity and Natural Environment Subgroup and to seek Brian Wilson's advice. It was agreed the LP would circulate a final revision of the H&P section to the Steering Group by 8 October.

Action: LP & PD

- f) Sports and Recreation – The Chair advised he had agreed with Wessex Water that it was inappropriate to include the Waterworks Museum as a potential Asset of Community Value, since the building sat within an operational plant. Nevertheless, the importance of the museum to the community should be highlighted as should the need to work with the village to sustain an important facility, perhaps using volunteer staff.

Action: PD

- g) Transport (Getting Around) – Final changes had been made incorporating feedback from the meeting with Wessex Water.

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

Updates were ongoing. Other than the 'Foreword', the document was largely complete. The latest version could be found on Dropbox.

Action: PD and CM

8. To Receive an Update on the Draft Consultation Statement

Updates were on-going.

Action: PD and CM

9. To Review Progress against the Neighbourhood Plan Timetables

The SEA consultation had commenced and was scheduled to be completed by 24 October. This would allow Regulation 14 consultation to begin in November, consistent with the existing timetable. This envisaged that the Steering Group would endorse the Neighbourhood Plan in January/February 2019. There was capacity in the current timetable for a six-week slippage.

10. Any Other Business

Two items were raised. AH asked whether a Steering Group member could vote on an issue in their absence. The Chair agreed to consider this. BE suggested that a suitable organisation for monitoring the Neighbourhood Plan, once made, could be a local form of Parish Meeting. The Chair agreed to include this suggestion within the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

Action: PD

11. Date and Time of Next Meeting

The date and time of the next meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 16 October 2018 at 19.30 hours.

The meeting closed at 22.30hours.

ITEM 4 – CORRESPONDENCE

Correspondence with Christopher Seal regarding potential site for a Car Park.

Peter Dye
To

Christopher Seal

Dear Christopher,

Don't worry about the delay, we will be going out to Regulation 14 consultation next month which will provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to comment on our policies and offer potential solutions to the village's aspirations.

Public consultation has identified car parking as a major issue for residents in the centre of the village - for reasons of safety, access, environment and aesthetics.

Bin collections are frustrated, emergency vehicles can't get by and the edge of the pond is continually being damaged.

We welcome a successful and thriving pub, but there is inadequate parking in the centre of the village for customers, visitors and residents.

The Steering Group believes that the best solution would be to create additional (permanent) off-road car parking in the near vicinity.

It could be that you are in a position to identify a solution that benefits all parties.

There are potential caveats about size, character, visual impact, etc, but at this stage we are simply interested in any ideas that you might have to solve one of the major issues adversely affecting life in the village.

If this all seems too vague, please come back to me.

Yours Peter

On 1 Oct 2018, at 14:05, Christopher Seal wrote:

Hi Peter

Sorry for the delay in coming back to you.

This is something we would consider but we would need to understand how this would be attractive to us. Please send me your thoughts we might be able to discuss this further at that point.

Regards

Christopher

Christopher J Seal

Managing Director

P J S Developments

ITEM 6d – HERITAGE SUB-GROUP

SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

RECORD OF SUB-GROUP MEETING

Topic sub-group	<u>Heritage</u>
Dates of Meeting	<u>3/10/2018</u>
Time of meeting from	<u>5 p.m to 5:45 p.m.</u>
Location of Meeting	<u>Bellamy Cottage</u>
Present:	<u>Bill Egerton, Caroline Crisp, Jill Kelsey</u>

Key Discussion Points

Copies of the Heritage Report commissioned from Kim Sankey of Angel Architecture Ltd. had been delivered to all the provisionally listed households. As a result, a number of representations had been received from owners. Kim Sankey had provided a letter responding to all these representations, which was being delivered to the households. This meeting had been called to discuss the conclusions in Kim's letter.

It was firstly agreed that since the first draft of Kim's letter, much more thorough responses had been provided. One error was noted: in the paragraph responding to the representation from Chipps Cottage, the first sentence started "Chipps Cottage was considered and not included ...". This should have read "Streamside Cottage (115 Sutton Road) ...". Kim Sankey had already been notified.

The Subgroup reviewed the conclusions in the letter:

- White Horse Cottage and Fox Cottage – The Subgroup agreed the recommendation that these properties be removed from the draft list.
- Springhead Pub – While expressing sympathy with the publicans, the Subgroup agreed to recommend that the pub and Pavilion were of sufficient heritage importance to be retained in the list. The Planning Authority would already need perform a delicate balancing act between the need for a thriving business and the need to protect the heritage value; this was a good reason to make sure the heritage significance was understood.
- Staddles – The letter had reinforced the significance of this and the other Wamsley Lewis houses. The Subgroup was quite sure it was right to include all these houses.
- Silver Street Cottages (Rose Cottage, Ebenezer Cottage, Albert Cottage) – The letter gave a good explanation of process, but did not give a firm recommendation on whether these houses should be included in the final list. The Subgroup did agree with

the recommendation in the letter that the three houses should either all be included or all excluded. After discussion, the Subgroup concluded that the real significance of this part of the village lies less in the construction of houses (individual or in groups), and more in the almost unique layout of the “street” beside the stream with rough paving and houses tight against the path. It is this layout that ought to be preserved. The Subgroup therefore felt that this section of the Report did not capture what is really important; the Subgroup will recommend to the Steering Group that this section be removed and if possible replaced with new text that focuses on the street itself.

The Subgroup concluded that armed with this further evidence from Kim Sankey, it is happy to recommend to the Steering Group a Policy seeking a Local Heritage List, with a revised report from Kim Sankey as evidence.

ITEM 6e – Questions from the H&P sub-group to be addressed by the Steering Group and Brian Wilson

Questions and comments for Brian Wilson and the Steering Group on the latest draft of the H&P section.

1. **Strategic objective** - this has been amended but fundamentally similar to previous objectives although we now refer to the conservation area. The conservation area has been poorly defined in the past and so this is not a strong recommendation.
Comment JC: This might be not the time to ask, do we need to provide a new Conservation Area Appraisal to back up the NHP? If this isn't the time please ignore.
QUESTION Might it be better to say that we will give additional guidance to help those responsible for enforcing the conservation area?
2. **Introduction** – some members of the subgroup wanted to add further details but others thought this might be better included in the policy detail and justification. The relevant extract is set out below with possible alternative locations in red after each section ;

The first policy to consider then is SUS28. This policy explains that whilst there is a lot of demand for development in villages, there are problems with providing development in such locations that have few facilities and where people tend to commute to the towns for work. The policy preamble goes on to state that it is more difficult to provide cost effective local services for a more dispersed pattern of development without putting greater reliance on unworkable public transport solutions. The resultant sustainable settlement hierarchy directs most housing developments to the main towns. Development in the rural areas will be directed to settlements with defined settlement boundaries providing that the development is of appropriate scale etc. outside of defined development boundaries development will be strictly controlled having particular regard to the need for protection of the countryside and environmental constraints and, in terms of housing, will be restricted to such as rural workers' dwellings. (Include under H&P 1 Housing numbers and size)

The second policy to consider is ENV1 which sets out the protection to be afforded to the area's exceptional landscapes, including the AONB, and states that development should not detract from local landscape character. (Include under H&P 3 Key views)

The third policy to consider is ENV2 which provides that development on sites supporting protected species will only be permitted where adequate provision is made for retention of the species or it's safe relocation. An ecological survey carried out in 2015 in Plaisters Lane indicated that the ancient hedgerow that abutted that lane and the fields adjacent to it had the potential to support protected species .(Biodiversity section?)

The fourth policy to consider is ENV4 which provides that development within a Conservation Area should not be permitted unless it conserves and enhances the area's character and appearance. (Include under H&P 1 Building and design)

The fifth policy to consider is ENV12 which expects any development to achieve a high quality of design. **(Include under H&P 1 Building and design)**

Comment JB: Introduction

I think it is important to include the paragraphs detailing the policies to be considered

Comment JC The third policy to". Agree the question but might help Brian Wilson if we say we are seeking to put the text in the Section of the NHP which would be most effective.

QUESTION: Where would these policies best be included, in the introduction or under the relevant policy?

(NB There has been some problem with cross referencing and policy details but we hope you get the drift – full references to follow)

3. **H&P 1** -At a recent meeting with Nick Cardnell was recommended that the design section should reflect the Place Appraisal. Some members of the group would like to change wording from that in the Place Appraisal as follows;

- **The Historic Core**

Much of the village's character is derived from the Historic Core and its rural byways which are narrow without footpaths and bordered in some cases by ancient hedgerows. Future development should match the existing styles, scales and building materials, rather than introducing taller buildings, non-traditional materials, wider roads and pavements. Protecting the aesthetic and architectural quality of the Historic Core and all its rural byways is important in protecting the overall character of the village.

- **The West Side**

The West Side benefits from proximity to the Historic Core but has a more diverse character with a confusion of styles and building materials. Several cul-de-sacs, with wide roads and pavements, strike a discordant note. Future development that better matched the Historic Core would enhance the overall character of the village and strengthen the sense of community.

- **Plaisters Lane North**

The northerly section of Plaisters Lane offers a mixture of styles, with a number of houses of architectural merit, although the plots are larger and buildings more widely spaced than in the Historic Core. Any future development should therefore continue to be restricted in this sensitive area of the village.

- **Gateway**

Gateway marks the transition between Preston and Sutton Poyntz. The narrow road descending into the village used to offer a striking vista of the Ridgeway and the White Horse. Recent development, while employing traditional materials has resulted in some loss of views from this area. Notwithstanding these changes, future development that retains the narrow lane 'feel' of the road at this point, rather than open it out, and which offers the same high design standards, would help maintain the distinct identity of the village and protect its value for the benefit of the wider community.

- **Puddledock South**

Puddledock South abuts Preston, but does not offer the clear transition or views provided by Gateway. Development of what was previously a farm track happened quite quickly, and features wide roads, pavements and cul-de-sacs. There is no sense of a narrow village lane beyond the unmade part of Puddledock Lane. Any future development should enhance the character of the area, and adopt the design standards found in the Historic Core.

(NB Original included further comments on views but agreed by group that these could be removed as would be better considered under H&P 3)

Comment from AH: The descriptions of the 5 Character Areas were modified without loss of meaning (in my opinion) to make them read a little easier and less confusingly, particularly in regard to what was said about Puddledock South and access from Weymouth.

As with the comments on key views, we have attempted to make the descriptions more accurate, e.g. 'South Dorset Ridgeway' not just Ridgeway, for accuracy and to enable to document to stand up to close scrutiny.

Comment JC: it might help to explain to Brian Wilson that the changes were aimed at making the text accurate and user friendly, not really content changes

QUESTION 1. These are very similar to the Place Appraisal and do we gain anything from changing the wording?

Comment from AH: I do not consider the Design Guidance section to be too long, if that is a conclusion that the NPSG and Brian Wilson might contemplate. It is worth noting that earlier versions of the draft did not contain a section specifically called 'Design Guidance' and that such guidance as there was, was considered 'wishy washy' and weak and one of the factors driving the discussions that took place with Nick Cardnell (NC) of Dorset Council (Planning & Community). This is one of the most important parts of the Plan and attention is drawn to the Loders NP (made July 2016) where the equivalent section, called 'Built Environment' runs to 3 sides of A4: NC drew attention to the Loders NP as an example of 'how to go about it'. NC also suggested that the Sutton Poyntz NP would benefit from the inclusion of a 'design guide'. Fontwell Magna NP was given as an example. The latter has guidance on design and materials that runs to 6 pages, excluding maps.

Significant effort went into examining these NP's, including that of Sturminster Newton (also mentioned by NC) as an example of a Town Neighbourhood Plan, so as to better inform the Sutton Poyntz NP process. The NPSG and Brian Wilson should be aware of this.

BD Comment Document talks about design guidance but then uses 'must' Can NHP define what can and cannot be used in such specific detail? Particularly for extensions to current houses?

QUESTION 2. The design guidance is quite wordy and detailed, there were suggestions for additional information, see deletions in the tracked changes. Do we need more or less here?

4. **H&P 2** - members of the subgroup felt that this policy had already been agreed as stated in the attached draft, however other members of the subgroup wanted to change the policy to:

New housing providing in the region of 10 to 20 homes over the plan period will be supported within the Defined Development Boundary so long as the development is acceptable in all other respects. Smaller housing will be supported to provide a mix of accommodation.

Those members of the steering group present at the subgroup meeting confirmed that significant debate at previous meetings had led to the conclusion that we should use the wording shown in policy H&P 2. Therefore debate on which prefix to 20.

QUESTION 1- which is the best term to use - around/about/at least 20? Can we use 'around'?

Significant debate at the steering group has also concluded that as the plan is not proposing any change to the development boundary needs to be justified and we need to have a mechanism for reviewing the build rate if the implied assumption that there is sufficient space within the village to enable the desired number of properties to be built to be incorrect. It is be difficult to assess how this should be included in the plan and the Steering Group need to agree a mechanism for this review. We should probably include more details about the regularity of review etc in this section of the policy.

The subgroup have some members who want to revert to the original plan of not mentioning the development boundary at all, and the text highlighted in grey in the attached plan would therefore need to be removed.

QUESTION 1 - do the Steering Group wish to reverse their decision on including a comment about monitoring the DDB?

**QUESTION 2 - should the text highlighted in grey be removed or amended?
Suggestions for improvements would be welcome.**

5. **H&P3 Key Views** -this section has been agreed by the Steering Group there are some minor changes to the titles of the views, now included in the draft. Main issues to resolve are whether we add any comments from the introduction or H&P 1 here. See above.

Comment from AH: So as the NPSG and Mr Wilson are aware, minor changes were made to the descriptions of the Key Views to make them more accurate and to correspond to places that can be found on maps, or are described in the literature on (e.g. Ricketts, 1977). The suggested changes improve rather than detract from the originals. I am pleased that Village Pond has become Mill Pond. But I also consider it misleading to describe a view as being 'towards' something that cannot be seen.

Locations such as the Beacon and Margaret's Seat do not appear on maps and so have been linked to locations that do. These may seem minor and somewhat trivial points, but in the interests of accuracy and the scrutiny that may follow, it is better to try and get it right now.

The vision splays on the Key View map are cones having pretty well the same small included angle at each location. Wider arcs (e.g. see Loders NP) might be more appropriate for some of the views into the village from the hills so as to encompass the limits of the village and include potential development locations.

QUESTION -is everyone happy with the new photos, should we get a better one from Margaret's seat? Are the views splays on the map at the right angles? We may need to improve these.

- 6. H&P 4** -may need some fine-tuning, and some disagreement as to whether it's in the right place.

Comment from AH:There has to be something in the H&P Section of the NP regarding flooding which draws attention to need to avoid exacerbating existing surface water flooding problems through poor or inadequate design of new builds or any other type of development in the built environment. This is not to do with biodiversity. The impact of flooding on the natural environment should be dealt with in the biodiversity section of the NP. Both issues need to be addressed, but in separate sections.

Comment JC Might help to explain the advice we are seeking is to find the most effective section in which to put this text. Because we all have a bit of a feeling that in H&P the policies are simply reminding the planning office of things they have at their fingertips it might not be effective in that section.

QUESTION - should this be moved to biodiversity section will remain where it is?

MINUTES OF H&P SUB-GROUP 08/10/2018

SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

RECORD OF SUB-GROUP MEETING

Topic sub-group – Housing and Planning

Date of Meeting: 08/10/2018 **Time of meeting from:** 18.00 **to**
19.16.

Location of Meeting: Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz

Present: John Bellis, John Crisp, Bill Davidson, Tony Heathershaw, Celeste Osadnik and Liz Pegrum (Chair),

Colin Marsh attended in order to record the minutes.

Apologies: Tony Ferrari

Key Discussion Points

- The Chair referred to the agenda that had been circulated in advance. The remit of the sub-group and process to be followed was outlined with reference to a pre-circulated e-mail from the chair of the Steering Group. Celeste Osadnik (CO) could not recall having received these e-mail communications.
- It was noted that Celeste Osadnik (CO) and Tony Heathershaw (TH) had asked to join the sub-group. This was agreed subject to endorsement by the Steering Group.
- The Chair outlined the objectives of the meeting and made reference to the minutes of the September Steering Group meeting which were read out in full.
John Crisp (JC) and CO considered that their recollection of what was decided did not entirely align with the minutes.
- Colin Marsh (CM) stated that his understanding was that policies H&P 1 to 3 had been agreed by the Steering Group subject to minor word changes and without alteration to the intent and that policy H&P 4 on flooding was to be left untouched pending consultation with Brian Wilson (consultant) by the Chair of the Steering Group. The supporting narrative on 'justification' and 'intent' of the policy was satisfactory subject to some further wordsmithing by the sub-group. This account was agreed.
- The Chair sought the endorsement of the minutes of the sub-group held on 17th July 2018 which had been circulated a few days previously and noted the importance of these to the transparency of process. As a

significant period of time had elapsed since the meeting there was uncertainty of recall and several of those present therefore felt unable to confirm them as a true and accurate record. JC was uncertain as to whether the term 'NIMBY' had actually been used at the meeting but felt it better to remove this reference; this was agreed. Taking these points into account and subject to the latter amendment the minutes were adopted as the best available record but not formally endorsed.

Action: LP

- The Chair referred to the multiple versions of the draft H&P section that had been circulated and after some discussion it was agreed to use the latest version without tracked changes provided by the Chair as the main point of reference whilst making comparison with the working draft version as well as the copy containing tracked changes. John Bellis (JB) stated that in producing the working draft great care had been taken to ensure that the views of the village were accurately represented as well as making the document more user friendly and readable.
- CM was able to clarify that Brian Wilson (consultant to the Steering Group) would review the final draft version of the H&P section to make it 'planner friendly' prior to it being presented for endorsement to the Steering Group. JC emphasised the importance of ensuring that the consultant was aware of the different wording options considered by the sub-group when undertaking this review.

Action: LP

- The sub-group reviewed the draft and decided upon the following actions.

Strategic Objective – transfer the first paragraph to become the first paragraph of the Introduction and incorporate the Strategic Objective section of the working document (3 objectives) in its place. **Action: LP**

Introduction – amend paragraph 2 to make it more readable, consider other content included within the working document and whether some information would be more appropriate within the supporting narrative for the respective policies. **Action: LP**

Policy H&P1 – AH asked that the paragraph on tree planting schemes relative to new buildings be included as he considered it to be a design issue. This was agreed.

It was also agreed that the paragraph on views be transferred to the key views section under H&P3.

Action: LP

Supporting Narrative for H&P1 – JC proposed some minor changes to the wording in relation to the summary of the Character areas. It was agreed to present the alternative options to Peter Dye and Brian Wilson for review prior to presentation to the Steering Group.

Action: LP

Policy H&P2 – Regarding the number of houses to be built during the life of the plan it was agreed to ask the consultants advice on the precise wording alternatives of ‘about/around 20’ or ‘up to 20’ prior to the issue being addressed by the Steering Group.

Action: LP

Supporting Narrative for H&P2 - Significant information in relation to the ‘Defined Development Boundary’ had been removed in the working draft proposal and it was agreed that the Chair would reconsider this and seek the view of Brian Wilson and the Steering Group. It was agreed to highlight the information that had been deleted and seek views on its applicability.

Action: LP

In response to JC’s concerns as to the phrasing of the questions asked of Brian Wilson it was agreed that the Chair would circulate the questions to sub-group members in advance. It was confirmed that the advice provided by Brian Wilson would be passed to the Steering Group for a final decision.

Action: LP

Policy H&P3 and supporting narrative – It was agreed to amend the titles of the key views with reference to the working draft version. AH noted that the ‘Village Pond’ should be correctly referred to as the ‘Mill Pond’. The Chair circulated some recently retaken photographs of several of the key views for consideration and these were agreed as suitable for inclusion. The Chair would consider providing a further photograph from the Margaret’s Seat location.

Action: LP

In response to a question from CO, the Chair explained the process by which the final list of key views had been agreed and endorsed by the Steering Group following the independent assessment.

The revised map of key views showing the ‘view splays’ was positively received subject to further consideration of the width of the splays. The advice of Brian Wilson was also to be sought in this respect.

Action: LP

It was agreed that the final paragraph of the working draft immediately preceding the policy on H&P4 was to be included in the final draft section.

Action: LP

Policy H&P4 – The Steering Group had requested that there be no change to this draft policy. It was confirmed that the main area of

dispute was the location within the final draft neighbourhood plan and this would be referred to Brian Wilson for advice. It was agreed that the word 'impervious' within the policy should read 'porous' and this amendment should be made. **Action: LP**

- The Chair summarised the agreed actions as follows:-
Changes to the Strategic Objective and Introduction sections.
Verify references and define an accessible source at a later stage.
Include trees section in H&P1 and transfer narrative on views to H&P3.
Seek advice on options for wording H&P2 as to the number of houses to be built and highlight the information that it is proposed to remove from the narrative regarding the Defined Development Boundary.
For H&P 3 incorporate the revised photographs and seek a review of the revised map.
Include a list of questions for Brian Wilson.

Actions

Redraft and circulate the H&P section (with optional wording as appropriate) for the neighbourhood plan along with a list of questions to be asked of Brian Wilson by 8/10/2018.

LP

Receive feedback comments from all sub-group members by end of the day on 9/10/2018. Any changes to be notified by comments within an e-mail.

H&P sub-group

Forward agreed draft to Brian Wilson for review by 10/10/2018 with a request for a response by 12/10/2018

LP

Brian Wilson responses to be circulated to the Steering Group for consideration at the meeting on 16/10/2018.

CM

ITEM 7 – REGULATION 14 FORMAL CONSULTATION PROCESS

REGULATION 14 - OUTLINE STRATEGY

Regulation 14 requires that there should be consultation on a draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP). It does not provide detail on what is required.

Who Do We Want to Consult?

Technically, the draft NP just needs to be publicised in a manner which brings it to the attention of those who live, work or carry on business in the area (stakeholders).

Ser No	Stakeholders	Number	Delivery Method
1.	Residents/households	500/242	Email & hard copy
2.	Landowners	40 (34 landowners resident in NP Area)	Email and/or hard copy required for 6 landowners external to the village.
3.	Businesses & workers living outside the Neighbourhood Area	10+?	
4.	Statutory Authorities (WPBC Schedule 1)	20+?	Primary Care Trusts, Utility Companies, English Heritage, Natural England, etc
5.	Adjacent Parish & District Councils	3?	WPDC, Osmington, etc

What Do We Want to Communicate?

These individuals (and organisations) need to be told that a NP is proposed, where/how they can find the document, how they can comment and what the closing date is for doing so. This should be a minimum of six weeks (with a few extra days for safety).

How Do We Want to Communicate?

It is sensible to offer a variety of means to allow people to access the NP. We need to consider special needs or whether individuals need assistance.

A leaflet through every door would provide a sound start, as would an open session where people with questions could come along – perhaps supported by SG attendance at coffee mornings.

Hard copies of the document should be available where people can read it.

Supporting documentation (Place Appraisal, reports, etc) should be easily accessible (online) but there is no requirement to seek comments.

A key question is whether we wish to provide a basic proforma, with a box for comments, to allow feedback to be received in a standardised format. Some but not all NP groups ask for comments policy by policy.

On the other hand, it might be helpful to ask for feedback where there are lists (assets of community value, local heritage listing, local green spaces, key views, etc) to be able to demonstrate specific as well as general support for a policy.

A notice in the Dorset Echo – as was done when the NP was initiated – would be sensible as would posters around the village and in the pub.

Timescale

If we want to finish the consultation stage before Christmas (providing ten weeks to respond to any feedback, revise and prepare the final documents) we need to start the Regulation 14 consultation on or around 6 November 2018. Waiting until our scheduled SG meeting on 20 November will mean that formal consultation won't end until 1 January 2019

SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN TIMETABLE 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 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.	16/10/2018	Steering Group
Revised Draft Neighbourhood Plan to Brian Wilson for Review	1 st Week of October	PD/CM
Open meeting on Heritage Assets list with Angel Architecture for consultation and representations from the public.	4 th October 2018	PD/BE/CM
Approval of H & P section of draft Neighbourhood Plan.	16/10/2018	Steering Group
Approval of Heritage section of draft Neighbourhood Plan	?	Steering Group
Approval of final draft Neighbourhood Plan and agreement on arrangements	6 th November	Steering Group

for Regulation 14 consultation process.	2018?	
Regulation 14 process commences	?	Steering Group
Recording of responses to Regulation 14 process	?	Steering Group
Regulation 14 process ends.	?	Steering Group