

SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

RECORD OF SUB-GROUP MEETING

Topic sub-group - Biodiversity and the Natural Environment

Date of Meeting 18/10/2017 **Time of meeting from** 19.39 to 22.15

Location of Meeting Springbank, Plaisters Lane

Present: Katrina Blee, Huw Llewellyn, Colin Marsh, Jack Winsper

Key Discussion Points

- KB suggested that the priorities for this meeting were the questions for the public survey and status of actions from previous meetings.
- KB reported on two actions from earlier meetings –
 - Dorset Local Nature Partnership** – limited information was available on this body which appeared to offer advice on nature conservation from a strategic perspective. No further action was proposed at this stage.
 - Planning Criteria for Biodiversity** – a reply from Nick Cardnell of Weymouth and Portland Borough Council indicated that a Biodiversity Mitigation Plan was required for most sites over 0.1 hectare and that ENV 2 section 2.2.18 and 2.2.19 applies. HL expressed caution that by including biodiversity in planning consent we needed to take care not to cause people to become negative about biodiversity and a carefully worded question and corresponding context statement was needed. This raised the question of tree preservation; as a point of clarification KB stated that whilst planning applications required formal consultation there was no mandatory legal requirement for the local authority to consult in relation to tree work. It was agreed that the Neighbourhood Plan provided an opportunity to strengthen local policy in terms of tree work consultation and enforcement.
- The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a correct record and the status of actions confirmed.
 - Action 3: to amend biodiversity maps – CM and JW had met earlier in the day and this was being progressed with projected completion in two weeks.
 - Action 4: Consultants advice on draft questions had been received and would be taken into account at this meeting.
 - Action 5: to amend and submit the information for section 5 of the Place Appraisal. Completed.
 - Action 6: first draft Neighbourhood plan had been submitted to the consultants for feedback and would be discussed at a subsequent meeting.
 - Actions 1, 2 and 7 related to the green corridor and the relationship to designated green space and were dealt with together.
- **Discussion on Green Corridor and Green Space**
 - CM suggested that the Fontmell Magna neighbourhood plan was a useful point of reference and this was sourced electronically.
 - KB suggested that designated green space was of similar planning status to green belt. JW sought clarification on the relative protection offered by a green corridor and designated green space. Whilst some further clarity was

required it was agreed that from a biodiversity perspective the two should be integrated in order to provide connectivity to aid the movement of species.

Using a map the green corridor was outlined as the course of the River Jordan from the springhead above the village to the green wedge to the east of Puddledock Lane with branches along the Osmington Brook and past Sutton Farm. JW sought clarification as to the terms River Jordan and Osmington Brook and it was agreed that these be confirmed for purposes of consistency within the overall plan. It was felt that this corridor could itself be broken up into 'parcels of green space' in order to enhance its protected status. A number of possible green spaces were identified on the map and a provisional list prepared which included; Wet Woodland, Veterans Wood, area of Fen, Water meadow, Marshy ground between trees along Osmington Brook, Rough pasture behind The Stables, 'Village Green', Open grass area by the Pond, Puddledock allotments, Pig field adjacent to allotments and Green Wedge (latter three as one unit or split), Field and Copse behind Old Bincombe Lane/Sutton Close, Mission Hall Orchard, Springside Orchard??, Margarets Seat, Springhead Pub garden. It was agreed to circulate this list of potential green space to other sub-groups for comment once we had received feedback on the list and accompanying question from our consultants.

Action: KB

Further brief discussion took place on the other proposed questions and related feedback from the consultants and actions were agreed as below.

It was suggested that despite the space limitations a map of the area could be incorporated into the public survey which would be common to all sub-groups, although KB noted the importance of not overpopulating the map. An action was placed on CM as below.

The date of the next meeting was agreed as Thursday 26th October 2017 at Springbank, Plaisters Lane at 20.15 hours.

Decisions/Actions

- 1. Read ENV10 plus feedback from consultants and adjust Q1 - JW**
- 2. Q2 on green space, review question and circulate list of proposed green space (see above) - KB**
- 3. Review ENV5 and re-draft question on flooding to add value with respect to the neighbourhood plan - HL**
- 4. Q4 which refers to the green corridor is satisfactory and defined as per the Place Appraisal map subject to a minor re-write of the question and addition of a context statement - KB**
- 5. Draft a question and context statement to take account of discussions on tree preservation re: seeking agreement on existing policy, rigour of enforcement – CM.**
- 6. Circulate the ENV policy statements from the Local Plan to the biodiversity sub-group members - KB**
- 7. Contact all sub-groups with regard to information they would want to include on a single map which will form part of the public consultation survey – CM.**