

Housing and planning sub-group meeting notes

6.30pm on Tuesday 17 July at The Blue Duck Bar

Present EP BD JC (AH as observer)

Apologies JB MB TF

EP started with a recap on where we are:

19/6/18 EP circulated a revised draft of policies and asked for feedback, particularly areas highlighted in red on the draft. Meeting had been agreed for 17 July just before the SG meeting. Deadline was tight because of holidays and so EP had sent round questions and asked for feedback rather than arranging a meeting as the date other than 17 July had proved impossible.

Purpose of today's meeting to look at those policies and highlight areas of discussion with SG later. MB had sent his comments and JC had sent tracked changes on a document. Both of these had been after seeing the draft for discussion with the SG that evening had been circulated. To avoid confusion EB was using the same document as had been sent to the whole steering group as the basis for subgroup meeting.

EP reported that the draft circulated to the SG had been incorporated into the draft plan and been sent to Nick Cardnell (Area Planning Officer) for comment following his discussions with PD, PD had sent on to Brian Wilson for his input /comments. Brian thought a monitoring role to review the DDB and potentially call for sites if building rate was less than the plan had put forward. In the light of this feedback from the professionals PD had asked EP to discuss these points with subgroup. The points from NC's draft below with H&P group's comments in red ;

Policy H&P1

Supporting text refers to 'knocking down and replacement'. The more usual phrase is 'infill' development.

(Group agreed – EP to change wording)

Reference to 'nearby buildings styles' and 'style of the older traditional properties' could cross reference to place appraisal.

(Group agreed – EP to update wording with ref to Place Appraisal)

Policy H&P2

No sites have been allocated. Recognise that the NP will not benefit from a 3 year housing land supply.

Given local constraints, requirement for 20 new homes appear broadly appropriate. Target could be better justified using other data sources. Past delivery rate, population projections, affordable housing need ect..

Phrase states 'around' 20 new homes. Preference for 'at least'. Please delete reference to 'up to' in supporting text.

(Some disquiet about this but ratified by SG meeting so EB to include 'at least 20' in redraft)

Policy H&P3

Policy maybe better placed in heritage chapter?

Key views will need to be closely defined and should not be wide and expansive.

'Blighted and detracts' seems a quite ambiguous. Could it be clarified further what aspects of development they would consider detracts from the view.

Text currently reads as an aspiration and should be re-worded as a policy requirement. "New development should not...detract from key views". See other local examples in West Dorset 'made plans'.

(Comments noted and EP to amend, but leave in H&P section)

Policy H&P4

Preference for the phrase "will" rather than "must".

Please note the Borough Council have recently published a new SFRA (2018).

(Noted and agreed)

Discussion about DDB issue followed re democratic issues and whether the SPS is democratic, in particular JC made the following comment (supplied by JC post meeting);

The Neighbourhood Forum, Steering Group, and sub groups are in reality self appointed. It would therefore likely to be unacceptable to those in the village who think about these things for such a body to have any role in trying to amend the Development Boundary (which is what in the end it means). There would have been merit in the former Sutton Poyntz Society taking on that role because that body had a constitution and held open elections for committee and officers and therefore had some claim to be representative. It is unfortunate that the SPS is currently not in a position to meet the requirements of its constitution and therefore to step up to the suggested monitoring role.

The obvious way forward is to ensure that the Neighbourhood Plan and the constitution of the SPS are entirely consistent and to look for a revival of the SPS committee working to its constitution and therefore able to take on a monitoring role.

EP commented that the SPS had become deeply unpopular in some quarters over the last 2-3 years so the committee were disconnecting themselves from planning issues to be more community orientated instead. They no longer wanted to be the nasty group. She pointed out that it was still just as democratic as it always has been, while elections were in the rules, in practice people ended up getting co-opted because of lack of volunteers as was always the case. It was agreed to discuss this further with the SG later.

Discussion then turned to other areas in the draft under consideration.

Are the policies strong enough? At the moment they don't seem to add anything to the AONB and Conservation area rules and leave us with the question 'so what?' JC keen to define more on the conservation area issues and the question of what the rules were was discussed again. EP thought that Bill Egerton had more information, question to be asked at SG.

How do we include key views - we think that photos and brief description is fine. Does SG agree? To ask question later.

Housing Numbers, JC very keen to use 10 – 20, but NC and BW clear that 20 more appropriate. EP thought thought the external advice more or less resolved the issue. Around 20 seemed to be appropriate. However ratification from SG to be sought later.

At that point the meeting closed as the SG meeting was about to start.

The meeting of the steering group records further discussion of these items and extract included below for completeness.

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

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

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

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

Action:PD

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

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

this respect.

Action:LP

and JC

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

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

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

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

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

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

Action:LP

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

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

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

Postscript; you will note the minutes record that a further consultation with Nick Cardnell was suggested and after the SG meeting Peter Dye put forward the idea that it made sense for EB and JC to meet with NC to get his views directly. This was subsequently arranged.