



**ARNE PARISH COUNCIL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP MEETING  
14<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER 2015 AT STOBOROUGH PRIMARY SCHOOL**

**Present:** Don Hunter (DH), Robert Kenward (RK), Richard Bessant (RB), Ray Scragg (RS), Avris Wakefield-Sutton (AWS), Ashley Pellegrini (AP), Amanda Crocker (AC), Bridget Kenward (BW), Vivienne Ward (VW), Keith Childs PDC

**1. Apologies for absence**

Apologies had been received from Caroline Macleod and Ian Jenkins

AP extended thanks to Debbie Corbin, the Headmistress of the School, for the use of the room and special thanks to RK for pulling together each group's policies into a coherent and regular form.

**2. Minutes of the meeting held on the 19<sup>th</sup> May and 28<sup>th</sup> July 2015**

A copy of the minutes had been issued to all members prior to the start of the meeting. They were confirmed to be a true and accurate representation of the meetings and were signed by the Chairman in the presence of the meeting.

**3. Matters Arising**

There were no matters arising that are not due to be discussed at this meeting.

**4. Comments from Keith Childs on the policies to date**

KC began by apologising for having been unable to attend the July meeting. He confirmed that he has had a preliminary look through all the policies. At this point, each policy was numbered within its own group which meant there were several policies with the same number. He suggested having a running numbering system throughout the whole document.

Each group's policies were then considered:

**(a) Environment**

Are there any particular proposals for the designated areas? DH – yes. These are drawn out through the document. The effect of tourism has been considered within the body of the whole document. BK suggested adding footnotes throughout the document in order to draw the reader's attention to related points elsewhere.

KC – the inclusion of maps would be useful to show the locations of the various designations and how they affect the parish. PDC would be able to help with this.

Para. 2 "The natural beauty of the area..." – what area? This needs to be better defined. Similarly, "These effects are all valued by residents." – which ones? This also needs to be better defined. "Direct impact on employment" – is this a positive or negative impact? What evidence is there for this statement.

KC – good use has been made of the results of the survey. We need to make the strongest case we can so those not directly involved in preparing the Plan will know exactly what is meant.

Last paragraph on page 1 – “small scale” – this requires definition by footnote.

**Policy 2** – Has the NP group had contact with the named bodies; i.e. Natural England and the Environment Agency? BK – No. We are waiting on information from PDC with regard to the settlement boundaries. KC – Now that there is something tangible to discuss, the settlement boundaries should be finalised before the Neighbourhood Plan is completed.

**Policy 3** – This needs to be made clearer. How could the policy be applied? BK – It has already been applied when she and DH spoke to a developer. KC – The intention of the policy is clear but the application needs clarification. RK – A footnote could be added to define “other development.”

**Policy 4** – Placement and management of SANGs. KC – We may like to consider a preferred location within the Plan. BK – The areas and size of the developments proposed within the Plan would not require SANGs. AP – Could policy 4 say we do not need to have any more SANGs. KC – Not a good idea as this would be viewed as a negative and possibly dismissed by an Inspector.

#### (b) Housing

**Policy 1** – This may not be compliant as it suggests precluding development by saying “there should be no new development in the village of Worgret”. NPs must not prohibit development in principle. BK – We could refer to areas of too large a size or located near to the centre of the parish. We could define Worgret in terms of its properties. RK suggested saying development in Worgret would be opposed by the parish. DH – He got the impression that Worgret ticked a lot of boxes in terms of the Local Plan. KC – We should have a policy saying where development should go, rather than where is should not. BK – Concerned that the Plan would open up two new areas for development and we would end up with those as well as the Worgret site. The NP should represent the feelings of the neighbourhood. Perhaps we should say we would like to retain Worgret as a green space and use the other policies to say where development should go. The supporting text can then say any development at Worgret would be opposed.

**Policy 2** – There could be scope to make minor tweaks to the settlement boundary as well as the inclusion of the two preferred development sites. KC will share the work already carried out by PDC relating to this. Any decision relating to the boundary will be the Parish Council’s. KC suggested any alterations should be consistent with those around the District. PDC have carried out an initial assessment and come up with some suggestions. This can be discussed in more detail outside of the Steering Group meeting.

**Policy 3** – The same comments listed for Policy 2 would also apply to Ridge.

**Policy 4** – “infill development where appropriate.” – define “appropriate” to provide clarity.

BK, RS, AC and KC will meet to discuss the notes made in 2013 relating to settlement boundaries.

#### (c) Traffic

**Policy 1** – Has there been any discussion with Highways. Written confirmation is needed to back this policy.

**Policy 2** – It may be necessary to give some examples of possible solutions, e.g. the path of the “alternative routes.”

**Policy 3** – This is fine, although Highway input would help.

**Policy 4** – Again, fine in principle. Is there any particular aspect that we would like to take forward? The policy really needs toughening up.

**Policy 5** – This is really a statement rather than a policy. How will the aspiration be taken forward?

**(d) Crime & Policing**

**Policy 1** – This is a statement. Is there any more detail that could be added, e.g. promotion of Watch schemes, the Alert Scheme. The Police could have an input regarding security in new developments.

**Policy 2** – More of an action plan than a policy.

**Policy 3** – How might this be actioned? Fly tipping should be included here.

**(e) Health**

**Policy 1** – Elaborate on how expansion could take place.

**Policy 2** – Where? Scott Close?

**Policy 3** – Wareham Hospital is not in our parish, but does affect those living in the parish. This should be included within the text, rather than be set out as a policy.

**(f) Community Well-being**

There is a whole series of points made within the supporting text that could be policies, e.g. the access bridge.

**Policy 2** – Should this be a policy? It may be worth elaborating on how this could be carried forward. Get the assets formally identified. “opportunities... for the young” – this needs further explanation.

**Policy 3** – This could be more definite – do not use the word “investigate.”

**(g) Employment**

**Policy 1** – This needs expanding – some of the details in the supporting text should be included within the Policy. How will the Parish Council protect and support existing employment sites?

**Policy 2** – Financial reward – this cannot come from the Precept but could be funded externally – perhaps locally sponsored and driven by businesses. How will the Parish Council encourage and reward new business growth? KC – might like to consider two separate policies: 1 for premises and 1 more broadly to encourage business. Include some of the conditions listed within the supporting text into the body of the policy.

**Policy 3** – Elaborate. Which other policies within the Plan?

**Policy 4** – This one is fine but should perhaps stress throughout the whole of the parish.

**Policy 5** – Elaborate, e.g. specify particular structures or areas within the parish. Include how the Parish Council would encourage the policy.

KC – happy to help as much as possible.

#### **5. Any reports from Working Groups**

Nothing to add at this stage.

#### **6. Next Steps**

KC to send through his notes.

Individual chairs should amend their sections as appropriate. They should then send them to RK for a consistency check.

Review of the redraft.

#### **7. Date of next meeting**

Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> December, 6pm at Stoborough Primary School.

KC will circulate some options regarding the settlement boundaries.

In between time, KC is available to anyone for individual help and guidance.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 7:33pm.