



**ARNE PARISH COUNCIL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP MEETING  
19<sup>th</sup> MAY 2015 EVERSNOT**

**Present:** Robert Kenward (RK), Richard Bessant (RB), Ray Scragg (RS), Avris Wakefield-Sutton (AWS), Ashley Pellegrini (AP), Caroline Macleod (CM) Amanda Crocker (AC), Bridget Kenward (BW), Ian Jenkins (IJ), Vivienne Ward (VW), Keith Childs (KC) Purbeck District Council

**1. Apologies for absence**

Apologies had been received from Ann Pugsley (APs) and Don Hunter (DH).

**2. Minutes of the meeting held on the 7<sup>th</sup> May 2015**

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

**3. Questions**

KC was welcomed to the meeting and the questions previously sent to him were discussed.

- (a) Time Scales – come back to this one later
- (b) Collection of evidence – KC reported that, from what he had seen so far, the evidence being gathered is contributing helpfully to the process. We may need to look in detail at specific areas. The more use that can be made of data held by PDC, the better. This may mean keeping more in touch with KC on a regular basis. AP reported that we are using the Cerne Valley NP as a template. KC drew members' attention to the Herefordshire Council web site. They have produced a number of guidance notes that may be of use: [www.herefordshire.gov.uk/neighbourhood-planning](http://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/neighbourhood-planning). Guidance note 10 covers evidence gathering.
- (c) Viable/unchallengeable – The best way to ensure this is to make sure the basic conditions are all met and the NP conforms with national guidelines/Local Plans/Habitat Regulations/etc. As the draft plan emerges, the content can be checked against the national policies. Hereford Council notes 9, 31 and 35 cover this area.
- (d) Writing policies – PDC will be able to provide assistance as the policies emerge. CM asked how specific we can be when writing policies. PDC does not control Highway policies. As quite specific issues are identified, it will be necessary to liaise with Highways. AC will arrange a meeting with David Brown from Highways. **Action: AC**

Policies/aspirations – There is scope within the NP to have both. This will be easier to formulate as the draft content comes forward. Hereford Council guides 4 and 8 cover policy writing.

- (e) Aspirations – How do we document these in the NP? There will be scope within the sections to set out specific aspirations. IJ – should we put forward what we want? If there is an aspiration for something, rather than a demand, then it could be included but care should be taken not to aspire to items that are undeliverable. Need to consider the likelihood of funding streams, etc. There is no reason why the NP cannot explore the aspiration.

AP – We are moving towards writing some policies. As the individual groups get to this point, they should go to KC for help and advice whenever possible.

- (f) Maps - What maps should be included, also notes, minutes, etc. This would all form part of the archive. The more that is recorded, the better. In terms of maps, in future it will be important to include maps where policies are site specific. Include as many as you want. Any allocations within the NP will need to be mapped.

RK – We should be guided by the findings of the survey as this will affect the referendum. Therefore, look at those areas that achieved a strong response, e.g. the 20mph outside the school.

KC – When we approach DCC Highways, we should raise the points highlighted by the survey and see if they are practical. We need to ask the question and keep the response in the archive, so the NP would record what has been considered and why, if necessary, it has been rejected.

IJ reported that he is already hearing an element of dissention regarding the effectiveness of the NP. BK suggested finding out who those residents were and getting them involved with the production of the NP at some stage.

- (g) Future Requirements - These are covered by Hereford notes 32 and 33.
- (h) Necessary Inspections - Covered by note 21 – Guide to Site Assessments. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) will have to be carried out if the NP includes any new development. This is something that can be done by PDC alongside the NP, or PDC will be able to assist. The draft SA cannot be produced until the draft policies are raised. The SA will look at all the options and judge them against set criteria. Part of the production of the SA will involve a scoping document. This will need to be put together and sent to the statutory consultees allowing a 5 week period for response. Hereford notes 9 and 9a deal with some of the issues.

Habitats Regulation Assessment – Another aspect that will need to be addressed. PDC cannot do this and it will need to be factored out at a cost of about £800 - £1,000. The HRA cannot be done until the draft plan is drawn up. BK reported that the Housing Group already have some ideas regarding this.

- (i) Will there need to be further public meetings? Yes.

BK reported that the Housing Group will need a further public meeting but would not want one before the findings of the Partial Review are known; specifically to see whether the public, as a whole, had gone for large scale, small scale or mixed housing patterns in response to the questionnaire. The results of the Issues & Options consultation should be available about July/August. The SA for the Partial Review will be an important issue on guiding the way forward.

CM asked about development at Worgret. KC said that PDC have a requirement to produce a SHLAA register. Inclusion of land within that register does not mean that it will be developed. The inclusion of the land in the register is promoted by the landowner.

RK – Would it be reasonable to assume the findings in our survey would not be too far out of kilter with the Partial Review? KC – it would be better to wait until the outcome of the consultation is known. He suggested that the NP does not ask the question regarding Worgret as it will be dealt with via the Partial Review.

BK – The Housing Group has come down on the 40 or less size development but this can be looked at later and we should now work on getting a Sustainable Housing Appraisal for the parish. Moving the boundary of Wareham to take into account Worgret will make a difference. KC – there was a lot of public concern regarding the larger developments across the whole of the district. Whether this is reflected in the written responses we will not know until the results are analysed.

In terms of the development boundary, the Steering Group has indicated a requirement to review the boundaries and KC can give advice on this. The scheme at Worgret would be in Arne Parish and would not automatically go to Wareham, although it has been promoted within the wider context of the town. Whatever the decision, it should not undermine the NP.

RS – What will the report consist of? KC – A summary of the responses and reasons. It may rule out some sites but, in most cases, it will be information to inform the next stage. The Partial Review is due for completion in 2017.

BK – If we can show a sustainable plan, then we can also show things that are less sustainable. Our NP would be part of the evidence that may inform the Partial Review.

As long as we are in overall conformity with PLP1, then our policies will be okay. Similarly, the policies must conform to national policies.

BK – Because we have a history of farmers losing fields, we would like to have a policy whereby an alternative needs to be provided if a field is going to be lost. KC – As long as something is deliverable and achievable, it could be a policy. Consider the local aspirations and needs and worry about national policies as they emerge.

#### **4. Next Steps**

The Housing Group policies can be ready very quickly.

KC – contact him if there is any general advice or input needed.

#### **5. Date of next meeting**

Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> July, 6pm at Evershot – to report on the progress of policies with some notes.

The Implementation Plan will be revised at the next meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 19:30pm.