



**ARNE PARISH COUNCIL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP MEETING  
28<sup>th</sup> JULY 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).

**1. Apologies for absence**

Apologies had been received from Ann Pugsley (APs) and Keith Childs (KC)

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

A copy of the minutes had been issued to all members prior to the start of the meeting but were unavailable for signing. They will be confirmed at the next meeting of the Steering Group.

**3. Matters Arising**

As per item 2.

**4. Report back from working group chairs**

AP suggested that, before starting the reviews, objectives needed to be set – namely, how we develop the policies with a view to getting them ready to send to KC for reviewing/amending. BK suggested having one person to write the final policies in order to keep the language consistent. RS felt one person leading a small group would work better as it may involve quite an amount of work. DH – if we get to the point where the policy is distilled to one or two sentences, it should not be too difficult for someone to bring them together.

RK – suggested appointing one person to work with each group in turn to finalise the policies. He was happy to take on this role, assisted by AP. AP agreed that RK should act as an advisor and would see each chair in turn to help them draft their policies. RK reminded chairs that he would review the policies only; it would up to the chairs to write their own summaries and backup.

The deadline of the middle of September was set by which time the policies would be in place, together with the post- and pre-amble.

AP reminded chairs that objectives are not policies. The survey should be referred to as the Arne Parish Neighbourhood Plan Survey in the first instance and the APNPS thereafter. This would keep the consistency going throughout each of the policies and statements.

A review of each group's policies to date then took place.

## Housing

BK reported that, whilst working through the policies and survey responses, the housing group asked for permission to meet with various people. She and CM have now met with the company who wish to develop on side of West Lane. The group felt that maintaining the rurality of the area is key. The meeting was very positive. One of the most important points that has come from the group's work is the recognition of the defined development boundary of Stoborough Village. It is important to encourage PDC to accept the settlement boundary in the first instance.

Policy 2 – “development” in the first line to be changed to “settlement”.

Page 2 – Evidence base – fourth line – the word “Committee” to be changed to “Steering Group.”

The term “windfall development” will be changed to “infill” throughout the policy document.

DH asked if would be possible to limit the number of new houses built that are used as second homes – no.

## Traffic

CM reported that she has met with Dorset County Highways and discussed the various proposals raised within the traffic group. The one-way system for Nutcrack Lane would not be permitted but, despite this, we should keep this as an aspiration for the future. If it cannot be done, then we need to keep the alteration of priorities at the Ridge junction within the Plan.

## Environment

VW thanked RK and BK for their assistance in writing this. The policies have arisen from the survey. Reference needs to be made to the Local Plan which does cover Policy 1 but it was felt that this is such an important area within the Parish that it should also be kept within our Plan.

Policy 2 – page 1, final sentence should read “The PDC Partial Review **consultation response** shows general support for the 400m rule for housing development, **whilst** the APS.....”

Policy 3 – to read “In a Parish where so much land is either designated for nature conservation or of importance for flood management, **it is imperative that care** must be taken.....”

“No net loss” needs to be expanded upon within the summary following. RK will find the relevant wording for the explanation.

In the summary for policy 3, the sentence commencing “No account was taken.... “ needs to be toned down or removed.

Policy 4 – “discussion” to be replaced with “consultation.” VK asked if it would be possible to include the expansion of the heathland. Perhaps this could be included within the summary following.

## Business

Currently consists of 8 policies. AP will forward the document to all members of the group.

Promoting tourism – BK reported that the Partial Review is currently looking at the conflict that exists within PLP1. We need to state a strong position on this i.e. the restrictions Natural England are trying to put on the type of business, etc. that is permitted within the 400m and 5km zones.

Need to also look at the “work at home” area.

### **Crime & Policing**

IJ – although the survey showed residents were worried about crime, further investigation showed that this is based on past experiences. There was only one real complaint about policing at the information evening. BK reminded members that the crime figures reported were based on where the defendant lived and not where the crime actually took place so they could be quite misleading.

We would like more regular updates on the crime figures and what is actually happening within the parish.

### **Health**

AP was unable to attend the meeting but had submitted a list of 3 policies. All were detailed and based on her knowledge of the issues. It was felt that some of the detail could be reduced.

### **Community Well-being**

BK suggested including the number of children attending the school who actually live within the parish. AP will check this. There are 193 children at the school but the numbers living in and outside the parish are not known.

Policy 2 leads into the possible mention of a community hub.

## **5. Neighbourhood Plan Training**

RB had attended the course and reported that we seem to be doing most of the work correctly. Nationally there are about 1,400 communities that have taken the first step towards producing a plan. 81 plans had been examined and 46 “made”.

It was noted that West Lulworth has now withdrawn their request to draw up a Plan.

## **6. Allotments**

AP suggested they be included in the Register of Assets by Dorset County Council and he will look into this.

IJ suggested registering the Hayricks under the Village Green initiative. AC pointed out that the site is owned by the Parish Council and to put any form of status on it would prevent anything future councillors doing anything with it. As it stands, no-one would be able to do anything with the site without the permission of the Parish Council.

## **7. Draft of the Plan so far**

Already covered.

## **8. Sustainability Appraisal**

BK has spoken to a developer and was told that anyone could write this appraisal as it was supposed to be understood by everyone. She will send AP an e-mail covering this.

## **9. Next Steps**

Introduction to cover the community and give an overview of the Parish of Arne. AP will write the first draft and BK will provide him with some information that could be incorporated.

## **10. Date of next meeting**

Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> October, 6pm at Evershot.

IJ thanked AP for his assistance in drafting the Crime policies.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 20:01pm.

