



**ARNE PARISH COUNCIL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP MEETING**  
**Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> January 2016 at Stoborough Primary School**

**Present:** Ian Jenkins (IJ), Bridget Kenward (BW), Robert Kenward (RK), Caroline Macleod (CM) Ashley Pellegrini (AP), Ray Scragg (RS), Avris Wakefield-Sutton (AWS), Vivienne Ward (VW), Don Hunter (DH), Anne Pugsley (APu), Amanda Crocker (AC), Keith Childs (KC)  
- PDC

**1. Apologies for absence**

Apologies received from Richard Bessant.

AP extended thanks to Debbie Corbin (DC), Headteacher of Stoborough Primary, for the use of the room; AP again thanked RK for pulling together each group's policies into a coherent and regular form, following the detailed input from KC. This vote of thanks was fully endorsed by the Steering Group (SG).

**2. Minutes of the meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2015**

A copy of the minutes was sent to all members of the SG prior to the meeting. They were confirmed to be a true and accurate representation of the meeting.

**3. The outline NP in document format**

In the light of recent communication, AP suggested abandoning this item for the time being. BK was then invited to discuss her recent e-mail as this would have a significant bearing on the NP.

BK & RS met with KC on the morning of the 12<sup>th</sup> January regarding the EA's amendments to building levels in Purbeck. As a result of the amendments, the land on the Purbeck School side of West Lane is no longer available for building. BK, RS and KC will draw up a plan to see what would fit on the land available on the other side of West Lane, together with input from the Housing Group – Stepping Stones site. Possibly looking at 6 bungalows.

The developer would like to be able to carry any development on the site as far as Corfe Road but this is not acceptable. AONB need to be contacted as the ground level rises steeply from Corfe Road. They would be able to give us an idea of what they would accept and we would then be able to limit the amount of development.

KC – need to consider the size of the area and then what should go on that area.

In terms of the Purbeck Local Plan, there is no housing requirement set out for Arne. There is an identified need in the parish for 29 houses.

BK – we have a strong case for showing we have tried very hard to find areas for housing but have been prevented by the various agencies. The only other site that would take more than 1 house would be the Ridge shed site.

DH – although we do not like the Worgret site, it does tick a lot of boxes. Would an inspector not discount the NP as offering 6 houses is only a token gesture? Would the site be imposed?

BK – we should not propose the site.

KC – it is possible at some point in the future that the site will be considered and it is still under review in the present plan.

DH – when is there likely to be an announcement from PDC regarding the first list of sites/preferred options?

KC – there are currently under review and there will be another consultation in late spring/early summer. PDC councillors have yet to agree on the sites.

IJ – has the Worgret developer offered anything else?

KC – there are several promotions within the area. It is probably unlikely that one of the more ambitious suggestions is likely to be agreed.

RK – agrees with CM when there is a defined need larger than 6 and the Housing Group were looking at about 40 houses on the Stepping Stones site – perhaps we should be looking at about 20 houses with small gardens.

BK – we only have a limited piece of land – only part of which is in the SHLAA.

AP – has the news compromised our NP?

KC – it impacts on our options but there is still a possibility to consider some development. Whatever approach is agreed needs to be reasoned – including those areas that are ultimately discounted.

BK – it is important to have a clear narrative showing how hard we have tried and why certain sites have been discounted.

CM – the engine shed site – the landowner is favourable to having some development on the site. KC will check what height the land is above sea level. DH – when we met with PDC, we spoke about the possibility of this site but PDC said no, due to the ponds, TPOs, etc.

KC – the SHLAA sites would be a good starting point for reviewing potential land available but they may not be the only potential sites. The risk of surface run-off will also need to be taken into account. PDC could help with this. We need also to be clear on the density that would be acceptable. There is no requirement for us to design the properties but the NP should provide as much clarity as possible to allow developers to know what is required.

BK to organise another meeting of the Housing Group asap and RS to attend.

Time Line – KC – with regard to the Sustainability Appraisal, PDC will be able to produce the SA Scoping Report and it should be finished during February. Once produced, it will be sent to the NP committee. It would then be necessary to hold a consultation (6 weeks required) with the statutory consultees – the responses from these bodies would come back to APC. This needs to be done before the public consultation. This means the public consultation may have to be postponed. PDC

would help in sending the Scoping Report out. There is then a need for the full SA and it would be advisable to have done some work on this before the final public consultation. April would now be the earliest time – provisionally Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> April.

AP suggested 3 or 4 group members now begin to write the NP document. RK has done a tremendous amount of work already and could be used to check it all afterwards but would not have the time to be involved with the actual writing. AP suggested he, RS and AW-S make a start on the writing.

The draft policy document was then reviewed line by line.

IJ – burial ground on the A35 – this should be the A351. AP – there are several errors of a similar nature that need to be sorted out and corrected.

Figure 3a – needs to explain the use of the 2002 data.

P10 – Addition as flooding had not been addressed. KC – think about how flood hazards might be identified. He will speak to the district engineer to find out how frequently the Flood Plan needs to be updated.

P13 – (9) – need to be consistent. Draw out all numbers or none? RK – reported where the % referred to a low number of people.

P16 – Policy 5 – Settlement boundaries rather than Development Boundaries.

(Item 7 – “the peace of the cemetery” – change to “tranquillity”)

KC – “all other possibilities” – should add “within the Plan”.

Policy 7 – will need to be updated and changed to settlement boundary. “unchanged” to “reviewed”.

#### **4. Settlement Boundary**

RS – need to be more consistent, i.e. boundary to go around gardens and inside the perimeter roads. This keeps the consistency. KC will update the plans in the next few weeks.

Policy 7 could just then make reference to a map.

No reference to settlement boundary for Stoborough – possibly include this in Policy 6 – revise as Policy 7.

P22 – CM suggested stop at Arne Road. What is suggested in the NP may not be the safest option. KC – have some input from Highways.

P22 – Puddletown Road – add “tanks, tractors and large mobile homes.”

## 5. Community Hub

CM – should be looking at the youth of today and what they may want in the future. More can be offered to the community with a hub facility. Perhaps explain to the public at the next public consultation. The parish council should have more input in providing something for the future. CM – would like this given a little more prominence.

AP – could this be brought up at the next Village Hall meeting? If we get their understanding then it could be included as Policy in the NP. AW-S will find out when the next meeting is and AP and CM could attend.

KC – working in green and Policy 19 need to be in line. Remove SHLAA and make reference to “land at Scott Close” and include a map.

19:35pm APu left the meeting.

Policy 19 – remove “eg” and “behind Scott Close”.

KC suggested highlighting objectives in a different colour.

P32 – Remove reference to Furzebrook Village Hall as it is not in our parish. Below Policy 20 – first sentence is inaccurate as there is only one village hall in the parish. “Redcliffe” should be “Redclyffe”.

P34 – Remove reference to Furzebrook from the figure.

P36 – there is now only one hotel in the parish as Worgret is now a B & B.

% for public service lost.

“In 50% of households .....” bit ambiguous. Needs rewording. “Responses received to the APNPS.....”

P39 – “A standing com.....” was originally part of Policy 24 but DH took it out as he felt it confused the Policy and was better as an aspiration. Needs rewording.

Policy 23 – APC will “nominate and recognise ...” include “significantly increase heavy traffic”.

Policy 24 – “Business related uses of buildings” – could be seen to encourage new builds. Needs to stress existing buildings.

**Agenda item 8 – Retention of Assets** – this will be carried out by e-mail.

## 11. Broadband

RS would like to get more information and plans from SuperFast Dorset. This will be moved to the next meeting.

**12. AOB**

IJ – sits on the Viridor Credits board – if anyone has an application the need to move quickly as funding may dry up completely.

**10. Date of next meeting**

To be confirmed.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.10pm.