

## NOTES OF MEETING

**Meeting:** Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting

**Date & Time:** Monday 8<sup>th</sup> January at 7.00pm

**Place:** Council Chamber, The New Town Hall, Commercial Road

### PRESENT:

**Chair:** Cllr David Northam

**Steering Group Members:** Cllr Colin Huckle, Michael Bevan, Penny Quilter, Phil Watts, Colin Marsh, Lara Wood, Rob Cheeseman

**Project Support:** Michele Williams

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	BY WHOM
1.	<p><b>Welcome and Apologies:</b></p> <p>David welcomed everyone and thanked them for their attendance. Apologies were received from Cllr Ann Weaving, and Jane Biscombe.</p>		
2.	<p><b>Minutes &amp; Matters Arising:</b></p> <p><b>Point 2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- David still not heard from Jonathan Mair so will agreement from the SG will go to Matt Proser to chase a response. All agreed next steps.</li> <li>- Phil has not met Cllr O’Leary – will look at arranging meeting soon.</li> </ul> <p><b>Point 4:</b></p> <p>David has made contact with George Venning today and consideration to invite him to a future Steering Group meeting. David to circulate email from George (confidential) to group.</p> <p><b>Point 5:</b></p> <p>Following on from Penny question about how the WNP would be tested for robustness of the policies. Discussion on the weight of the plan to actually protect Weymouth. Phil explained that the Plan will only be one of a number of documents which anyone submitting a planning application will have to adhere to. It is positive that our plan will have more impact on the planning framework than the Local Plan will have. It will definitely make a difference and is better than having no plan.</p> <p>Minutes of last meeting held 11<sup>th</sup> December were approved – to be uploaded onto website.</p>	<p>Chase via Matt Proser</p> <p>Arrange meeting</p> <p>Circulate email to group</p> <p>Upload onto web page</p>	<p>DN</p> <p>PW</p> <p>MW</p> <p>MW</p>
3.	<p><b>Briefing from James Riley (AECOM) on HRA</b></p> <p>Presentation from James and discussion on the next steps. Once AECOM have finalised the HRA they can have discussion with DC, but</p>		

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	BY WHOM
	<p>agreed for AECOM to send the updated document to us and we will share with DC and copy in AECOM.</p> <p>Consideration of wording “adverse effect” = determine the integrity of the site – does it undermine the purpose of the plan.</p>		
4.	<p><b>Update on Regulation 14 Consultation</b></p> <p>All responses now in, but there are a number of statutory bodies that appear to not have responses – request for Michele to send out reminders.</p> <p>David asked for everyone’s comments on the feedback so far – how do they think it has been received.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are comments about the Communities Policies mainly being around Transport. David advised that as long as other issues are in the plan it does not matter under which heading they are.</li> <li>- DC comments have identified areas that we need to make changes it is not necessary to make all changes, if not making any suggested changes we need to be robust in the reasons why not. Then look at residents and local comments.</li> <li>- There is a lot of comments on the size of the document, and the scale of the area covered. We cannot do anything about the size of the area and the final document might not be as large, but needs to cover the area. Discussion on whether to change the layout of the plan as maps are not clear enough on smaller scale – Michele to look into this. Comments about our vision being unimaginative and bland, but overall there are positive comments.</li> <li>- Comments received around the vision which was said to be unimaginative and bland, agreed to look at this for submission version of the plan.</li> <li>- Overall comments seemed positive, especially around the sustainable environments section, general agreement that need for more affordable home.</li> <li>- Need to be clear that any objective evidence carries weight and we need to take into account.</li> <li>- Consensus that in ‘Jobs’ we are a little weak, unsure how to improve this area.</li> <li>- ‘Community’ generally positive but comments around the smaller ‘communities’ not having input.</li> <li>- Disappointed in the number of responses, in terms of terminology around car parks consideration to change to “not build on car parks unless.....”</li> <li>- The small margin between ‘agree/don’t agree’ – does this mean there is a lack of confidence, are we using the right language, do we need to do more work?</li> </ul>		

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	BY WHOM
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Positive that what the environment sections comments were very aligned with what the young people had said.</li> <li>- We need to consider how we will inform the public of outcome of the Reg 14.</li> </ul> <p>Paul has suggested that there are task groups to look at the responses and changes necessary to the submission plan. He will send an updated list with the suggested changes as soon as possible so that task groups can start and have responses for the 12<sup>th</sup> February meeting which he will be attending. Paul has confirmed that he will be available ad hoc after the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2024 if necessary.</p> <p>We need to start changing the terminology we use from ‘The Steering Group’ to ‘The Council’. We may need to point out to the Council that additional work might need to be done i.e. Economic Strategy.</p> <p>Conversation needed with Dorset Council that if they are not wishing to allocate land for Affordable Housing how are we going to reach the housing need.</p>		
5.	<p><b>Future Schedule/Timetable:</b></p> <p>Discussion on the timetable from Paul, David still not happy with the response from DC that they will not accept anything during the HURDA period – the Plan is not a political document. Agreed that we will strive to have the Submission Plan ready for Full Council on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2024, but agreed if needs to be later, then it will have to be later.</p> <p>Although David keen to have a special Full Council in April the feasibility of it was not clear in light of the fact that DC will not consider receiving the document until after election period and possibly until the first Full Council meeting with new councillors has been held.</p> <p>Paul suggested that Task Groups are created to look at the 5 themes and then once he has feedback – hopefully by the 12<sup>th</sup> February meeting he can then make changes, which will then determine what is changes in the current plan.</p>		
6.	<p><b>SFRA L2 Weymouth</b></p> <p>Some clarification on the SFRA which says 2138 – should it be 2038? David will check and ask for changes if necessary.</p>	Confirm date	DN
7.	<p><b>Any Other Business:</b></p> <p>Reminder that the future meeting dates have been changed as in Point 8.</p>		
8.	<p><b>Dates of Future Meetings:</b></p> <p><b>Date:</b> Monday 12<sup>th</sup> February 2024  <b>Time:</b> 7pm  <b>Venue:</b> Council Chamber</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Monday 11<sup>th</sup> March 2024</p>		

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	BY WHOM
	<p><b>Time:</b> 7pm <b>Venue:</b> Council Chamber</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Monday 8<sup>th</sup> April 2024 <b>Time:</b> 7pm <b>Venue:</b> Council Chamber</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Monday 13<sup>th</sup> May 2024 <b>Time:</b> 7pm <b>Venue:</b> Council Chamber</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Monday 10<sup>th</sup> June 2024 <b>Time:</b> 7pm <b>Venue:</b> Council Chamber</p>		

Meeting ended at 9:10pm