

# **Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (PNPSG)**

## **Draft Meeting Minutes**

**30<sup>th</sup> November 2018**

**Rodhill Meeting Room, Puddletown**

### **Extraordinary Meeting to Meet the Chair and the Clerk of the Puddletown Area Parish Council (PAPC)**

#### **Present:**

Stephen Baynard (Chair of the PAPC) (SB)

Peter Churchill (PC) (Chair)

Jane Cox (JC)

Janey Gordon (JG)

Colin Hampton (Clerk of the PAPC) (CH)

Paul Langdon (PL)

Janet Ranger (JR)

John Ridout (JR)

Sandra Shaw

#### **Apologies:**

Mary Miles (MM)

#### **1. *Introduction to the Issues:***

A tour de table was undertaken to introduce the participants.

PC introduced the PNPSG's issues with the PAPC's decision to support the Wyatt Homes planning application at Three Lanes Puddletown.

- The progress of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) was noted. Progress was such that a draft NP and the initiation of Regulation 14 had been scheduled for mid-January 2019. The NP was therefore on schedule.
- The decision by the PAPC was considered by the PNPSG to break the trust between the Parish Council and the NP group. The PNPSG had provided good planning and principled reasons to object to

the planning application. The PNSP had wanted to object to all planning applications until a full site assessment had been completed by independent contractors (studies to be completed by Christmas 2018). Despite this the PAPC had voted to support the application.

- The PNPSG felt that there was a lack of both understanding and interest in the NP by members of the PAPC. This would make the next steps in the NP impossible to achieve.
- By voting to support the Three Lanes planning application the PAPC had voted against one of the key principles of the NP, had supported a planning application before development sites had been agreed by the PNPSG / PAPC, and had demonstrated to other potential developers that the PAPC would not block future planning applications. The NP and PAPC are aware that over 300 dwellings are wanted by developers. This level of development is considered too high by the NP and is very likely to have a negative impact on Puddletown
- The NP is about to enter the period when support from the PAPC would be most needed. The PAPC will be responsible for organising the Regulation 14 consultation with the public and statutory bodies. The PAPC will be a key player in the Regulation 16 consultation and the examination by an independent examiner. The PAPC will organise the referendum. Difficult issues will need to be discussed, and the NP defended. However the PAPC had failed its very first test of NP support.
- The PNPSG was aware that the decision of the PAPC had been very negatively perceived by the people of Puddletown. As a result belief in the NP process had been greatly diminished.

On this basis the PNPSG considered that with the current PAPC it was impossible to complete the NP, that a key matter of principle had been broken, and the PNPSG had therefore resigned.

2. *Reply by the Chair of the PAPC:*

SG replied to the issues raised by the PNPSG.

- The PAPC greatly appreciated the huge amount of work that the PNPSG had undertaken, and he and the PAPC supported the NP.
- He had cast his vote in support of the planning application because he considered the application to be a good one, one that had been improved since the first application, and one that in any case was going to be approved by the WDDC. The only negative planning point was the single access into and out of the planned development.
- The vote he had cast had been undertaken with his head, rather than his heart. If he had voted with his heart he would have followed the advice of the PNPSG.

- The NP, at its current level of development, had no influence on planning decisions.
- In any case SB believed that the Three Lanes site was one that had already been approved by the PNPSG. It was certainly a site that had been under discussion for some time.
- The positive support of the PAPC for the Three Lanes planning application would have no bearing on future planning applications.
- It was vitally important that the NP continue, otherwise Puddletown was at risk of being swamped by new housing.
- If the PNPSG felt that they were unable to continue, then there was no way that the PAPC could continue with the NP.

3. *Discussion:*

There followed extensive discussion on the issues raised.

No agreement could be reached on key issues, including:

- Whether or not key principles had been broken by the PAPC in supporting the Three Lanes Planning Application,
- Whether or not the PAPC supported or was interested in the NP,
- The potential of success if the NP continued under the current Parish Council.

4. *Conclusions:*

It was concluded by the PNPSG members that the reasons for their resignation remained. They will not further develop the NP under the current Parish Council. SB noted his sadness at this decision.

It was therefore **agreed** by all participants that:

- The current on-going studies undertaken by the contractor AECOM (financially supported by funding from Locality) would continue to completion. The Strategic Environmental Assessment and the Site Assessment studies are well advanced, and will both be completed by Christmas.
- The main contract support, Feria Urbanism, will be asked to package up all existing information into a proper, accessible form. The Clerk will be briefed, and will have access to this information.
- The PNPSG will brief the Clerk on the status of the project, and will supply further information so that the Clerk has a complete project overview.

The PAPC (the current Parish Council, and / or the one that will be formed following the May 2019 elections) can then decide how best to proceed.

*Minutes prepared by PC*