

## Minutes of a meeting of the Puddletown Area Parish Council held at 7.00pm on Tuesday 21st November 2017 at Puddletown Village Hall

**Present:** Cllrs S. Baynard, P. Walton, P. Drake, A. Sheppard,  
P. Churchill, J. Johnstone, S. Langdon

**Apologies:**

**Acting Clerk:** S. Langdon

**Public:** 36 members present

The Chairman welcomed everyone to an extraordinary meeting of the PAPC which had been called to advise the PAPC and Puddletown Residents of the progress of the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan (PNP) and to hear the views of Puddletown Residents on the draft objectives, visions and principles.

### **Public Participation Time**

A short democratic period for members of the public to raise issues of concern.

No issues were raised.

17/217 **Apologies for absence** were received from Cllr M Cooke and Cllr P Cooke

17/218 **To receive Declarations of Interest** in accordance with S94 of the LGA1972 and consider any dispensations requested.

No dispensations requested.

17/219 **To consider the draft objectives, visions and principles which will form the basis of the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan.**

Cllr P Churchill presented the 'Principles, Visions and Objectives' which will form the basis of the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan. The Principles, Visions and Objectives had been formed using evidence from the PNP survey, engagement events and the Design Forum.

A copy of the presentation can be found at [www.puddletownareaparishcouncil.co.uk/extraordinary-meeting-neighbourhood-plan/](http://www.puddletownareaparishcouncil.co.uk/extraordinary-meeting-neighbourhood-plan/)

Cllr Churchill asked for questions or comments regarding the proposals:

**Question** There was concern that the proposed 50% affordable housing / local houses for local people may not be realistic for developers or landowners, and would result in less income from the enhanced community infrastructure being returned to the village.

**Answer** One developer who had attended the Design Forum had suggested he would be willing to develop with this level of affordable housing. Cllr Churchill asked if there were other views about this proposal for affordable housing.

- Question Suggested that 50% affordable housing would be aspirational
- Answer Figures from WDDC suggest they are only achieving 16% affordable housing when they suggest 33% affordable should be built.
- Comment A further view was expressed that 50% affordable housing maybe too high, the Inspector of the plan may not agree. Every developer should contribute to affordable housing. Suggested 35% affordable housing would be more reasonable.
- Comment It was suggested there had been 3 or 4 developers who had been willing to build affordable or rented properties in the last 10 years in the Parish and only one of these had been successful. (The Hastoe development at Tolpuddle)  
After the meeting details of 'unsuccessful' was asked for from Councillors but no details have been supplied.
- Comment It was stated that expressions like 'sustainable' should be put into the plan with care and the plan should be realistic about circumstances that are outside the control of the PNP or the PAPC such as bus services.
- Question What would prevent a developer submitting a planning application before the Neighbourhood Plan was produced?
- Answer Nothing would prevent a developer from submitting an application, however it would be hoped that none would. At Reg 14 more weight would be given to the Draft plan. It was felt that there had been a good relationship between the developers and the PNP at the Design Forum.  
  
A Straw poll indicated that a majority of those present at the extraordinary meeting were in favour of a Neighbourhood Plan
- Question When would the reorganisation of the Councils take place, and will this affect the progress of the plan?
- Answer April 2019 and the effect on the plan is not known
- Comment By mid-January 2018 PNP should have a clearer idea of the numbers of houses proposed for the plan.
- Question Information about how decisions about size of development and rate of growth was asked for
- Answer The survey in April 2016 had a 14% response rate (14% of Puddletown resident households) which was reported as good for this type of survey. 56% of the respondees favoured a development rate commensurate with the previous 15 years.  
Engagement was still ongoing with opportunities for feedback via email, Facebook page and by leaving completed comment sheets in the Library and Shop.

- Comment A comment was made suggesting the cost of the NP be more widely publicised to residents.
- Answer It is not something that the PAPC would usually publicise.
- Comment Those attending were reminded that there was no housing quota for Puddletown to fulfil in terms of the Local Plan
- Comment Suggestion that PNP should/could work with one developer to achieve more unified approach and could help fund PNP
- Response The PNP could lose control of the project and not be considered independent.  
There was a suggestion that if development took place at Chapel Ground and Rod Hill the developers might work together to produce a more cohesive approach.
- Comment Wherever development occurs it was suggested that there should be good planning to minimise disruption to residents
- Comment Suggestion that design of development should be such that areas are not left which may be developed in the future.
- Comment There may need to be a Strategic Environmental Assessment, which will look at other sites that could be developed within the planning boundary. If there is development at the Middle school, it could impact on development sites in the village.
- Question Had all SHLAA sites been included in the process?
- Answer All landowners who had SHLAA sites had been invited to attend the Design Forum.
- Comment ‘Bungalows’ / single storey buildings are attractive to older residents and it was hoped there would be some provision in future developments
- At the end of the discussion Cllr Churchill suggested further comments or feedback after the extraordinary meeting would be welcomed by the Steering Group.
- PAPC councillors reflected on the presentation and the views expressed by the residents attending the meeting. Concern was voiced over the relatively small percentage of residents engaging with the PNP despite using different events and forums and advertising all events. Cllr Churchill reminded councillors that 500 contacts had been made with people at different events incorporating 212 individuals.
- Difficulty in formulating a satisfactory plan with the uncertainty of the Middle School expansion was also a concern.

Meeting finished at 9.10 pm

.....Chairman