

Stinsford Parish Council

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 13 February 2023
at 7:00pm in The Stinsford Centre, Kingston Maurward College

Present: Ms Sarah Jane Pattison (Chair), Mr George Armstrong (Vice-Chair) and Mr Michael Clarke

Also in attendance: Miss Kirsty Riglar (Clerk) and three members of the public

13. Apologies for Absence

13.1 An apology for absence was received from Ms Susan Escott.

14. Declarations of Interest

14.1 There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary or other interest.

15. Public Participation Time

15.1 Ms Serena Shone, resident of Church Lane, addressed the Parish Council in relation to the degradation of the approach to Stinsford and the lack of management of the trees in the area by Kingston Maurward College. She also raised concerns about the safety of the permissive car park on Church Lane.

15.2 Mr Julian Bailey, resident of Church Lane, addressed the Parish Council about the significant impact of the relocation of the tractor and construction vehicle training area by the College to a site abutting Church Lane. He detailed the impact on his and neighbouring properties in terms of noise and vibration. He also expressed his concerns about the environmental impact on habitats in the area. He had approached the Principal of the College about this and was told that this location would be temporary but there had been no information provided about a timeframe.

15.3 It was proposed that a meeting be sought between the Principal of the College and representatives of the Parish Council to discuss residents' concerns about the current location of the tractor training area, the safety and future of the permissive car park, management of the trees on Church Lane, in addition to plans for the planting of screening for the new substation.

Ms Shone and Mr Bailey left the meeting at 7:30pm.

16. Minutes

16.1 It was **resolved** that the minutes of the meeting held on 9 January 2023 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a true record

16.2 Further to minute 7.2/22, it was reported that the issue relating to the signage on Slyers Lane had now been resolved.

16.3 Further to minute 7.3/2022, Mr Armstrong provided feedback on the recent Working Together webinar about Dorset Council's new approach to 20mph speed limits. Individual communities could apply for such limits for residential areas but would be required to pay and even a simple scheme would cost between £6-10,000. The policy would be reviewed after a year and he suggested that the Parish Council provide some feedback at that time.

- 16.4 Further to minute 7.1/2022, it was proposed that information be sought from Dorset Council about where in the county a reduced speed limit had been implemented due to vulnerable users and the criteria used to make this decision.
- 16.5 Further to minute 10/2022, the Clerk reported that she had not yet investigated the replacement of the noticeboard at Higher Bockhampton. However, it was agreed that the addition of two wooden handles and a reinforced back to the board would increase its longevity in the short term.

17. Planning Matters

- 17.1 P/HOU/2022/07216 – The Oasthouse, St Georges Road, Dorchester DT1 1PB – Install 26 panel roof mounted domestic solar panels
And
P/LBC/2022/07217 – The Oasthouse, St Georges Road, Dorchester DT1 1PB – Install 26 panel roof mounted domestic solar panels

Having considered the material planning considerations, it was **resolved** to support these applications.

- 17.2 P/VOC/2023/00148 – Land north of 4 Maurward Close, Stinsford DT2 8PU – Erection of No. 3 dwellings with associated landscaping and works (without compliance with conditions 2 & 4 of planning permission P/FUL/2021/03341 – revised plot C)

It was noted that this application had been withdrawn prior to the meeting.

18. Lower Bockhampton play area – restoration of wall

- 18.1 Mr Armstrong provided an update on the proposed specialist restoration of the boundary wall of Lower Bockhampton play area by Thomas Gargrave. The over-arching quote remained in the region of £10,000 for the entire wall, addressing both the brickwork and coping stones. However this would be revisited following completion of the first section, once the level of repair required was known. Dorset Council's Conservation Officer had been approached and was content with the proposed works.
- 18.2 It was proposed that the works commence on 1 April 2023 and arrangements were in place for access to water and electricity from Bockhampton House. Arrangements for secure storage of aggregate on site were being progressed.
- 18.3 It was **resolved** that the proposed restoration of the play area wall be progressed from 1 April 2023 in accordance with the update provided.

19. Installation of community grit bin

- 19.1 The Parish Council noted the response received from the Rangers at Higher Bockhampton about the need for any additional grit bins to be provided by the community.
- 19.2 It was **resolved** to:
- (i) clarify the proposed location of the grit bin and identify the landowner;
 - (ii) seek a quote for the provision and installation from Dorset Council; and
 - (ii) once this was received, approach the National Trust and Hardy's Birthplace Visitor Centre about contributing towards the cost.

20. Overview of recent meetings

20.1 The Parish Council considered the outcomes of the following recent meetings:

(i) ***Meeting with Chris Loder MP on 13 January 2023***

The Parish Council welcomed the meeting. It was felt that this had been productive and a good first step in opening dialogue with him and he was supportive of the Parish Council's concerns in relation to certain issues. His response regarding the ambiguous messaging from Dorset Council about the consideration of nutrients in planning was noted.

(ii) ***Climate and Ecological Emergency public event on 2 February 2023***

It was felt that the turnout of local residents was promising. Whilst the lack of volunteers remained an issue, the Parish Council welcomed the offer from former Parish Councillor Ms Martin get involved. The Chair had subsequently written to her to thank her. A discussion took place concerning residents who may be interested. Mr Armstrong and Mr Clarke would approach those identified.

It was noted that the Facebook page had not yet attracted much interest with only four members including the Chair and the Clerk. It was agreed that once a small group of residents were engaged a start-up meeting should be held to follow two themes:

- a) the approach to be used to data and monitoring; and
- b) projects to take forward taking into account the ideas of residents raised at the event on 2 February.

It was agreed that this would be the focus of the next Pilot article.

21. Consultations

21.1 The Parish Council agreed a final corporate response to the Government's consultation on the Levelling-up and Regeneration Bill: reforms to national planning policy (appended to these minutes) and **resolved** that this be submitted.

21.2 The Parish Council **resolved** to submit a response to the Dorchester Transport Action Group Survey to include reference to:

- (i) roads that cut across rights of way;
- (ii) the need for a link across the A35 near Higher Kingston; and
- (iii) ongoing concerns about the safety of crossing the A35 at Stinsford Hill Roundabout.

22. Date of next meeting

22.1 It was noted that the next meeting was scheduled to be held on Monday 20 March 2023. This meeting would again be held in The Stinsford Centre.

The meeting concluded at 8:35pm.

Chairman..... Date.....

Appendix

Levelling-up and Regeneration Bill: Reforms to National Planning Policy Consultation

Submission by Stinsford Parish Council

Question	Response	Reason
1. Do you agree that local planning authorities should not have to continually demonstrate a deliverable 5-year housing land supply(5YHLS) as long as the housing requirement set out in its strategic policies is less than 5 years old?	Agree	Local Planning Authorities should not have to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. This creates undue pressure to agree sites to hit housing figures even when sites are not appropriate.
2. Do you agree that the buffers should not be required as part of the 5YHLS calculation (this includes the 20% buffer as applied by the Housing Delivery Test)?	Agree	Buffers give false expectation of development encouraging inflationary impacts on local land values and encourages land banking. This also does not take account of windfall sites pushing delivery figures up. A better solution would be pressures to ensure that developers actually deliver in set time periods.
3. Should an oversupply of houses early in the plan period be taken into consideration when calculating a 5YHLS later on or is there an alternative approach that is preferable?	Agree	Local Planning Authorities should be able to count historic over supply. This will help to remove undue pressure to agree applications and allow greater flexibility in identifying the most suitable sites for development.
4. What should any planning guidance dealing with oversupply and undersupply say?	Agree	Planning guidance need to ensure that oversupply is carried forward. Undersupply is often justifiable because of a lack of appropriate sites in a specific locality or the failure of developers to deliver. Policy needs to be accepting of local issues and offer sanctions that can be taken against developers who fail to deliver.
5. Do you have any views about the potential changes to paragraph 14 of the existing Framework and increasing the protection given to neighbourhood plans?	Yes but disagree about the practicality of this.	Agree in principle but for a neighbourhood plan to include 'plans and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement'. Housing allocation requires a very substantial planning research basis. It is difficult to see how most Parish Councils

would have the resource basis to carry this forward especially taken their dependency on non professional volunteer models of delivery. This policy could lead parish councils and local communities open to allegations of delivery failure because it does not include a realistic delivery model.

6. Do you agree that the opening chapters of the Framework should be revised to be clearer about the importance of planning for the homes and other development our communities need?

Oppose – it needs to be revised but not as proposed.

This section needs to accept that what landowners and developers want is to make economic surpluses and this is not necessarily the same as what communities want or need. It should be revised with a view to trusting local communities to state what they need rather than have a notion of needs thrust upon them by planners and developers.

7. What are your views on the implications these changes may have on plan-making and housing supply?

Disagree

Community trust in the plan making process is already shattered. The only way to reverse this is to bring forward a system where local communities are able to determine what development occurs in their locality free from the pressure of developers and land owners. The present system all too often looks like a developer and landowner free for all while local communities suffer the consequences.

8. Do you agree that the policy and guidance should be clearer on what may constitute an exceptional circumstance for the use of an alternative approach for assessing local housing needs? Are there other issues we should consider alongside those set out above?

Agree

The term 'exceptional' requires clarification. Support the first bullet point that 'large scale development could outweigh the benefits'. Support bullet point 2 that there should be no requirement to review green belts. Past over delivery should also be taken into account.

9. Do you agree that national policy should make clear that Green Belt does not need to be reviewed or altered when making plans, that building at densities significantly out of

Agree about green belt but disagree about high density.

Green belt should not need to be reviewed or altered. Disagree on the acceptability of high density housing. High density is often associated with declining standards of living and the

character with the existing area may be considered in assessing whether housing need can be met, and that past over-supply may be taken into account?

10. Do you have views on what evidence local planning authorities should be expected to provide when making the case that need could only be met by building at densities significantly out of character with the existing area?

Disagree

health implications of reduced access to personal green space. This also has environmental and infrastructure implications. This requires evidence to suggest that there is a land shortage in the UK rather an access issue with so much land held in the hands of a minority of the population.

Much new build in the UK is already high density with developers building on increasingly small plots to squeeze as many units in as possible. High density should never be allowed when it is out of character with an existing area. Local Planning Authorities need to consider the environmental, infrastructure, health and equalities Implications. They also need to demonstrate that a site is the best potential from other available options.

11. Do you agree with removing the explicit requirement for plans to be 'justified', on the basis of delivering a more proportionate approach to examination?

Strongly disagree

This is about simplifying or amending the test of soundness. This could be essential for creating an appropriate balance with environmental and other considerations. Of considerable concern is that the 'test of soundness' covers a range of issues that allow the communities and individuals to raise concerns through the consultation procedure. As such this could potentially close down a long established road for addressing poor planning practice and so have implications for democratic process.

12. Do you agree with the proposal not to apply revised tests of soundness to plans at more advanced stages of preparation? If no which if any, plans should the revised tests apply to?

Strongly disagree.

As above the test of soundness covers a range of issues that are essential to allowing the public the democratic right to express a view in the planning process. The test should apply to Local Plans, Minerals and Waste Plans Neighbourhood Plans and

all other planning approaches to land use.

13. Do you agree that we should make a change to the Framework on the application of the urban uplift? Disagree

This will superficially raise the number of houses to be built in an area by an over simplistic notion of affordability. The uplift allows for an amount to be added on top of the standard methodology derived figure. In some urban areas of the south east this has in places almost trebled the housing target. In the document this is aimed at larger cities but could be disastrous if ever rolled out on a wider basis.

14. What, if any, additional policy or guidance could the department provide which could help authorities plan for more homes in urban areas where the uplift applies? Disagree

The 'uplift' is based on a simplistic model of market economics – build more leads to lower prices and affordability. This ignores the fact that housing markets operate as investment opportunities. Policy guidance is needed to understand and regulate the use of housing as an investment commodity. The uplift policy came into being in 2018. It has not led to greater affordability and should be scrapped.

15. How, if at all, should neighbourhood authorities consider the urban uplift applying, where part of those neighbouring authorities also functions as part of the wider economic, transport or housing market for a core town/city? Disagree with the urban uplift.

The set of economic assumptions behind the urban uplift is wrong. Planning policy needs to provide serious protections for non rural areas, smaller towns and small towns.

16. Do you agree with the proposed 4-year rolling land supply requirement for emerging plans, where work is needed to revise the plan to take account of revised policy on addressing constraints and reflecting any past over-supply? If no, what approach should be taken, if any? No

Local authorities should be allowed to plan on a basis of local need and show flexibility in accordance with that.

17. Do you consider that the additional guidance on constraints should apply to plans continuing to be prepared under the transitional arrangements set out in the existing Framework paragraph 220?	Yes	Constraints should always be a serious consideration in the planning system.
18. Do you support an additional permissions-based test that will 'switch off' the application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development where an authority can demonstrate sufficient permissions to meet its housing requirements?	Yes	Support this position but the presumption is wrong to start with because it allows for undue developer pressure.
19. Do you consider that the 115% 'switch-off' figure (required to turn off the presumption in favour of sustainable development Housing Delivery Test consequences) is appropriate?	Yes	Support this figure.
20. Do you have views on a robust method for counting deliverable homes permssioned for these purposes?	Yes	Viability studies are essential.
21. What are your views on the right approach to applying Housing Delivery Test consequences pending the 2022 results?	No comment	
22. Do you agree that the government should revise national planning policy to attach more Social Rent in planning policies and decisions? If yes, do you have any specific suggestions on the best mechanisms for doing this?	Yes	Yes but the government needs to define genuine affordability and move away from market based models.
23. Do you agree that we should amend existing paragraph 62 of the supply	No	This would be discriminatory against the housing need of other groups protected under the provisions of the Equality Act

specialist older peoples housing?

(2010). To focus on one group also has wider socio economic implications and impacts on the built environment.

This could be useful in villages and in rural areas if accompanied by tighter environmental and conservation guidance.

24. Do you have views on the effectiveness of the existing small sites policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (set out in paragraph 69 of the existing Framework)?

Yes

25. How, if at all, do you think the policy could be strengthened to encourage greater use of small sites, especially those that will deliver high levels of affordable housing?

Yes

The policy should prioritise brown field sites.

26. Should the definition of “affordable housing to rent” in the Framework glossary be amended to make it easier for organisations that are not Registered Providers – in particular, community-led developers and almshouses – to develop new affordable homes?

Yes

It is important to allow for housing coops and other community based approaches to be able to contribute to the provision of affordable homes.

27. Are there any changes that could be made to exception site policy that would make it easier for community groups to bring forward affordable housing?

No.

Please see below.

28. Is there anything else that you think would help community groups in delivering affordable housing on exception sites?

Yes

Affordable needs to interact with a wide range of cooperative, collective and community based living alternatives.

29. Is there anything else national planning policy should do to support community-led developments?

Yes.

Lower land costs through the use of compulsory purchase.

30. Do you agree in principle that an applicant’s past behaviour should be taken into account into decision making?

Yes.

The Community Planning Alliance has identified planning practices all over the England and Wales where local authorities are seen to work

behind closed doors with development interests. This is not acceptable and damaging to public confidence. Development interests must be held accountable for their actions and approaches.

31. Of the two options above, what would be the most effective mechanism? Are there any alternative mechanisms?

Both options used together.

Any development that has a direct impact on the community needs to be exempt from the legal case of commercial confidentiality. Both options could be used together to allow local authorities to fail to determine an application and to allow the community to promote behaviour as a material factor in the instance that a local authority has failed to take appropriate action over poor developer behaviour.

32. Do you agree that the build out policy measures that we propose to introduce through policy will help incentivise developers to build out more quickly? Do you have any comments on the design of these policy measures?

No

The issue is not build out speed as much as land banking. The policy needs to bring forward measures to prevent land banking.

33. Do you agree with making changes to emphasise the role of beauty and place making in strategic policies and to further encourage well-designed and beautiful development?

Oppose

A collective aesthetic is not possible. For purposes of sustainable development through the use of renewable technologies some development will never achieve this objective. It would be more useful to look at how conservation objectives could be strengthened.

34. Do you agree to the proposed changes to the title of Chapter 12 existing paragraphs 84a and 124c to include the word 'beautiful' when referring to 'well-designed places', to further encourage well-designed and beautiful development?

Oppose

Some places need to be functional.

35. Do you agree greater visual clarity on design

Yes

This is useful. Very often developers will try to make cost

requirements set out in planning conditions should be encouraged to support effective enforcement action?

savings by short cutting on agreed design issues.

36. Do you agree that a specific reference to mansard roofs in relation to upward extensions in Chapter 11, paragraph 122e of the existing framework is helpful in encouraging LPAs to consider these as a means of increasing densification/creation of new homes? If no, how else might we achieve this objective?

Yes.

This is to be supported where it does not distract from conservation issues. In many smaller or market towns mansard roofs were constructed in the first three decades of the 19th Century and contribute considerably to historic town scape. It is important not to detract from what already exists. Conservation zones should be respected and new conservation zones encouraged.

37. How do you think national policy on small scale nature interventions could be strengthened? For example, in relation to the use of artificial grass by developers in new developments?#

Yes

This is to be supported but consideration also needs to be given to wildlife corridors etc.

38. Do you agree that this is the right approach making sure that the food production value of high value farm land is adequately weighted in the planning process, in addition to current references in the Framework on best most versatile agricultural land?

Yes

Support the maintenance of productive farmland. Land should however also be considered for rewilding projects. Much land was taken in the 1940s for food production and has only been sustained as such by the excessive use of nutrients etc. Much of this land is not suitable for residential development and should be returned to as close as its natural state as practical through rewilding projects. Weighting should not therefore be just between agricultural value and residential build but should also take account of the potential environmental value of the land.

39. What method or measure could provide a proportionate and effective means of undertaking a carbon impact assessment that would incorporate all measurable carbon demand from plan-

No answer

Support the objective of a carbon measure but this would require much greater investigation to establish a best fit approach.

making and planning decisions?

40. Do you have a view on how planning policy could support climate change adaptation further, specifically through the use of nature-based solutions that provide multi-functional benefits?

Yes

Carbon sequestration through the provision of green places can also contribute to community well-being through allowing public access, landscape protection and ecological diversity. Support rewilding projects.

41. Do you agree with the changes proposed to Paragraph 155 of the existing National Planning Policy Framework?

No but potentially Yes if careful consideration is given to landscape, environmental and community considerations.

In many instances large scale industrial renewables were located in areas that had a devastating impact on local communities and landscape.

42. Do you agree with the changes proposed to Paragraph 158 of the existing National Planning Policy Framework?

No

The impacts have also to be acceptable to local residents. In some cases this may require compensation policies for property, relocation and disturbance. While this is not a planning matter at present the impact of industrialisation through large scale renewables has had a devastating impact on many rural communities.

43. Do you agree with the changes proposed to footnote 54 of the existing National Planning Policy Framework? Do you have any views on specific wording for new footnote 62?

No

This does not protect residents who will suffer the immediate impacts of developments. Renewable developers will normally consult within wider boundaries so as to produce a supportive evidence base by flooding it with responses from those not directly impacted by the development. For purposes of environmental justice developers should be compelled to work with and if necessary compensate those directly suffering negative or perceived negative consequences of development.

44. Do you agree with our proposed Paragraph 161 in the National Planning Policy Framework to give significant weight to proposals which allow the adaptation of

Yes

This is a valuable approach as long as it does not distract from the protection of heritage assets.

existing buildings to improve their energy performance?

45. Do you agree with the proposed timeline for finalising local plans, minerals and waste plans and spatial development strategies being prepared under the current system? If no, what alternative timeline would you propose?

No

This is unrealistic because because of the shortages in planning officers and other professionals in may local authorities and because of uncertainty about the date when this bill will be adopted into law.

46. Do you agree with the proposed transition arrangements for plans under the future system? If no, what alternative arrangements would you propose?

No

The timeline is too ambitious. It will potentially lead to rushed poor quality delivery.

47. Do you agree with the proposed timeline for preparing neighbourhood plan under the future system? If no, what alternative timeline would you propose?

No

Neighbourhood plans are dependent on delivery by volunteers and grant applications to further technical specifics. Neighbourhood plans are a vital part of the planning system offering the views of residents in a way that is more difficult in a local plan but delivery mechanisms do need serious resourcing. Without this on issues such as housing allocation assessments the approach could potentially be seen as 'setting up parishes and communities to fail'.

48. Do you agree with the proposed transitional arrangements for supplementary planning documents? If no, what alternative arrangements would you propose?

No

The new approach will require greater resourcing. A 30 month period after 30th June 2025 is to short. If an authority has fallen behind with a local plan it is likely because of a resource issue. A 30 month deadline is likely to be a period when a local authority therefore has resources tied up working towards the completion of its local plan. This could lead to bad planning with insufficient or inadequate policy coverage.

49. Do you agree with the suggested scope and principles for guiding

Disagree

Local planning authorities should be resourced and allowed the freedom to develop plans

National Development Management Policies?

applicable to their areas. This policy distracts from that approach. The question in part is about if a local planning authority is to be seen as representing local communities or carrying out the orders of central government.

50. What other principles, if any, do you believe should inform the scope of National Development Management Policies? Very little

Wherever practical policy should be developed at the local level.

51. Do you agree that selective additions should be considered for proposals to complement existing national policies for guiding decisions? No

As much policy as possible should be left to local authorities.

52. Are there any other issues which apply across all or most of England that you think should be considered as possible options for National Development Management Policies? Yes

Procedural rules and issues concerning equalities and other national legislation. National Development also needs to cover large infrastructure projects.

53. What, if any, planning policies do you think could be included in a new framework to help achieve the 12 levelling up missions in the Levelling Up White Paper? No view

No opinion.

54. How do you think that the framework could better support development that will drive economic growth and productivity in every part of the country, in support of the Levelling Up agenda? Oppose the Bill

Economic growth is not the objective in all parts of the country neither is it environmentally viable or desirable. The fundamental starting position of basing levelling up on economic growth is wrong.

55. Do you think that the government could go further in national policy, to increase development on brownfield land within city and town centres, with a view to facilitating gentle densification of our urban cores? Yes but opposed to it doing so.

Densification generally amounts to limiting access to personal space and especially green space. Highrise development was deemed to be failed policy in the 1970s. The case has not been adequately made to return to a policy that invariable means

a further cut in peoples standard of living.

56. Do you think that the government should bring forward proposals to update the framework as part of the next year's wider review to place more emphasis on making sure that women, girls and other vulnerable groups in society feel safe in our public spaces, including for example policies on lighting/street lighting? Yes

Equalities should be at the centre of all policy making but in the example given of women and girls including black and minority ethnic, disabled, transgender, intersex and sex workers. The policy must be inclusive of all women and girls whilst reflecting a diversity of needs. Need should be established through local consultation. A good starting point for a genuinely inclusive approach would be Leslie Kern (2020) Feminist City: claiming space in a man made world, Verso, London. Consideration needs to be given to all other groups protected by the Equality Act (2010) and the intersections between them that can lead to multiple disadvantage.

57. Are there any specific approaches or examples of best practice which you think we should consider to improve the way that national planning policy is presented and accessed? No

Obviously all policy should include full consultation.

58. We continue to keep the impact of these proposals under review and would be grateful for your comments on any potential impacts that might arise under the Public Sector Equality Duty as a result of the proposals in this document. Noted

This is a wider question. The proposals require a full Equality Impact Assessment. All too often this is done as a tick box approach.