



## Buckhorn Weston and Kington Magna Parish Council

### Buckhorn Weston & Kington Magna Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of meeting held on Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> August @ 7:00 pm Buckhorn Weston Village Hall

Committee Room

Attendees: Linda Munster (LM) (Chair)  
Peter Townsley (PT)  
Richard McDougal (RM)  
John Westbrook (JW)  
Richard Smith (RS)  
Felicity Beck (FB)

Apologies: Lisa House (LH) Secretary

Serial		Action
1.	Apologies received from Lisa House (LH).	
2.	The minutes for the meeting held on the 14 <sup>th</sup> June were agreed and signed.	LM
3.	There were no matters arising from the previous minutes.	
4.	There were no declarations of interest.	
5.	Due to JS moving house there is a vacancy for Vice Chairman and LM proposed that PT be duly elected, PT agreed and the vote was unanimous. PT is now elected as Vice Chairman.	
6.	The draft Reg 14 Consultation report prepared by the consultant was discussed including items that the steering group were required to provide answers for. These were comments made by the people who responded to the questionnaire during the 6 week consultation period. Each comment was looked at and an answer provided. Comments raised were generally about why particular areas were either inside or outside of the settlement boundary. LM reiterated that the starting point to looking at a new settlement boundary was by using the 2003 Dorset Council boundary (that was removed in 2016) and looking to expand on it to allow for some small development to take place where possible. The Consultation report, when finalised, will be added to the Neighbourhood Plan and be submitted with the other documents at Reg 15 to	

	<p>Dorset Council, it will also be made available for the public to view on the PC website. All comments will be viewed by the council and the independent examiner. The steering group acknowledged that there might still be some confusion over the term “Neighbourhood Plan” and LM confirmed that it is also referred to as a “Neighbourhood Development Plan” (NDP) as it lays out what, if any, development can take place, where and what form of design it has to follow. It does not mean that if your property is not inside the settlement boundary you are not part of the community, the SB does not delineate the village boundary. This had been mentioned to some SG members as a concern. The purpose of the NP is also to protect how our villages look.</p> <p>RS commented on the response from Public Health England that “could a proportion of homes be protected for existing village residents that would be accessible to both young people and families”. FB responded that with the small amount, if any, of development we would not be in a position where we could reserve properties for villagers. RS felt that this would only be possible on a large development where the developer would have to allocate some of the housing to local people as part of the planning conditions, BW &amp; KM have not allocated any sites of a size where this would be possible but the SG acknowledged their comments. The SG acknowledged the positive nature of the responses from the community.</p>	
7.	<p>The SG discussed the timeline submitted by the Consultant and also the document provided by the planning officer on time taken to produce neighbourhood plans in Dorset. It was interesting to note that in Dorset the average time taken from designation of the area to the plan being ‘made’ was 4.87 years. RMc commented that Portland took 7.5 years and Cerne Valley almost 2 years. The consultant has advised that on current timelines we are looking at:</p> <p>Allow a month for Dorset to adjudicate on whether they think basic conditions are met following submission at Reg 15.</p> <p>Allow two months after that for the consultation that Dorset carries out and to appoint an Examiner.</p> <p>Allow a further two-three months for the Examination.</p> <p>Allow a further two-three months for the Referendum.</p> <p>Adding all this together would take us to roughly May 2024.</p> <p>It was discussed how much of the budget was left to finish the NP and that the SG was mindful on how the costs were going. LM pointed out that we have had the maximum grant available from the government and that we currently have around £1k left in funds. RMc has requested that we get a full breakdown of time spent and the projected time required to take the plan to submission, so that we can compare actual to forecast at each stage. LM has agreed to go back to the consultant to get clarity on the position and also to point out the urgency of submission bearing in mind the timeline involved.</p>	LM
8.	<p>RMc requested clarity on the subject of IOWA/LGS/IG. It was confirmed that with no NP land that was previously IOWA (important or open wooded area) was protected from development and with a NP this land is now designated either LGS/IG (local green space/important gap) and is also protected from development as is the conservation area.</p> <p>As the previous SB was removed there was no development allowed in either village, this was referred to as ‘Countryside’ but with a NP there could be limited development inside the SB as per the plan.</p> <p>Outside the SB this is still considered ‘Countryside’ and there will be no development.</p>	
9.	<p>The following dates were suggested for future meetings subject to being required: 11<sup>th</sup> October, 15<sup>th</sup> November &amp; 13<sup>th</sup> December 2023.</p>	

10.	There was no other business.	
11.	Date of the next meeting Wednesday 20 <sup>th</sup> September 2023	

Meeting closed: 20:53 hrs

These minutes are approved as a true reflection of the meeting:

Signed: .....