

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW STEERING GROUP (NPRSG)

MINUTES OF MEETING MONDAY 26th NOVEMBER 2018

IN ATTENDANCE: Parish Council

Keith Charman (KC), Louise Davies (LD), Andrew Jackson (AJ),
Sheena Overington (SO)

Community Members

Mona Johansson (MJ), Steve Rollinson (SR), Jill Sutcliffe (JS)

Action

The meeting opened at 7.00 pm. Introductions were made and GDPR forms completed.

1. **Apologies:** All in attendance. Mike King and Katy Fletcher were no longer able to help due to a change in personal circumstances.
2. **Appointment of Chair and Deputy Chair:** Having been involved in the initial Neighbourhood Plan process, SO indicated her willingness to lead and Chair the review. Being a Parish Councillor, KC suggested that the Deputy should perhaps be a community member. JS, having been involved previously, offered her help. All unanimously agreed to the appointments.
3. **Declaration of Interests:** A large map was displayed; members provided details of their home location and other interests as listed below:
Keith Charman: Lived in Newpound Lane. No other interests to declare and no friendships associated with potential development.
He worked part-time as an agronomist advising on the science of growing crops, had been on the Parish Council for 11 years and was involved in the first Neighbourhood Plan process.
Louise Davies - Lived at Nine Acres, Newpound Lane but her family also owned Three Lanes End Farmhouse and surrounding land. They owned the field next to Clark's Yard and rented the Glebe Fields from the Diocese of Chichester. She had no friendships associated with potential development.
She was the Parish Clerk and had been involved in the first Neighbourhood Plan process.
Andrew Jackson – Lived in Newpound Lane opposite the Glebe Fields. No other interests to declare and no friendships associated with potential development.
AJ was employed by a global company which was involved in connecting software systems to manage domestic and commercial buildings. He had been a member of the Parish Council for over 25 years, had been involved in the first Neighbourhood Plan process and was currently the Chairman of the Parish Council's Planning Committee.
Mona Johansson – Lived in Thornton Meadow. Worked as a Development Project Manager for Saxon Weald Housing Association. Saxon Weald had no housing stock in the Chichester District and to the best of her knowledge, had no plans in expand into Wisborough Green so unlikely to make offers on affordable units on S106 sites. She had no friendships associated with potential development.

Sheena Overington – Lived in Newpound Lane. She had no friendships associated with potential development or other interests to declare.

She had been a Parish Councillor since May 2011 and was involved in the first Neighbourhood Plan process.

Jill Sutcliffe - Lived at Ingrams Farm, Fittleworth Road. Family members owned some surrounding fields; identified on the map. No other interests to declare and no friendships associated with potential development.

Her background was as an environmentalist and through her involvement with Keep Kirdford and Wisborough Green, she was now more up to date with environmental policy and was aware of possible weaknesses in CDC and WSCC policy.

Steve Rollinson – Lived in Thornton Cottage opposite the village shop. He had a close friendship with Michael Gadd, who had a site within Wisborough Green, and due to the nature of his work, also knew a number of local developers but was unaware if they had Wisborough Green interests. He had no other interests to declare.

He had been involved in the construction industry for his working life, originally selling products to the sector but now provided recruitment services, primarily for senior personnel, and also advised on talent acquisition.

4. **Terms of Reference:** Adopted by the Parish Council on 16th October 2018 and circulated to all in advance of the meeting. The Review Group formally adopted and agreed to work within the terms.

5. **CDC Local Plan: Preferred Approach:**

- a. **Update:** Details of the document had just been published on the CDC website and would be on consultation from 13th December until 7th February 2019. It indicated that the north-east parishes had been allocated 150 houses; 25 in Wisborough Green and 125 in Loxwood. At the last Parish Council meeting, District Councillor, Josef Ransley, raised his concern at the division and that no further housing had been allocated to either Kirdford or Plaistow and Ifold. As Plaistow did not have a Settlement Boundary, it was considered in the rural area and therefore not allocated housing. The implications of the consultation were discussed. Many in Loxwood were upset by the allocation but it was unknown if consultation responses would influence this decision. The decision to allocate in this way was unknown but was possibly related to the identification of sites and the new provision of a larger shop as well as the school and doctors' surgery.

KC explained that the Parish Council would need to respond to this consultation but it put parishes in a difficult situation. Historically the four parishes had worked collaborative on issues of critical importance, but this consultation potentially put parishes at odds.

SO explained that Mr Ransley had also suggested that perhaps a new settlement could be created. Adding additional housing to existing settlements started to change the character and nature of a village, and the creation of a new settlement would prevent this change, however, a location would need to be identified.

JS highlighted the development in the Horsham District, particularly in Billingshurst, and the implications for the NE parishes. With the South Downs National Park (SDNP) isolating the Chichester District Parishes in the north-east, it

perhaps created vulnerability and indicated a need to emphasise in policies that the parish was in the 'setting of' the SDNP.

- b. Any Other Implications: Site sustainability and the use of brownfield sites at Newpound were briefly discussed. It was felt that sustainability criteria, despite being unsuitable for rural communities, were unlikely to have changed but LD to enquire from CDC and Lisa Jackson, the consultant engaged to help with the previous NP process.

LD

6. **Objective Review:** MJ had provided some thoughts which SO read out and were discussed. It was noted that the Parish Council has also completed a NP monitoring report, which had been circulated in advance of the meeting.

- a. **Identifying Strengths:** The NP has demonstrably served the village well, examples being:
- Jones Homes had to review their initial designs as these were not in keeping with local vernacular as set out in NP and Village Design Statement.
 - CDC refusal, and Inspector not allowing appeal on field off Kirdford Road as not in keeping with NP.
 - Two brownfield sites included as development sites, so in keeping with community preference for brownfield.
- Great community engagement and communication of the Plan.

- b. **Identifying Weaknesses:** Possibly public perception of development occurring on Greenfield land, despite stated preference for brownfield. For residents that don't engage with the planning process, how well do they understand why Winterfold was included at a late stage, and how Greenways is included.

AJ highlighted that prior to the preparation of the NP, CDC advised that Settlement Boundaries could be stretched to incorporate a site, but a settlement area could not be increased by creating islands/pockets of development. The NP had allowed this to happen (Clark's Yard) but incorporating Newpound was potentially still unacceptable. Increasing the 5 minute isochrones or including Newpound would in effect open up Ansell's Yard, Kirdford Road. Greenways and the implications of the non-sale of caravans was briefly discussed.

- c. **Identifying Opportunities:** Depending on results of village housing needs survey and progress of the Community Land Trust, Review Housing Policies accordingly to serve objectives? Engage community on any issues that have emerged since 2016 and to incorporate new policy / action in Community Action Plan?

In terms of the CLT, although it was an aspiration to establish the CLT, there were a number of challenges in relation to the S106 housing. SO advised that Greenoak would be taking on the Jones Homes properties hopefully using the housing allocation policy prepared by the CLT. Although applications would also need to register with CDC, it was hoped that the local allocation policy would be used rather than CDC banding which restricted access. The Parish Council had

previously entered into an agreement with Greenoak to try to ensure that housing was provided to those with a local connection and need. It was currently not known if Greenoak would take on the Runnymede Homes. The Housing Needs Assessment, which had recently been sent to all village households by the CLT, would hopefully help to inform the NP Review. If there was no need, over and above what was currently being provided, it could have implications for the size of further development sites.

The NP review did provide the opportunity to update the Community Action Plan as a number of the aspirations had been achieved. Since the original consultation, services and situations had changed and it was important to get this community feedback.

- d. **Identifying Threats:** Review of CDC Housing Numbers during period. Public cynicism with process making engagement difficult. Change in government / priorities during period (such as CDC's current support for CLT's). Greenways – what is going on as there appears to be little interest in the properties. Also HEELA's assessment of land east of St Peter's Church doesn't mention the NP Local Gaps Policy as that policy would make the development of the corner next to Newpound Lane/the school extremely difficult but the assessment mentions impact of development on designated heritage assets only.

The field east of the church had originally been considered as a possible site for a small number of houses with access via Glebe Way. An Environmental Impact Assessment was undertaken which raised concerns about the impact on the church. The Winterfold site was subsequently offered for development; it had previously been identified as a potential site.

- e. **Site Identification:** One site had been identified on the HELAA published by CDC – Glebe Fields. The Parish Council had also received details of two further sites that had been put forward to CDC; details were provided and displayed. AJ highlighted that site selection was the most controversial element of the NP and on occasion, information would be provided to the group that was not necessarily in the public domain and could have an impact upon some households. He therefore asked all to be mindful, that on occasion, information would be confidential to the meeting prior to public consultation.

It was agreed that consultant advice would be required to assist with site selection to ensure that site assessment and proposals had independent consultant validation.

In terms of consultation, it was agreed that careful thought would need to be given to how the consultation was conducted to obtain the required information. Although a previous consultation had been highlighted as a good example of community engagement, there were elements that could have been improved by simplifying. It had been evident that people sometimes did not understand the question intent especially in relation to site selection.

- f. **How can we best use this review to benefit WG and link into support /promote current issues/needs/status and projects?**
 Outcome of village Housing Need Survey – possibly a new policy required.
 Inclusion of Wisborough Green Trust (CLT) MJ
- Agreed Action:**
- All to read current Neighbourhood Plan and identify areas of review. ALL
 - **Site Assessment:** AJ, KC and SR to meet to discuss approach, community engagement and consultant help required. AJ/KC/SR
 - **Policies:** SO, MJ and LD to meet to review monitoring reports and consider policy amendment/inclusion and consultant help required. SO/MJ/LD
 - JS would consider Environmental information/climate change and transport (high volume, industrial transport). JS
 - JS to prepare a reference list of relevant environmental documents and policies. JS
 - MJ to undertake some research and contact rural housing/CLT contacts to ascertain if/how information is incorporated into NP. MR
7. **Review Process Timescale:** SO/LD to review CDC's timeline and prepare a suggested timeline for the consultation process. SO/LD
8. **Consultant Help:** All agreed that help would be required, particularly for site selection, policy writing and plan validation. LD had already spoken to Lisa Jackson who helped previously. Although she was quite busy and was moving away from NPs, she did seem interested in helping. Support packages were also available from Locality – more than was offered previously. SO to review. SO
9. **Funding:** Potentially up to £17,000 was available through Locality, however, they advised that support packages were used so that this fund could be primarily used for public consultation and printing costs. Although LD had submitted an expression of interest, it was unlikely that an application could be made until consultation details and anticipated costs had been confirmed; an early application was required to secure funding before April. Application to be prepared when timeline/consultation details confirmed. SO/LD
10. **Any Other Business:** None.
11. **Date of Next Meeting:** The two groups to make independent plans to meet. Although a daytime meeting was suitable for some, it was agreed that future meetings should be held on a Monday evening at 7 pm. Date of next meeting to be circulated.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.50 pm.