

## NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW STEERING GROUP (NPRSG)

### MINUTES OF MEETING MONDAY 4<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2019

**IN ATTENDANCE:** **Parish Council**  
Sheena Overington (SO), Andrew Jackson (AJ), Steve Rollinson (SR)  
Louise Davies (LD)  
**Community Members**  
Keith Charman (KC)

SO opened the meeting at 7.00 pm.

1. **Apologies:** Apologies were received from MJ and JS.
2. **Declaration of Interests:** No change or additions to the interests previously declared on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2018, although KC and SO both advised that they knew of the developer promoting self-build.
3. **Minutes of the Last Meeting:** The minutes of the last meeting held on Monday 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019 were approved as a true record.
4. **Locality Funding and Technical Support Application:** LD advised that the Parish Council's application for grant funding, to cover a review of the site selection and allocation process by Chapman Planning, had been successful. An application had also been made for technical support to assist and validate the assessment process to take sites forward for public consultation. Having spoken to an advisor, this application was being progressed and would hopefully be confirmed shortly. LD had requested the support as soon as possible after the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2019 site submission closing date.
5. **Policy Review:** Unfortunately the planned meeting had been postponed due to illness. However, SO had continued to undertake research into wording and the evidence required to underpin a revised parking policy, the original policy having been removed from the NP by the examiner. The requirement for car ownership and the lack of public transport provided justification, but evidence was required. CDC had provided 2011 Census figures but this related to the district rather than parish; LD to circulate. Thought was given to how accurate car ownership details could be obtained and whether road observation was required; non-use of garages, street and pavement parking, other vehicles/caravans on driveways. It was noted that Parish Council minutes had also recorded concerns over the years. Having reviewed the Local Plan, AJ advised that there appeared to be a slight change in policy. He was aware that some counties discounted garages within calculations but believed that this was not WSCC policy. SR agreed to obtain developer criteria. **Action: SR**

In terms of new policies, SO believed that the only possibility related to Communication Infrastructure and the requirement of developers to provide fibre connections; SO provided details of an example policy. It was agreed that this should be investigated further. **Action: SO**

SO had reviewed the other policies removed by the examiner and believed that re-wording elsewhere had addressed. As reported at the last meeting, slight wording changes/updates would be required to:

OA2: Spatial Strategy

OA5: Local Gaps

EN2: Landscape Character and Open Views

EN4: Conserving and Enhancing the Heritage Environment

EN5: Local Green Space

IN3: Street Lighting

SO to arrange a further policy review meeting and prepare drafts for the next meeting.

**Action: SO**

## 6. **Site Selection:**

a. **Call for Sites:** LD had prepared a draft based upon the CDC form to inform the HELAA. The form was reviewed and simplified. LD noted changes and to amend accordingly.

**Action: LD**

b. **Site Assessment and Allocation Process:** A quotation from a consultant recommended by Lisa Jackson, who originally helped with the NP, had been circulated in advance of the meeting. Sally Chapman, of Chapman Planning, had quoted to undertake a desk based review of the NP site allocation process; review of background documentation, allocation process, Local Plan Review requirements, HELAA, current legislation and best practice. It was resolved to accept the quotation for £1575 which was covered by the Locality grant. In terms of site assessments, it was agreed that guidance on the assessment of 'amber' sites, as well as the rationale for choosing one site over another, was required. Site Selection group to consider if any other clarification was required.

**Action: KC/AJ/SR**

LD advised that the application for Locality Technical Support was being progressed. She had provided Locality with a telephone update on Friday and was informed that the advisor would be in contact shortly to arrange a date to visit the group and walk around the village to identify village characteristics; this had been requested as soon as possible after 31<sup>st</sup> March. He/she would then validate the site assessments and advise on the site selection process. Although not part of the support package, the advisor could potentially offer guidance on the best approach for public consultation.

c. **Site Assessment Approach:** It was agreed that:

- Site Selection Group to undertake assessments, with MJ, if possible, as she was not involved in the previous process, was a community member and had a good planning knowledge.
- For continuity, to keep traffic light system although form maybe updated by Sally Chapman.
- To only assess sites submitted for 'Call for Sites' plus those identified by the NP Review group as having potential; an approach to the landowner would need to be made.

**Action: KC/AJ/SR/?MJ**

- Assessments to be undertaken as soon as Sally Chapman's report had been received.
- It was noted that as the current development sites appeared to address the identified housing need, there was a possible opportunity to provide several smaller sites of 6 or more houses, as was the community's wish identified in the first NP consultations.
- The 'Call for Sites' had been included in the latest parish magazine. Notice to be included on the website and also the Parish Council noticeboards.  
**Action: LD**
- Flow chart to demonstrate process to be prepared.  
**Action: KC/AJ/SR**

7. **Public Consultation:**

- Site Selection:** Past consultation events were briefly discussed. From experience, it was agreed that the site selection process was difficult to explain and obtain clear community feedback. Potentially other evidence, in support of policy review, could be obtained through a questionnaire and policy changes could be included as part of the draft plan (Regulation 14) consultation. As such, it was agreed that the consultation should focus on site selection, and the event be held at the end of June, if possible. LD to enquire into the availability of the Village Hall for a Friday afternoon/evening and all day Saturday.  
**Action: LD**
- Questionnaire Consultation:** In view of time constraints, it was agreed that this questionnaire could not be circulated in time for feedback at a June consultation; however, it could be used as part of the event publicity and returned via the event. Research into questionnaire examples to be undertaken.  
**Action: SO/MJ/LD**

8. **Self-Build:** An email had been received from a Loxwood developer who was promoting self-build with local villages and CDC; details had been circulated. Although an interesting idea, which had been undertaken in the village previously, the recent Housing Need Survey demonstrated no current demand or interest in self-build in the village. It was agreed that the idea could not be pursued at this early stage of the review process, but information to be retained on file; developer to be advised.  
**Action: LD**

9. **Any Other Business:**

- Ad Vincula Articles:** it was agreed that SO would prepare a further article to keep the community updated (little and often!). To include reminder of Call for Sites, update on grant funding and technical support which provided independent validation of process.
- In her absence, MJ had provided comments on the agenda items. Circulated to all and noted with thanks.
- SO advised that the full Housing Need Survey report would be available shortly.

10. **Date of Next Meeting:** Monday 4<sup>th</sup> March 2019 at 7.00 pm in the Vine Room at the Village Hall.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.10 pm.