

## NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW STEERING GROUP (NPRSG)

### MINUTES OF MEETING MONDAY 7<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2019

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Parish Council

Sheena Overington (SO), Andrew Jackson (AJ) (arrived at 7.30 pm)

Louise Davies (LD)

**Community Members**

Mona Johansson (MJ), Steve Rollinson (SR)

**APOLOGIES:** Keith Charman (KO) and Jill Sutcliffe (JS)

**Action**

SO opened the meeting at 7.00 pm.

1. **Apologies:** Apologies were received from KC and JS. LD advised that KC had recently resigned from the Parish Council but had kindly offered to continue on the NP Review as a Community Member. SR had applied to be co-opted onto the Council and if successful, would then continue as a Parish Council member.
2. **Declaration of Interests:** No change or additions to the interests previously declared on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2018.
3. **Minutes of the Last Meeting:** The minutes of the last meeting held on Monday 26<sup>th</sup> November 2018 were approved as a true record.
4. **Timeline:** A projected consultation timeline had been prepared by SO and LD and circulated to all. The dates linked with the Local Plan review timeline but as it was a working document, it would be updated as the process progressed. There were no further comments to add at this stage and was approved.
5. **Policy Review:** SO/MJ and LD met on 17<sup>th</sup> December to undertake an initial review; meeting notes had been circulated. SO had since reviewed the Stable Field Appeal Decision Notice and provided details of the inspector's comments which highlighted where current policies were perhaps a little ambiguous and could be strengthened with slight word changes:

**OA2: Spatial Strategy** - The inspector commented that (c) "Does not consolidate gaps" is slightly ambiguous and therefore requires clarity. The gaps work as the gateways to the village and ensure that the settlement does not sprawl along radial routes and impact on the wider countryside, therefore suggested wording to be added along the lines of "as these must be kept open to protect the village form".

**Action:** Re-write (c) to ensure both robust and clear. Also (e) change/re-write will to must.

**OA5: Local Gaps** – The inspector stated that the policy "provides a clear policy test as it seeks to protect what has been identified as an important feature of the village eg.

separation of outlying development from the central core. It is the presence of distinctive green gaps within the village, forming an important feature of the village's character, which underlies this policy approach."

There was an allegation of inconsistency, ie, the other criteria of the policy involved an inherent expectation of development within local gaps. The inspector considered that criteria (a) was clear policy – the application of these criteria within policy OA5 is a matter of planning judgement.

**Action:** Re-write to eliminate any possibility of inherent expectation of development within local gaps. This should include a more robust approach to Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) and Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Proposal (CAMP).

EN2: Landscape Character and Open Views – The inspector found the proposal to be in conflict/breach of this policy.

**Action:** First paragraph was clear but a rewrite of the second paragraph was required to give definition of "harm to an acceptable level" eg mitigation proposed on land within the applicant's control must demonstrate no harm etc.

EN4: Conserving and Enhancing the Heritage Environment – the inspector felt that this policy exceeded national policy (as did Local Plan Policy 47) because of its uses (on Heritage assets) conserve and enhance and no mention in either policy of weighing up the balance of public benefit against conserving heritage which the NPPF requires.

**Action:** Re-write to exclude use of 'enhance' and provide more clarity regarding the link between the Conservation Area/Heritage in both core and rural settings eg. Listed Building, Brooklands Farmhouse, is in a rural setting but its significance as a former farmhouse would be diminished. Review new wording for Local Plan Policy 47.

**Action:** In addition to the above and as noted by the policy review group, to also include:

- A parking policy for new developments (original policy removed by NP examiner)
- HO1 Housing Need Policy to be updated to reflect evidence from recent Housing Need Survey with the emphasis on smaller units. To give clarity to 'retirement/elderly design/usage etc, to remove ambiguity referred to in Stable Field appeal and also ambiguity with current policy in relation to Great Meadow and the developer's attempt to increase the size of 4 bed properties.
- EN5 - Local Green Space - Strengthen and include Songhurst Meadow.
- IN3 Street Lighting - Strengthen and change to Dark Skies as policy title instead of lighting.

6. **Site Selection:** SR, AJ and KC met for an initial meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> December. Discussion focused on the site selection process and whether this was sufficiently robust. Having not been involved in the previous process, SR agreed that there were benefits with the traffic light system. However he felt that the selection process needed to be more objective; in some of the amber areas it appeared to be a little subjective. It was the consensus of the group that consultant help was required to ensure that the method of site assessment and selection was robust and would stand up to scrutiny moving forward. It was important to obtain clear guidance as to whether the assessment sheet could be used again or required change. SO advised that she had been involved in the initial site selection process using a different assessment sheet; LD to provide details.

LD

In addition to funding, technical support packages were available from Locality and groups were encouraged to use this support and reserve funding for other costs. As a site assessment support package was available, LD to make further enquiries, particularly in relation to timescale, for discussion at the next meeting.

LD

7. **Housing Need Survey:** SO had now received a results summary; the full report would be forwarded by CDC shortly and circulated:

- A total of 136 households responded to the survey, equating to a 20% response rate. This is seen as statistically representative of the parish in-line with guidance from the rural housing network.
- 44 households indicated that they want/need to move within 5 years. 36 of these households stated that they would move within the parish.

The following is based off those households who wish to remain within the parish:

Size of property needed	
Size of property needed	Frequency
1 bedroom	18
2 bedroom	13
3 bedroom	3
4 bedroom	0
Did not answer	2
Total	36

- It is evident from the table above that the greatest need is for 1 and 2 bedroom properties

Type of property needed	
Property Type	Frequency
Flat/bedsit	8
House	23
Bungalow	3
Adapted/Sheltered Accommodation	0
Did not answer	2
Total	36

- The greatest demand is shown to be for houses.

Tenure Preference	
Tenure Type	Frequency
Open Market	13
Rent to Buy	4
Affordable Rent	8
Shared Ownership	3
Discounted Market Sale	2
Starter Home	4
Affordable Self-Build	0
Did not answer	2
Total	36

- There is a wide range of tenure preferences. The largest demand is for homes bought through the open market. However, there is an identified need for affordable housing within the parish, as evidenced above.
- The affordable rented tenure is the most preferred. However, other affordable tenures have been heavily considered as secondary tenure preferences.

All agreed that this was valuable information which supported the need for smaller housing in the village. It was noted that if demand for affordable housing was met by the current development sites and there was no further identified local need, it might provide an opportunity for smaller development sites that did not have the requirement to provide affordable housing (financial contribution to district affordable housing for 6-10 houses). Smaller sites had been a community preference in the first NP consultations but had not been achieved.

8. **Housing Allocation Policy:** This had now been prepared by the Community Land Trust (CLT) and was being considered by a CLT advisor and CDC. SO hoped that this allocation policy would supersede the current CDC Banding allocation, but this had yet to be confirmed. In terms of the current development sites, it appeared that Greenoak (the Parish Council's preferred housing provider) would be taking on the Great Meadow Homes. It had been hoped that the CLT would take on the Runnymede homes (Songhurst Meadow) but unfortunately Homes England funding was not available for S106 Housing which made the proposal unviable. Negotiations between Runnymede and Greenoak had been re-established but the outcome unknown. SO believed that the legal papers were now being drawn up to establish the CLT, albeit that there was no identified need at the present time.
  
9. **Any Other Business:**
  - a. **Local Plan Consultation Event:** CDC was holding an event in Wisborough Green Village Hall on Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> January, 3 pm until 8 pm. LD had publicised on the noticeboards and on the village Facebook page. SO was away and unable to attend. Being a Parish Council meeting day, LD's time would be limited, but it was agreed that a flyer should be produced to give explanation to the NP Review process in the hope that CDC officers would distribute.
  
  - b. **Ad Vincula Article:** SO agreed to prepare and circulate an article for inclusion in the next parish magazine; to be emailed to the editor by 14<sup>th</sup> January. To include explanation of NP review, headline results of the Housing Need survey, CLT Housing Allocation Policy and purpose, Parish Council call for sites (link to CDC call for sites to inform the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA).)
  
  - c. **Call for Sites:** As advised by CDC, the Parish Council could undertake its own call for sites to inform the NP Review process. It was agreed that this information should be included in the article (follow up in March) with a cut-off date at the end of March. Sites put forward after this date would only be considered if inclusion was deemed of benefit to the village. LD to adapt CDC's form and request that this be returned to the Parish Council with a map to identify the land. To include a note that information should also be provided to CDC. It was agreed that the inclusion of previously assessed sites would be considered further at the next meeting.

Nt Mtg

10. **Date of Next Meeting:** Monday 4<sup>th</sup> February 2018 at 7.00 pm in the Vine Room at the Village Hall.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.00 pm.