

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW STEERING GROUP (NPRSG)

MINUTES OF MEETING ON MONDAY 2nd NOVEMBER 2020

By Zoom due to Coronavirus

IN ATTENDANCE:

Parish Council

Lucy Bartley (LB), Louise Davies (LD), Andrew Jackson (AJ), Steve Rollinson (SR)

Community Member

Sheena Overington (SO)

As Chair, SO opened the meeting at 7.00 pm.

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. **Apologies:** Received from Keith Charman, Community Member.
2. **Declaration of Interests:** There was no change to the interests previously declared and recorded.
3. **Minutes of the Last Meeting:** The minutes of the meeting held on 5th October 2020 were approved as an accurate record.
4. **Local Plan Review Update:**
As Toby Ayling at CDC had not responded to LD's email about the housing allocation number, SO had sent a stronger email, which generated the following response "We are progressing the Plan and intend to have a discussion with Members about a potential distribution of development shortly. My intention is to write to all parish councils following that discussion to update everyone on progress."
Yet another delay was met with dissatisfaction.

Details of the 2020 Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) had been reviewed by all. The implications for the village and northern district were briefly discussed; the figures were concerning and would irrevocably change the character of the village. The group questioned where all the people would be coming from and whether there was a market for all the housing, especially with the development in the Horsham and Waverley areas.
5. **Developer Contact:**
 - a. **Stable Field Developer:** The developer had submitted a further request to the Parish Council; he was advised that the Parish Council's position had not changed.
 - b. **Paddock Farm Field:** SR advised that he had been contacted by the business partner of the developer acting for the landowner. He wanted to find out what was going on. The feedback from him was that NP Group had been obstructive and cooperation was not good. SR had provided a brief update and confirmed that the

Group was waiting for a clear understanding that access was achievable; other developers had provided information that was required. SO advised that she had also been contacted by the landowner for an update; SO advised that he should be in communication with his agent. She provided a limited update but confirmed that a vigorous process had been applied to all site accesses. The Parish Council had engaged a traffic consultant to ensure that all sites accesses were achievable and the only site that was questionable was Paddock Farm Field. It was noted that when the site was originally promoted by the landowner, the access was through Balchins Close. This access was assessed by AECOM and it was just before the September 2019 consultation that the access was changed. The NP Group had accommodated this last-minute change but as concerns over the access had been raised, engaged the traffic consultant. The developer had been given a whole year to obtain the required information.

6. Site Selection:

- a. Paddock Farm Field Access: A full report had now been received from the developer. Although WSCC Highways indicated that access was possible, CDC had raised concerns, particularly the impact on the Listed buildings in the Conservation Area; access constraints had also been identified on the HELAA. It was noted that WSCC Highways was a consultee and CDC would make planning decisions. SR had also heard that the owner of the Balchins Close access would not permit its use. Although it would be beneficial to have a site that was out of sight, it was only achievable through the Coed Afal access. It was agreed that the site should be included for the SEA and HRA and the outcome then discussed when the housing number had been confirmed.
- b. Site Selection Report (V1): Individual site details circulated. SEA and HRA details to be added when available. Approved by all.
- c. SEA and HRA: LD had contacted AECOM to provide an update and to ascertain if the process could be resumed on the 5 sites with indicative numbers albeit that CDC had not confirmed the housing allocation. For the SEA, this was certainly possible although the process required reasonable alternatives or different ways of delivering the housing numbers. It was agreed to proceed but without confirmation of the housing numbers, if was not know which sites or if all sites would be required. As Anells Yard had also been identified on the HELAA, to be included. To be guided by AECOM:

WG19-3: Tanglewood 6 or 12

WG19-4: Stable Field 10 or 12

WG19-5: Winterfold 6

WG19-7: Paddock Farm Field 10

WG19-8: Glebe Field 10 or 18 (25 discounted by consultation)

WG19-2: Anells Yard – identified on the HELAA and maybe required to meet housing number

- d. Public Consultation: LD had circulated details of the recent Loxwood consultation and posed the question as to whether a further 'paper' consultation was required. This would provide an opportunity to highlight changes, ie, increase in numbers at Tanglewood, possible inclusion of Ansell's Yard, and ensure that the process was totally transparent.

The merits of a further consultation were discussed. There were mixed views as to whether it was duplicating the previous consultation and whether the information already obtained provided sufficient steer for the Parish Council to make the final decision. However, circulating a questionnaire would provide an opportunity to provide site updates to avoid the previous criticism. It was agreed that when CDC confirmed the number, a decision on how to proceed would need to be made quickly, and as such, the paperwork to be prepared in case a consultation was required. By drafting, it would help to determine if a consultation were necessary or whether there was sufficient evidence for a Parish Council decision. The following were agreed:

- Require name and address to avoid duplications and ensure a reasonable spectrum of the village was represented.
- Write in a way that the results inform the process to set the proposals which would be for the Regulation 14 consultation and referendum.
- Use previous consultation questionnaire and Loxwood's example as the starting points. Craft carefully to receive confirmation based on what the village has decided before.
- Provide guidance and expose considerations for each site (as September consultation)
- Potential solutions to meet housing number rather than ranking individual sites.
- As Ansell's Yard had been identified on the HELAA, to be included if the housing number warranted. It was preferable to include a brownfield site and was primarily excluded previously due to the distance from the village and loss of employment opportunity. CDC had not been enthusiastic due to distance from the village. A pavement sharing opportunity could be provided.
- If a consultation were undertaken, previous consultation results and reports would be published on the village website. Consideration would need to be given to providing hard copies in the village hall, Covid-19 regulations permitting.
- Wharf Farm had been identified on the HELAA as potential for Business/Employment use. It was one of two primary commercial areas, with the main area being at Newpound. It was noted that The Wharf had expanded in recent years and it was unanimously agreed that Policy ED3: Site Specific Policy – Commercial Areas at Newpound, to be updated to include The Wharf. In view of The Wharf's rural location, light pollution to be considered. To be included in consultation.

SO/LB to draft, with input from SR, and circulation to group to check accuracy, that questions would glean the required information and no omissions. **Action: SO/LB/SR**

7. **Local Green Gaps:**
 - a. **Local Validation:** AECOM had acknowledged receipt, but no further update provided.

8. **Drafting Revised Document:** Work in progress. **Action: LD**

9. **Any Other Business:**
 - a. SO advised that she had a long discussion about the Planning White Paper and the implications for Neighbourhood Planning with Dave Chapman, Locality Advisor. There had been much opposition with a feeling that it should never have been published in this form. The details were displayed; to be circulated. **Action: LD**

 - b. **Next Ad Vincula Article:** SO to prepare an article; update on CDC lack of response and positive news from Dave Chapman's response. **Action: SO**

8. **Date of Next Meeting:**
Monday 7th December 2020 at 7.00 pm, by Zoom.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 7.46 pm.