

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW STEERING GROUP (NPRSG)

MINUTES OF MEETING MONDAY 4TH JUNE 2019

IN ATTENDANCE: Parish Council
Sheena Overington (SO), Louise Davies (LD)

Community Members
Keith Charman (KC), Jill Sutcliffe (JS)

SO opened the meeting at 7.00 pm.

1. **Apologies:** Apologies received from Andrew Jackson and Steve Rollinson. It was noted that due to pressure of work and family life, Mona Johansson had stepped down from the steering group.
2. **Declaration of Interests:** There was no change in the interests previously declared and recorded.
3. **Minutes of the Last Meeting:** The minutes of the last meeting held on Tuesday 7th May 2019 were approved as a true record.
4. **Timetable Update:** The delay with the Local Plan Review had ramifications for the NP review. CDC had confirmed that the date for the Regulation 14 consultation could now be later but had given no definite date; LD would pursue. SO had revised the NP review timetable as the June consultation had been postponed but there was a danger that the process could still falter. She again expressed her concern that the delay and lack of information from CDC could undermine the credibility of the NP Review process. LD had reviewed Local Plan consultation responses and there had been much opposition from Loxwood. **Action: LD**
5. **Chichester District Council Support:** Although there had been extremely good support for the NP's preparation, unfortunately it appeared that CDC was unable to offer the same level of support; no dedicated NP officer in place, inexperienced staff and it appeared, staff shortages. JS quoted that in the NPPF Guidance, paragraph 021, it stated that District Councils should offer support. SO to consider writing to Nick Herbert, MP and CDC at some future point. **Action: SO**
6. **Locality Grant Funding Application:** LD confirmed that this had now been processed and a payment of £7412.00 made to the Parish Council. This covered validation of site assessment by Sally Chapman, the questionnaire circulation and analysis by AirS and the majority of consultation costs to include Regulation 14. Thanks extended to LD for submitting the application quickly.

7. Site Selection:

- a. Site Assessments: The methodology and assessment sheet had been validated by Sally Chapman, independent external consultant. SO/KC had initially assessed 2 of the 15 sites to check the process and the group had assessed 5 further sites on 22nd May. Two more dates had been arranged – Tuesday 11th and Tuesday 18th June, meeting at the Village Hall car park at 6 pm.

CDC had been unable to provide an up-to-date HELAA, but had provided LD with contact emails to make direct contact; an email was sent with the Parish Council's 'Call for Sites' form. Unfortunately, some of this information had included 'old' emails and related to sites already in the NP! It was, however, possible to link some contact details with sites already known, resulting in 15 sites to be assessed; all contacts were accounted for. KC had been provided with the most up to date list with revised numbering system. KC agreed to follow up with 2 sites in relation to access and future plans; details were provided.

LD had updated Sally Chapman who confirmed that she was able to undertake her validation of the consultation results in October.

- b. Locality Technical Support: The up-to-date information for the 15 sites had now been sent to AECOM. An independent assessment would be undertaken with a site visit in June and a draft copy of the report provided by the end of July; Locality had set the completion deadline as 22nd August 2019.
- c. Housing Needs Survey/Affordable Housing: CDC had previously advised that the survey results were with 'management' for checking. A further email had now been sent requesting the report and if necessary, details of the management to approach. The survey had been completed last autumn and the information was important to understand the affordable housing need particularly as some Great Meadow housing had not been allocated to Wisborough Green residents.

8. Public Consultation:

- a. Arrangements: The Village Hall and display boards had now been booked for Friday 27th and Saturday 28th September; these dates had been confirmed by the group by email. The format of the displays had been prepared and would be updated when site assessment information was known.
- b. Publicity: To be confirmed at the next meeting. **Action: LD**

9. Community Questionnaire:

- a. Arrangements with AirS and timing: Funding was now available to proceed. LD had emailed AirS to ascertain availability but no response to date. Although information relating to sites could be added to the consultation response questionnaire, it was important that this questionnaire was used to capture all other details and the evidence to support policy updates. The circulation of the

questionnaire did not need to link with the consultation event and could be circulated after further policy technical support had been received. This support might help to define questions or identify further questions that need to be asked. It was agreed to wait for AirS response and consider timing at the next meeting when hopefully more information about the technical support package was available.

- b. Questionnaire: A draft questionnaire had been circulated, although layout and response sections would need to be added. Minor layout changes and responses were required, but no further questions identified at this stage.

10. **Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)**: LD had submitted an application to CDC to assess the SEA need, which had to be submitted with the Locality technical support application. In order to progress the technical support, a response was required from CDC; the following was subsequently received:

‘Neighbourhood Plans must meet certain Basic Conditions, including the requirement that the making of the plan “does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.” To ensure compliance with this and other relevant legislation, Chichester District Council is likely to take a uniform approach to screening and require all Neighbourhood Development Plans allocating sites for housing development to undertake an SEA.

This is on the basis it is anticipated that your neighbourhood plan will need mitigation in order to fulfil the terms of the Habitats Regulations Assessment and in that respect an Appropriate Assessment will be required to be undertaken by Chichester District Council (CDC) of your neighbourhood plan at the pre submission stage, in the light of the Sweetman judgement in 2018. It is therefore advised that in all likelihood Strategic Environmental Assessment work will be required from the start of your neighbourhood plan process.’

The technical support application was now in the system and hopefully being progressed.

11. **Policy Review and NP Amendments**: SO/LD had marked up an NP and identified where updates or new pages were required.

In terms of policies, new drafts had been prepared but further advice was required. An application to Locality had been made for policy development technical support, and initial contact by AECOM had been made. Unfortunately, timescale was currently unknown.

Dave Chapman, Locality and CLT advisor, had also provided a link to a useful ‘made’ NP <https://www.babergh.gov.uk/planning/neighbourhood-planning/neighbourhood-planning-in-babergh/east-bergholt-neighbourhood-plan/>

It included reference to CLTs which provided the link to the CLT being established in the village, the economic development and expansion of existing business was a good policy and the biodiversity policy was potentially relevant for WG. It was agreed that this should be reviewed further and ideas potentially incorporated. **Action: SO**

JS advised that she was collating the evidence which linked NP policy to the CDC and SDNP Local Plans. She had also contacted the Sussex Wildlife Trust in relation to

assessment of wildlife corridors and local wildlife areas which potentially provided evidence for stronger justification to support green infrastructure. She highlighted climate change and monitoring may also need to be considered. JS/SO to consider biodiversity policy further.

Action: SO/JS

JS was aware that the SDNPA did have a Neighbourhood Planning Officer who might be able to offer some guidance; JS to contact.

Action: JS

12. **Any Other Business:**

a. Ad Vincula Article: An article about affordable housing had already been drafted and Mona had agreed to add further details to give explanation to the allocation process. LD to follow up with Mona.

Action: LD

b. Meeting with Developers: As it was likely that meetings with developers would be required at some point, LD suggested that a policy giving basic guidelines should be adopted. She proposed to prepare for the Parish Council and suggested that these guidelines also be used by the NP Review Group; agreed.

Action: LD

c. Baseline Assessment of Green Gaps: SO/JS had undertaken an initial assessment of the Gaps; SO to write up notes. To consider including an aerial view in the NP to highlight the green space around the village.

d. Oil & Gas Exploration: Although not related to the NP Review, JS advised that UCOG had applied for an exploratory licence to drill at Dunsfold (referred to as Loxwood). She believed that they were also looking for a further site half way between there and Broadford Bridge which put Wisborough Green at risk.

e. Boxal Bridge: JS advised that she was seeking further heritage advice. LD confirmed that WSCC had made no further mention or contact.

11. **Date of Next Meeting:** Monday 1st July 2019 at 7.00 pm in the Vine Room at the Village Hall.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 7.55 pm.