

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW STEERING GROUP (NPRSG)

MINUTES OF MEETING ON MONDAY 4th JANUARY 2021

By Zoom due to Coronavirus

IN ATTENDANCE:

Parish Council

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

Community Member

Keith Charman (KC), Sheena Overington (SO)

As Chair, SO opened the meeting at 7.00 pm.

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. **Apologies:** Received from Steve Rollinson (SR) (Parish Council).
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 7th December 2020 were approved as an accurate record.
4. **Site Selection:**
 - a. **Site Consultation:** The Parish Council supported the Groups proposals at the December Parish Council meeting. As such, the consultation flyers were distributed in the January Parish magazine over the Christmas period; the first response was received on 24th December. A collection box had been placed in the village shop, the Parish Council post box was being regularly checked and emailing a photograph of the response form was also proving popular. About 60 responses had been received to date. Reminder posters and a notice on the village Facebook page would be displayed shortly. Although it was stated on the form that every eligible resident should complete a form, some had been submitted as 'Mr and Mrs'. It was agreed that this should be accepted as two responses. LD was also verifying parish addresses as one response had already been received from a Roundstreet Common resident; although the postal address was Wisborough Green, the residence was in Loxwood Parish.
Before the flyer was printed, SR had contacted Toby Ayling at CDC regarding the Government's announcement to adjust housing numbers. CDC had advised that the Government decision to revert to the original housing numbers would not change the allocation to Wisborough Green; a sentence of explanation had therefore been included on the flyer.

Communication distributed by a local Durban Road resident had been circulated in advance of the meeting. LD advised that she had also received two telephone calls from him and had given further explanation to the consultation process, as detailed in the flyer. He had recently moved into the property and was presumably unaware of the development possibility; it had been identified on the 2014 SHLAA. He was opposed to the development behind his property on Winterfold Garden and was trying to generate opposition. Two letters had been produced, the second correcting factual inaccuracies in the first communication, although it was noted that no reference to the inaccuracies had been made. SO expressed concern that, whilst the resident had every right to object and submit his comments, circulating miss information to influence opinion was damaging for the whole village. With the second communication, he had included a photocopy of the response form which could potentially cause some confusion. It was agreed by all that LD to draft an email from the Steering Group to give further explanation; such an approach could be potentially detrimental to the whole village. Neighbourhood Planning was a democratic process to allow residents and not developers or CDC to influence the village.

Action: LD/ALL

An email had been received from another resident whose property backed onto Winterfold Garden; circulated. Whilst the Group had sympathy for his situation, and sentiments, it was agreed that planning was not influenced by the personal details provided and that the implications made were inappropriate. The NPRSG and Parish Council were endeavouring to find the best solution for the whole village and other residents would be equally concerned about development proposals close to their home. Decisions would be made against criteria set by the Government and CDC. It was agreed that LD to draft a response and circulate for comment.

Action: LD/ALL

Now that the consultation was underway and a summary of the 2019 consultation in the public domain, it was agreed that the evidence should be published on the website. To include details of the evidence still outstanding (SEA/HRA) with an explanation that this could again influence the selection process. Any requests could be referred directly to the website.

Action: LD

- b. Developer Contact: The following meetings had been held involving members of the Parish Council and NP Steering Group, in line with the Developer Engagement Policy. Meeting minutes to remain confidential to the Parish Council and NPRSG.

29 Sept - Millwood Homes – Glebe Field: Meeting held at the request of the developer. It was implied that a planning application was being prepared.

8 Dec – Runnymede Homes – Winterfold Garden: Meeting held at the request of the developer. It was confirmed that plans were at an advanced stage for 8 houses and the access had changed. The Runnymede representative was unaware of the previous discussion with the landowner relating to the number, open space and garage donation; the minutes of the meeting with the landowner were subsequently emailed to Runnymede. All were incredibly disappointed at the

landowner's action but having established a good working relationship with Runnymede, it was felt that Runnymede would provide an appropriate scheme, considering the neighbours and paying attention to design details. It was acknowledged that being close to the Settlement Boundary and village centre, and having been identified by CDC as a suitable site since 2014, this site was vulnerable to development. However, it had been hoped that incorporating an open space would lessen the impact. It appeared that CDC was also influencing density and best land use. Having previously met with the landowner, KC was extremely annoyed by his retraction of his agreed intent. KC recalled highlighting that inclusion for development did not sit comfortably with him, and that reduced numbers and the green barrier had been included to lessen the impact. He was concerned that this was now lost without being given the knowledge or opportunity to challenge.

15 Dec – Runnymede Homes – Tanglewood Nursery: Meeting held at the request of the developer. Confirmation that the proposed number had increased.

16 Dec – Plotlife – Stable Field: Held at the request of the NPRSG. It had been brought to the attention of the NPRSG that a planning application was being prepared and as such, an indication to inform the consultation was required.

16 Dec - Ansell's Yard: The agent confirmed that the site could be included in the consultation, but the landowner was not interested in meeting at this time. Included based upon the HELAA.

5. **Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment:** The Parish Council had agreed the options for consideration and delegated the final submission to the NPRSG, however, suggesting that the maximum for Option 1 should be included. The AECOM submission had been circulated and was reviewed. Reference to Historic England comments included in Glebe Field. It was agreed that the document should be submitted with the site and village maps. **Action: LD**
6. **Drafting Revised Document:** The first draft had been circulated for consideration and checking; some spelling errors had already been highlighted by SO and corrected. All to read and provide comments to LD. For further consideration and confirmation:
 - Dark Sky and Parking Policies: SO advised that these policies had been an amalgamation of several examples, but required simplifying. **Action: SO/LD**
 - Individual Site Policies to be prepared; consultant help maybe required.
 - Settlement Boundary: As advised by CDC, to be reviewed. Boundary to include Great Meadow only as Songhurst Meadow was yet to be completed. Wording to be confirmed. Details of the CDC reference to Settlement Boundaries from CDC Key Policies 2013 was provided by SO; need to be mindful as the boundary is reviewed.
 - 5-minute Isochrone/Strategy: Would need further consideration and wording amended particularly if Tanglewood or Ansell's were to be included.

- Green Gap Delineation: It was agreed that the chart displayed, showing the new delineations to link with field boundaries with faded 'bow ties' to show the original allocations, to be included. It was felt that providing any gradual fading would introduce an element of ambiguity again.
- All to review and send comments to LD. **Action: ALL**

7. **Grant Funding:** The following was agreed after some discussion:

- A grant application to be submitted to Locality to cover the Regulation 14 consultation and consultant help.
- Approach to be made to consultant who assisted Loxwood; James Garside Planning sent an email introduction just before Christmas. The value of having a consultant who was familiar with the area and CDC policy was acknowledged. LD to contact and establish costs for grant. **Action: LD**
- Due to Covid restrictions, paper response Regulation 14 consultation to be organised when SEA and HRA process completed; expenditure before 31 March was required.
- Flyer to every household via the Ad Vincula. Full Revised Plan to be provided online with supporting evidence.
- Due to Covid restrictions, it would not be possible to provide 'loan' copies of the Revised Plan or hold a consultation event for those without online access. In relation to the policy changes, the new policies and proposed amendments had been included in the January 2020 survey with a high majority in support. For those without online access, it was felt that the opportunity to at least view the proposed sites was important. Information to be provided on the village notice boards.

8. **Any Other Business:**

- a. **Next Ad Vincula Article:** It was agreed that a combined article from the NPRSG and Parish Council to address the consultation process and criticism was appropriate. Changes and delays were as a result of other influences. The Parish Council was not promoting development, this was coming from national and district policy; the NPRSG was trying to do damage limitation. SO to draft for comment before forwarding to the Parish Council Chairman, who supported this action. To include reference to external pressures and influences and that evidence has been published. **Action: SO**

9. **Date of Next Meeting:**

Monday 1st February 2021 at 7.00 pm, by Zoom.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.19 pm.