

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW STEERING GROUP (NPRSG)

MINUTES OF MEETING ON MONDAY 5TH OCTOBER 2020

By Zoom due to Coronavirus

IN ATTENDANCE:

Parish Council

Andrew Jackson (AJ), Sheena Overington (SO), Louise Davies (LD)

Community Members

Keith Charman (KC)

SO opened the meeting at 7.00 pm.

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. **Apologies:** Received from Steve Rollinson, Parish Councillor.
Apologies were received from Lucy Bartley, Parish Councillor, after the meeting.
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 September 2020 were approved as an accurate record.
4. **Local Plan Review Update:**
 - SO advised that CDC had adopted an Interim Planning Statement until the reviewed Local Plan had been adopted. Recent communication advised that the Council did not have a 5-year housing land supply and that Parishes would be notified of housing allocations in October.
 - CDC had circulated its technical response to the consultation regarding 'Changes to the Current Planning System', and on 22 September 2020, passed a formal resolution regarding the proposed changes to the standard methodology for housing need.
"This Council calls on the Government to withdraw its proposals, contained in its consultation on Changes to the Current Planning System, for altering the Standard Methodology for calculating housing delivery targets and raising the on-site Affordable Housing provision threshold, so that full consideration of the consequences of these proposals can be considered as part of its wider Planning for the Future White Paper.

In the interim, this Council calls on the Government to genuinely support local democracy by supporting rather than undermining the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan making processes, recognising and allowing for genuine

constraints upon development and making Ministerial interventions as required to enable meaningful community involvement and influence.”

- The SDNP Authority had also submitted concerns about the proposed changes.
- The Parish Council Chairman was attending briefings on the proposed changes and would report back. A question had been submitted for a SSALC meeting later this week, being held by a Petworth based planning consultant, Flo Churchill; In view of CDC Interim Planning Statement and proposed planning changes, what weight is now given to comments by Historic England or within a Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment? Will comments stop development? Are the latter reports now redundant? Her response: “In essence nothing changes as the Planning White Paper only signals the government’s intended direction of travel. There are a lot of stages a Bill has to go through before it becomes statute. Any comments from Historic England still have significant weight as does the need for SEA and HRA because we are still subject to those laws and regulations until such time as either the Planning Bill or other domestic legislation replaces current policy, guidance and regulation and statute. It should also be noted that an Interim Planning Statement from a Local Planning Authority cannot override current policy, guidance or statute. Comments, as long as they are about planning matters and or material considerations are (or should be) still taken into account until such time as the law changes and therefore can be taken into account when coming to a balanced decision. Whether or not comments are sufficient to warrant refusal of a planning application will depend on the materiality of the comment and the weight that the decision maker attaches to them. SEA and HRA reports are not redundant at the present time.”

5. **Developer Contact:**

- a. **Glebe Fields Developer:** Parish Council members met with a representative from the development company on 29th September 2020, in line with the Developer Engagement Policy. Brief explanation to the discussion was given.
- b. **Stable Field Developer:** The developer had requested a copy of the September Consultation Report and Terrafirma Green Gap report. Having sought legal advice, the Parish Council was entitled to withhold the information at this stage on the grounds set out in Regulation 12 (4) (d) of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, as the information formed part of a larger report which was currently incomplete and release of the information at this stage was not in the public interest. The Parish Council had since received a further request which indicated that the matter would be reported to the Information Commissioner. Further legal advice was being sought.
- c. **Tanglewood Nursery:** KC advised that he had been contacted informally, due to a work association, by the agent acting for the landowners. The agent telephoned to ask for background information, which KC advised that he was unable to provide as the NP Review process was ongoing. He also appeared to be interested in the Greenways Nursery Site; KC was able to discuss the history which was in the public domain. KC also confirmed that a pavement to the site was potentially important given CDC comments.

6. **Site Selection:**

- a. **Paddock Farm Access:** The agent had provided a copy of the WSCC Highways pre-application advice which had been circulated. It was agreed that the details did not include a plan of the proposed access, whether it was to be widened and any implications on Coed Afal, a Listed property. Having spoken to the agent, LD advised that she had raised the concern about the proposed access being between two Listed properties, in the Conservation Area, and whether the planning authority would permit, particularly if the wall (potentially Listed) had to be removed. Nothing further heard.

Being on the Parish Council in the early 1990s, AJ was aware that the land/access owner at the time had proposed a scheme for fishing ponds and a wildlife space, possibly in a semi commercial capacity. He could not recall if a planning application was submitted, but certainly there had been discussion relating to the suitability of the access. AJ believed that the idea had not be pursued due to the access. LD to undertake further research. **Action: LD**

AJ expressed concern that there was no plan included in the Highways advice and that the implications for the Listed building had not been addressed. It was agreed that the agent should be asked to provide this information to allow the site to be considered further; the information provided to date did not demonstrate that the site was achievable. **Action: SO/LD**

- b. **Site Selection Report (V1):** KC had circulated individual site reports based upon the assessment reports and in line with information provided in the Arundel Site Selection Report. It was important to ensure that the details were correct and that all members to have a thorough read to check accuracy.

It was agreed that Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) information to be included. LD to ascertain if the 2020 update was now available.

Action: LD

7. **Local Green Gaps:**

- a. **Local Validation:** Forms had been sent to 16 residents, with 14 assessments completed and returned. The summary chart had been circulated. It was agreed that a further meeting was required to complete the standardisation process and full Green Gap report to forward to AECOM for validation. All to review the document in advance. Agreed to meet on Zoom on Thursday 8th October at 7.30 pm. **Action: ALL**

8. **Policy Work:** The revised policies had been drafted in line with the community questionnaire and AECOM report. Reference would also be made to Loxwood's updated NP. For further discussion at a future meeting. **Action: SO/LD**

9. **Drafting Revised Document:** LD had now started to update the original NP. It was necessary to show changes to the original document but there did not appear to be a cross through option within Publisher. At the present time, new text was blue and red was to remove. AJ agreed to give advice. The new document was now set up, but LD would also review the new Loxwood document for insight. References and statistics needed to be updated and the new polices incorporated. **Action: LD/AJ**

10. **Any Other Business:**

- a. **SDNP Boundary:** Following the developer meeting, the Parish Council Chairman had asked why the whole parish had not been included in the SDNP. Unfortunately, this was before LD's and SO's time on the Parish Council, although both were aware that public consultation had occurred. At the time, the implications were unknown, but with the developer pressure in the area, in hindsight, it would have been beneficial for the village. It was agreed that SO should write, as the NP Lead, to ascertain if there would ever be an opportunity to review the SDNP boundary due to the difficulties experienced having two planning authorities. SO would draft the email and circulate before sending. **Action: SO**
- b. **Loxwood Reviewed NP:** Loxwood Parish Council has now commenced the Regulation 14 consultation; it could be a useful reference.
<https://www.loxwood-pc.gov.uk/neighbourhood-plan.html> **Action: ALL**
- c. **Next Ad Vincula Article:** LD attended a recent workshop which suggested that regular drip feeding of information was useful to keep a project in the forefront of people's minds. Although a slight repeat of last month, SO to prepare an article to advise that the Green Gap Assessment Report had now been completed and sent to AECOM for independent validation. **Action: LD**

8. **Date of Next Meeting:**

Thursday 8th October 2020 at 7.30 pm, by Zoom.

Monday 2nd November 2020 at 7.00 pm, by Zoom.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 7.50 pm.