

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW STEERING GROUP (NPRSG)

MINUTES OF MEETING ON MONDAY 7th DECEMBER 2020

By Zoom due to Coronavirus

IN ATTENDANCE:

Parish Council

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

Community Member

Keith Charman (KC), Sheena Overington (SO)

As Chair, SO opened the meeting at 7.00 pm.

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. **Apologies:** All in attendance.
2. **Declaration of Interests:** There was no change to the interests previously declared and recorded. As site selection was being considered, LD reminded members of her farming interest in the Glebe Fields.
3. **Minutes of the Last Meeting:** The minutes of the meeting held on 2nd November 2020 were approved as an accurate record.
4. **Site Selection – Further Consultation:**

Housing Allocation Number: CDC had now confirmed the housing allocation in a letter dated 26th November 2020; circulated. The number had been increased from the indicative number of 25 to 40. It was acknowledged that in comparison with the other northern Parishes, the number could have been higher. Although the community indicated at the September 2019 consultation an overwhelming desire to challenge a further allocation, it was felt by the Steering Group that considering CDC's current position with no Local Plan in place, lack of 5-year housing land supply and with the Government proposing planning reforms, any further delay to the NP process could leave the village in an extremely vulnerable position. It was a significant increase but not substantial. With directives being pushed down from the government, a challenge was unlikely to be successful particularly as the allocation to the northern parishes had been shared. The Group therefore agreed that it was in the best interests of the village to accept the allocation and not delay the NP process.

It was agreed that this recommendation should be made to the Parish Council. Due to the urgent nature, it was hoped that an Extra-Ordinary Parish Council meeting could be called for next Tuesday, 15th December 2020, in place of the scheduled Planning Committee meeting. SO to attend.

Proposal: Parish Council to support this recommendation.

Further Consultation: SO advised that she had contacted Dave Chapman, Locality advisor, in regard to allocation and the specific issues, not least Tanglewood enlargement (not consulted on) and Ansells Yard included on the HELAA but not included in the September 2019 consultation event. He had difficulty in fully answering the questions. There were some issues which were common with other NP reviews, but there were specific issues relating to Wisborough Green. His advice was to undertake a consultation as there was potential for developer challenge if a developer lost out. He felt that there was sufficient data from previous consultations that it was legally possible and plausible to explain the changes and have a passive consultation; only respond if not in agreement. However, he advised seeking further advice from Mark and Nick at AECOM. Undertaking in this way reduced the analysis workload. Dave Chapman advised that the CDC Regulation 14 (6 week) consultation would identify any other issues. He advised that including Ansells Yard as a reserve site would be the easiest solution if a consultation was not undertaken.

Proposal: To undertake a further consultation.

SO had already circulated some possible words to give explanation to this decision. To re-draft and circulate for approval.

Action: SO/ALL

SEA and HRA: To complete the SEA and HRA process, reasonable alternatives would need to be considered. These options were discussed, and it was agreed that the following options and details be **presented to the Parish Council for consideration and agreement:**

Excluded Sites following September 2019 consultation: Farnagates Sites 1 & 2 received little support and therefore discounted for any further consideration.

Proposal: These 2 sites to be removed from the site selection process.

Positive Support at September 2019 Consultation: There was clear guidance which confirmed community support for Winterfold, and Stable Field and Tanglewood with a pavement. Not far beyond the original isochrone to the village centre, the sites could be developed in a logical order of priority from the village centre which created a shared footpath. If further housing were to be accommodated in Kirdford Road, potentially with the inclusion of Ansells Yard, a pavement would be required.

Proposal: Parish Council to acknowledge and support that a pavement on the Green would be required, and that development on Stable Field would reduce the Green Gap.

Ansells Yard: The site did feature in consultations for the original NP and had some merit, but it was the furthest site away from the village centre so the distance from the village and potential loss of employment had been considerations. It was therefore discounted for inclusion as the housing allocation could be met on other sites closer to the village. However, it was a brownfield site which was an identified preference. The site had now been identified on the CDC HELAA 2020 for 18 residential units and 3 business units (it was not included on the 2018 HELAA). For the NP Review, it was assessed as 'red' by AECOM and the local assessment due to pedestrian access to the

village. However, inclusion of Stable Field and Tanglewood could facilitate. The loss of the business units was also a negative. If the Parish Council chose to include in the strategy, the number of residential units could be reduced to ensure a fair proportion for business use to support the existing and any new local businesses. Perhaps there could be a way to provide subsidised workspaces to retain local businesses, like affordable housing? Potential to include a small green space/mini playground due to distance from the village. All would need to be discussed with the promoter. It was important to carefully consider the justification for inclusion which would need to be documented in the Site Selection Report.

Proposal: To include in consultation for residential and business use. Meeting to be arranged with promotor to confirm details.

Glebe Fields: It was acknowledged that not including this site could result in a challenge. When promoted at the consultation, the proposal for 25 dwellings on one site was dismissed. There was some support for 18 or 10 dwellings but the sensitivity of the site was acknowledged. There was potential for 10 but the rest of the site would need to be gifted to the community in perpetuity to prevent development spread. It was noted that Historic England had previously raised concerns about the use of this site and the impact upon the Church, which would be highlighted in the SEA process.

Proposal: To include in consultation for 10 dwellings.

Paddock Farm Field: Access concerns identified which were confirmed by an independent highways consultant engaged by the Parish Council. The promoter was requested to seek pre-app advice from WSCC and CDC. WSCC advised that the access was possible, but CDC raised a number of concerns relating to the site, not just access. The officer's consultation report conclusion was:

"The proposal constitutes a departure from the housing-supply-related planning policies of the Local Plan as it seeks the erection of dwellings outside of an existing settlement boundary. However, having regard to the Council's current housing land supply position it is accepted that, at the time of writing, the tilted balance set out at paragraph 11 of the NPPF applies to such proposals.

In view of the preceding assessment and having regard to the criteria set out in the IPS, it is considered that the harm arising from the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the relatively modest benefits resulting from it in terms of an increase to housing supply. Consequently, I consider it unlikely that a planning application comprising proposals along the lines set out in your enquiry would receive officer support."

The HELAA 2020 also dismissed other land using this access due to significant access constraints with other comments relating to the setting of the Conservation Area, Listed buildings, and lower land being in Flood Zone in 3b.

Proposal: To include in consultation; if favoured by the community, to be discussed further with CDC prior to final site selection.

Policy Amendments: LD highlighted that the wording would need to be reviewed for Policy OA2: Spatial Strategy, OA3: Settlement Boundary, OA5: Local Gaps as the inclusion of the Kirdford Road sites had a direct bearing.

Settlement Boundary: The planning consultant who assisted with the original NP advised that the boundary was not altered until a site had been developed.

Proposal: That the boundary be reviewed to incorporate Great Meadow as it had been developed. Songhurst Meadow not to be included as development was on-going. To be included in the next review.

Refer to development options. Need to give alternatives for SEA and HRA to make up allocation, prior to January 2021 consultation results.

Proposal: To keep the number of dwellings to a close as possible to 40, whilst acknowledging that following further discussion with promoters there could be a slight variance in the site allocations. Decision to be made by the Steering Group.

Site Number Order	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
WG19-2 Anells Yard	11 + at least 3 business & green space (Max. 18 + 3)	0	0
WG19-3 Tanglewood	11 (5 more than consultation)	11 (5 more than consultation)	11 (5 more than consultation)
WG19-4 Stable Field	10	11	11
WG19-5 Winterfold Garden	8 (2 more than consultation)	8 (2 more than consultation)	8 (2 more than consultation)
WG19-7 Paddock Farm Field	0	0	10
WG19-8 Glebe Field (lower section only & land gift	0	10	0
Total Dwellings	40 + 3 business at least	40	40

5. **Local Green Gaps:**

- a. **Local Validation:** The final report had now been received from AECOM; circulated. LD had made the minor amendments that were easy to complete, ie, reference to photographs and the suggested re-ordering. However, it was agreed by all that re-wording was not required and that the document created the necessary supporting evidence. The final paragraph stated “ In conclusion, the Re-assessment is considered suitably robust for its intended purpose, which is to provide evidence to inform future work to prepare the Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Review. It is clear that a great deal of effort has gone into ensuring the involvement of local residents, as reflected in Appendix 2, which presents the outcome of work to

standardise the assessment proformas. This generates confidence in the robustness of the Re-assessment as a whole, although clearly leads to challenges from an editing perspective. This brief report has made a number of suggestions around how the Re-assessment might be improved; however, all relate to points of editing rather than fundamental recommendations that must be addressed as a point of necessity.”

It was agreed that there was potentially value in creating fading for the re-defined Green Gaps if it could be achieved; AJ agreed to investigate creating a graphic picture with an area colour gradient for inclusion the draft plan. **Action: AJ**
Proposal: To support the Steering Group’s decision and action.

6. **Drafting Revised Document:** LD had followed a similar approach to the Loxwood Revised NP and identified both new text and the deletions. The revised policies had been incorporated and explanation to the review process included. It was nearing completion and would be circulated shortly for comment. Local Plan and NPPF references would need to be checked and updated as necessary. Consideration would need to be given to the new Specific Site policies. **Action: LD/ALL**
The HRA required advance draft policies so these would need to be checked when reviewing. Justification for policy changes had been included and the changes highlighted. The draft plan would need to be submitted with the site selection for the HRA which could follow behind SEA.
7. **Any Other Business:**
 - a. **Next Ad Vincula Article:** Required by 11th December due to Christmas. SO to prepared article to highlight consultation and refer to the important flyer in Ad Vincula. To circulate for approval prior to submission. **Action: SO**
8. **Date of Next Meeting:**
Monday 4th January 2021 at 7.00 pm, by Zoom.

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