

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW STEERING GROUP (NPRSG)

MINUTES OF MEETING TUESDAY 8TH MAY 2019

IN ATTENDANCE: Parish Council

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

Community Members

Keith Charman (KC), Mona Johansson (MJ), Jill Sutcliffe (JS)

SO opened the meeting at 7.00 pm.

1. **Apologies:** All were in attendance.
2. **Declaration of Interests:** There was no change in the interests previously declared and recorded. LD again highlighted that her husband's land had been put forward for assessment.
KC and AJ had previously declared their interest in LD's land at the Site Assessment Group meeting, as did SR in Stable Field.
3. **Minutes of the Last Meeting:** The minutes of the last meeting held on Monday 1st April 2019 were approved as a true record.
4. **Timetable Update:** SO/LD had recently contacted CDC to ask for clarification on a number of points; the full questions and responses had been circulated. Unfortunately, the response indicated that the Local Plan review had been delayed. However, the comment that the strategy was not confirmed and numbers might change was more significant, particularly when linked with the advice not to proceed too quickly. It was also noted that a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was required from the start of the NP process; this had previously been undertaken by CDC. SO expressed her frustration that volunteers were expected to undertake NPs with little regard by higher authorities to the time involved and the impact upon personal lives when timetables were changed. KC also felt that these changes could impact upon the credibility of the process and volunteers. To be raised at the next Parish Council meeting with a view to writing to Nick Herbert MP. **Action: SO**

It was agreed that:

- CDC to be asked if delaying the Regulation 14 consultation to February/March 2020 would be acceptable to allow the planned June consultation to be rescheduled for mid/end of September.
- Application to be made for Locality SEA technical support package.
- To ascertain from CDC which other parishes were undertaking NP reviews.
- To review the last Local Plan consultation details to get a feel for other north-east parish responses. **Action: LD**

5. Site Selection:

- a. Site Assessments: KC confirmed that the site assessment criteria had now been reviewed by Chapman Planning and amendments incorporated in the circulated assessment sheet. It was noted that independent assessments by AECOM (through Locality) were also being undertaken which would validate assessments undertaken by the Group.

SO raised the following questions:

- Criteria to be used to determine, for example, what was considered a safe access, whether this related to traffic speed, visibility splays, as this could be subjective. It was agreed that all details would be recorded and potentially advice from specialists/highways authority would be sought if considered necessary.
- In terms of flooding/drainage, it was agreed that 'likely to create a new flood risk' should be included.
- AJ explained that the energy/climate change section related to opportunities to implement energy efficiency, such as discrete solar panels.
- Explanation to the use of the traffic light system was included on the last page. AJ stated that the use of traffic lights identified where mitigation might be required. It was not the intention to use as a scoring system as this could be open to challenge. Mitigation to be considered for each heading.

AJ asked if during the on-site assessment process mitigation measures, options of linking or changing site sizes should be considered. It was felt that this should be considered after the initial assessment process and when the AECOM report received. In terms of this support, LD explained that it was initially a desk top exercise and the consultants would then visit the village. AJ felt that it would be beneficial for the group to meet with the consultants if possible as they might also be able to offer advice about mitigation.

Action: LD

CDC also confirmed that it was no longer able to offer the same support as in the past as there was no dedicated NP officer and the NP work was spread between the planning officers. Questions could be asked by email.

The following was agreed:

- Assessments to be undertaken by KC, AJ, SO, MJ, JS and SR. LD would not be involved with the process due to her land interest. Having previously objected to Stable Field, JS would not be involved in this assessment.
- Doodle link to be circulated to coordinate first assessment dates, meeting at 6 pm. To assess as a group if possible, with one scribe; those unable to attend, to undertake independent assessment to validate. Photographs of all sites to be taken.
- Information to be subsequently reviewed at standardisation meeting and further assessment undertaken if considered necessary.
- To undertake assessments quickly to have the information available for the possible meeting with AECOM.
- Site plans and 'Call for Site' forms (personal details redacted) to be circulated.
- The latest HELAA to be obtained from CDC.

- b. Locality Technical Support: This was being provided by AECOM. They had received all site information and plans and were now progressing with the desk top exercise. They would review the local information as well as the HELAA and also look to identify any other potential sites.
- b. Affordable Housing Need: It was disappointing to note that the full results of the Housing Need Survey, undertaken by CDC last autumn, had not been received, despite several reminders; the report was currently with management for checking! In response to a further enquiry, CDC had now confirmed that the housing register was as follows:

Households on the housing register with a local connection to Wisborough Green Parish as at 01.05.19					
Band	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	Total
A-C	2	-	3	-	5
D	9	2	1	-	12
Total	11	2	4	-	17

CDC also confirmed that Greenoak had entered into a local letting plan with CDC for Great Meadow, which gave priority on first lets to households on the register in bands A-D with a local connection to Wisborough Green. The scheme was due to be completed at the end of May and the rented units were recently advertised on the CDC Homemove system. Four out of the 7 affordable rented homes went to households with a local connection, and the remaining 3 units did not receive bids so went to general needs lettings; unfortunately the 2 eligible households did not bid on the available properties. There was high demand for the one- bed properties but as there were only 2 available, they were allocated to the households with the highest priority. CDC was keen to impress that the housing register was a snapshot of the current need and did change on a daily basis. Residents were not informed when properties were coming forward in an area; it was the responsibility of the household to look and make a bid.

MJ felt that the increase in number on the register was perhaps as a result of recent advertising in the parish, which was encouraging, but SO was concerned at why households had not bid; were they aware of the process, did they require help to understand and access, and therefore missed out on this opportunity as a result? As MJ had an understanding of the system, it was agreed that she should write a sensitive article for inclusion in the parish magazine; explain banding and what people needed to do. **Action: MJ**

It was important to have an understanding of the need as the provision of affordable housing did link with site size. Clear explanation would need to be given at the future consultation.

- 6. Public Consultation: In view of the Local Plan review delay, CDC’s comment about being too advanced and the government funding and support application process not being opened in April, it was agreed that the June consultation event should be

postponed to September if this still fitted with CDC deadlines; confirmation to be obtained. SO to prepare an article for the June parish magazine. **Action: SO**
LD to check dates for hall and display board hire later in September. **Action: LD**
Consideration to the displays and feedback sheet at a future meeting.

7. **Community Questionnaire:** On hold until funding confirmed.
8. **Policy Review and NP Amendments:** Policy work was now on hold. However, SO/LD would continue to make the minor amendments to the existing NP and update and prepare the document structure to receive the new information. **Action: SO/LD**

JS advised that she was collating the evidence which linked NP policy to the CDC and SDNP Local Plans. She highlighted climate change and monitoring which may need to be considered as well as the implication of bat movements.

9. **Locality Funding and Support:** The application process had not been opened. LD checked daily and would submit the application as a matter of urgency. The grant funding application would include support from Chapman Planning to provide an independent validation of the site consultation analysis.

10. **Any Other Business:**

- a. **Ad Vincula Article:** SO/JS agreed to write an article to give explanation to the postponement of the consultation event; Local Plan delayed, advised not to progress too quickly by CDC and government funding not opening. **Action: SO/JS**

11. **Date of Next Meeting:** Monday 3rd June at 7.00 pm in the Vine Room at the Village Hall.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.35 pm.