

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW STEERING GROUP (NPRSG)

MINUTES OF MEETING WEDNESDAY 7th OCTOBER 2019 Vine Room, Village Hall

IN ATTENDANCE: Parish Council

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

Community Members

Keith Charman (KC), Jill Sutcliffe (JS)

SO opened the meeting at 7.00 pm.

1. **Apologies:** Steve Rollinson (SR)
2. **Declaration of Interests:** There was no change to the interests previously declared and recorded.
3. **Minute of the Last Meeting:** The minutes of the meeting held on 18th September 2019 were approved as an accurate record.
4. **Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA):** SO had met last Thursday with Nick Chisholm-Batten and Ryan Putt from AECOM for an inception meeting. They confirmed that an SEA was required due to the significant environmental effects. Explanation was given to the work and assessment process; they would be in contact again shortly.
5. **Site Consultation:**
 - a. **Consultation Feedback:** On the whole, a good consultation which was well received. People had been surprised at the amount of information but positive comments received on the presentation and layout. Negative comments only received from two developers. It was noted that people did take photographs and took response forms away to complete.

Group's Observations:

A display to explain the significance of the current green gaps would have been helpful; the plan from the current NP was subsequently displayed.

The site plans should have perhaps indicated the gifted land with a dotted line, however, all were treated in the same way with the whole site identified.

- b. **Analysis of Response Forms:** Data was now being inputted. Help was offered to LD as necessary. **Action: LD**
- c. **Site Selection Assessment Report and Chapman Planning Review:** Sally Chapman had advised that this report be completed to demonstrate the selection process. SO had drafted the content based upon examples found online. The format was

approved, which SO would continue to develop. For approval prior to sending to Chapman Planning for site selection validation. **Action: SO**

SO would contact Chapman Planning to establish if any further information was required.

- d. Stable Field: An email sent to AJ on the Friday from the landowner/developer was read out. AJ gave explanation to the concerns raised and his subsequent explanation/discussion. It was agreed that an acknowledgment should be sent with a request that any further communication should be directed through the Parish Council email. To be circulated prior to sending. **Action: SO/LD**

- e. Paddock Farm Field: An email from the agent expressing concern at the consultation details and access had been received; circulated. Although his comments would be included in the feedback, his questions to be answered directly, particularly as the Balchin's Close access had originally been confirmed by the landowner. SO to prepare the response and circulate before sending. **Action: SO/LD**

6. AECOM Policy Review: The final report had now been approved by Locality and received; circulated. Overall, it was a good report which highlighted where slight wording amendment was required. Useful website links had also been included to highlight similar policies which had passed examination. In terms of parking, it was highlighted that the WSCC policy had now been updated which did provide additional parking, although not to the village's aspirations. In order to exceed this policy, further evidence was required, in terms of measuring and counting garaging and off-road parking. It was agreed to undertake this work in an attempt to improve on the WSCC policy; in the worst case scenario, the examiner would remove the policy and the WSCC standard would apply. **Action: TBC**

7. Community Questionnaire:

- a. Distribution Timing: With Christmas fast approaching and with the current workload relating to the site selection, it was agreed to delay circulation until after Christmas, ideally week commencing 20th January. LD to contact AirS. **Action: LD**
- b. Questionnaire: All to email possible changes/typos to LD as soon as possible. The layout prepared by AirS was not ideal, so LD to suggest that she prepares the booklet and provide as a pdf for printing; consistent with the consultation booklet. Questionnaire to be confirmed at the next meeting. **Action: LD**
Definition of harmful change to be removed.

8. Any Other Business:

- a. Great Meadow: A resident had commented that commercial vehicles were not permitted on the estate and as such, this had stopped people bidding for the affordable properties. SO had therefore contacted Greenoak Housing to seek clarification. Greenoak advised that Jones Homes had placed some restrictive covenants on the properties, however no bans on pets or chickens. Residents were

not allowed to park vehicles over a certain size but up to transit van was acceptable. Greenoak shared the frustrations that so few Wisborough Green residents bid for the properties particularly as bidding was not committing; they could have withdrawn if unsuitable. Greenoak wanted to work with the Parish Council to encourage residents to contact Greenoak directly to ask any questions; suggestions were Ad Vincula and the website.

As this resident had obviously been misinformed and was possibly informing others, it was agreed that details should be included in the next Ad Vincula to correct this misunderstanding. **Action: SO**

- b. Green Gaps: SO had discussed with CDC and undertaken further research into the Local Gaps policy; CDC advised that a review of the Local Green Gaps within the NP and policy was required as part of the review. Earlier in the summer, she and JS had undertaken a review of all the green gaps. She had prepared an assessment sheet for each gap which assimilated the assessment with references to the CDC Landscape Capacity Study 2019. All agreed with the format and that each gap should be given a name for easier identification. Assessment sheets to be prepared for formal approval at the next meeting.

The CDC Study was undertaken by Terraferma based in Petersfield. SO to contact to ascertain if they could assist with a validation of the local assessment. **Action: SO**

- c. Locality Support and Grant Funding: An email had been received (circulated) which advised that further support and grant funding was still available to the group. A Plan Healthcheck had already been organised (exact timing to be confirmed), but additional funding to facilitate a local gap validation might be required. To follow up as necessary. **Action: LD**

- d. Settlement Boundary: In email exchanges with CDC relating to the gaps, a useful link to the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies Settlement Boundary Review December 2013 had been provided; details to be circulated. **Action: LD**

It stated that boundaries will be reviewed through the preparation of NPs and provided details of the methodology, assessment criteria and key requirements.

- e. Contact by Potential House Purchaser: LD had been contacted by email and telephone. She gave explanation to the questions asked and the information provided. A further email had been received and the response agreed.

9. **Date of Next Meeting: Monday 4th November at 7.00 pm**, in the Vine Room.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.30 pm.