

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW STEERING GROUP (NPRSG)

MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON MONDAY 1st DECEMBER 2025

On Zoom

IN ATTENDANCE:

Parish Council

Louise Davies (LD), Andrew Jackson (AJ), Sophie Winship (SW)

Community Members

John Bristow (JB), Keith Charman (KC), Louise Jellard (LJ), Sheena Overington (SO)

The meeting opened at 7.30 pm.

1. **Election of Chair:** It was agreed that SO would Chair this meeting.
2. **Apologies for Absence:** All members were in attendance.
3. **Declaration of Interests:** No change to previously declared interests.
4. **Minutes of the last meeting:** The minutes of the meeting held on Friday 31st October 2025 were approved as an accurate record.
5. **Site Assessments:**
 - a. Progress Update / Planning Consultant's Input: LD reported that the agreed assessment and rationale charts had been forwarded for review to James Garside, Planning Consultant. The specific site layout plans for both Elivia Homes sites has been forwarded. SO had reviewed the CDC Landscape Capacity Study and relevant information for each site had also been sent. The only information that remained to be added to the assessments related the bat network and barn owl habitat; reference maps had now been prepared. The consultant's review would be received before the planned Parish Council meeting on 16th December and LD would circulate when received. **Action: LD**

There was potentially one site change to report. The sale of Champions Farm appeared to be progressing, which included both promoted sites; the site along Newpound Lane had been sold with the property and not retained as indicated in the sale details. The current owner believed that allocation for housing was unlikely, and had only promoted due to his personal circumstances, but would discuss with the prospective owners after exchange. He had been advised that the sites would need to be withdrawn in writing otherwise they would appear at the consultation event.

- b. Clark's Yard: CDC had now responded to LD's email which had full explained the situation and the owner's reluctance to confirm the site's availability. CDC had confirmed in writing that the site would need to be withdrawn; the email to be

held in the evidence. Details would need to be included at the consultation event and explanation given as to why sites for 86 dwellings rather than 75 would need to be found.

- c. Sites/Capacity Options: Through the assessment process, there appeared to be some obvious options. However, LD highlighted that CDC had stressed the importance of giving options to the village, it must not be a done deal at this stage. As the site assessment validation had not been received from James, it could not be discussed in detail. However, it was agreed that the Local Plan Policy of 35 dwellings per hectare was designed for urban areas and too dense for Wisborough Green. Explanation to this would need to be included at the consultation event. To be discussed further at a meeting on 15th December, but in the meantime, all to give further thought to potential options and how this could be presented. It was noted that variables, such as trees or access, could also impact. AJ would look at Great Meadow (25), Songhurst Meadow (22), Tanglewood Nursery (10) and Anells Yard (proposed 25) to calculate an average density and identify a more realistic capacity per hectare figure. He also highlighted that a lower density over an increased number of sites could create lost opportunity for future growth. **Action: All/AJ**
- d. Parish Council Presentation: The draft presentation, to be taken to a Full Parish Council meeting on 16th December 2025, had been circulated to all. The content was approved; the only additions would be the site and capacity options, to be considered further on 15th December.

6. Site Consultation Event

- a. Advertising Schedule: The Parish Council December newsletter was being distributed to all households and included a repeat of the last explanation article with the consultation poster on the back page. The following was agreed:
- Posters to be displayed around the village in early January.
 - Roadside boards (as previously, approximately 3 by 3 ft) to be erected early January – 3 sites.
 - Repeat of the poster in the February Ad Vincula.
 - Details on the Village Facebook page. All supported SW's suggestion, as Chair of the PC, to do a short video clip to raise awareness.
- Action: LD/SW/AJ**
- b. Notification to Land Promoters: LD to draft an email for approval; to notify of the consultation event with no specific site information. To be sent to all promoters in early January. Two site layout plans had already been provided for the large sites, and it was agreed that simple layout plans could potentially help residents visualise the likely impact of all sites. To be given further thought as this did have a cost implication and asking land promoters to incur a cost could create an optimistic impression. **Action: Next Meeting**

- c. Previous Feedback: CDC was happy that 'studies' already undertaken were still evidence, however, previous village opinion needed to be reaffirmed; opinion, circumstances and residents had changed over time. All to review previous NP evidence and pull out the relevant questions. To be included in the consultation booklet, something along the lines of – Do you agree with what the village has told us before? YES / NO
LD to provide links to the evidence for all to review. **Action: ALL**
- d. Consultation: It was felt that the consultation displays and response booklets previously worked well. LD would draft for further consideration in January. LD highlighted that thought would also need to be given to the detail included in the displayed assessment charts; the full assessments would be contained in a folder for review, if required. Confirm at the next meeting. **Action: LD/Next Meeting**

7. **Any Other Matters to Report**

- a. Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA): LD had requested a screening opinion for both studies from CDC; given that they were both required before, it was reasonable to anticipate that they would be required again. As Locality support had been withdrawn, LD had made direct contact with AECOM, which previously prepared both reports. AECOM referred her to Dave Chapman, a Locality advisor. He indicated the possibility of negotiating a better cost, especially as the documents had previously been prepared by AECOM; indicative costs were given. LD was advised to contact Mr Chapman again when the screening opinion outcome was confirmed.
Action: LD
- b. Non-Designated Heritage Assets: CDC had referenced Southbourne NP Policy SB9 (details circulated) and suggested this might be useful to include. SO had reviewed and believed it would be good to include. She was happy to undertake the necessary assessments with help. SW and KC agreed with the inclusion and volunteered to help.
Action: SO/SW/KC (and anyone else?)

8. **Date of Next Meeting:**

Monday 15th December 2025, 7.30 pm on Zoom.

Monday 5th January 2026, 7.30 pm on Zoom.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.25 pm.