

## Minutes of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Meeting 26th May 2016

Attendees: Ian Credland; Nick Owens; David Withycombe; Frances Gaudencio; Ian Weir; Virginia Pullan; Sue Hatton; Bill Hatton; Victoria Standfast; Laura Bourke (Consultant, Dowsett Mayhew Consultancy). Jane Bromley (Administration). 28 members of the public.

IC reminded the members of the public that the meeting was a meeting in public and not a public meeting. Whilst members of the public were welcome to listen to the Working Group's discussions, they were not at liberty to take part in the meeting.

1. Election of Chair: SH Proposed IC which was seconded by IW and all were in favour. There being no other proposals for Chair, Ian Credland would remain as Chair of the Group for the forthcoming Parish Council year.

2. Co-Option of non- Councillor Members of the NPWG: The non- Councillor Members of the Working Group being: Virginia Pullan; David Withycombe; Georgia Cheshire and Adrian Batchelor; were recommended for co-option onto the Working Group by IC and this proposal was seconded by SH, all of the Councillor Members of the Group present were in favour.

3. Apologies for absence: Adrian Batchelor; Georgia Cheshire; Judith Foot.

4. Declarations of Interest: Ian Credland sites 1 & 2. Nick Owens sites 1, 2, 15 and 17. David Withycombe site 12; Frances Gaudencio site 8; Virginia Pullan site 7.

Local Green Space Declarations of Interest: Ian Credland LGS2; Nick Owens LGS2; Frances Gaudencio LGS 5.

Schools Interest: David Withycombe Hassocks Infants; Frances Gaudencio Windmills Junior; Sue Hatton Downlands and Windmills Junior.

5. The minutes of the meeting on 26th April 2016 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

6. Summary of meeting with MSDC 18th May 2016. A meeting had been held on 18th May between Claire Tester (CT) Neighbourhood Planning Consultant to Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC); DM and LB from Dowsett Mayhew and BH, SH, FG and IC from the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan Working Group (HNPWG).

LB summarised the discussions that took place at that meeting. CT had requested the meeting following a previous meeting with Mark Bristow (MB) Neighbourhood Planning Officer from MSDC where Air Quality (AQ) was the focus. (A letter had, following this previous meeting, been sent to MB from DM, requesting MB's written approval of the approach taken by the HNPWG with regard to Air Quality issues, which MB had given verbally in the meeting. MB had left the neighbourhood planning post before replying to the letter and CT was now responsible for a reply).

CT confirmed that MSDC were in the final stages of carrying out a Transport Study to support the MSDC Emerging District Plan the study does include the impact of Neighbourhood Plan Housing proposals and the Transport

Consultants were aware of the housing numbers allocated by HNPWG in the Reg. 14 Plan. CT advised therefore for the HNPWG to utilise this report as part of the Reg. 16 evidence base. CT advised the Transport Study was expected at the end of May and recommended the Neighbourhood Plan be submitted following publication of the Study. She confirmed that the early indications were that the Transport Study concurred with the numbers allocated within the draft Hassocks Reg. 14 Pre Submission Plan.

A meeting with Chris Owens (CO) from WSCC had highlighted the WSCC concerns with regard to AQ. A letter of 26<sup>th</sup> May 2016 from CO had confirmed that they were awaiting the Transport Study from MSDC before finally confirming they would support the HNP as drafted currently regarding AQ issues.

### Friars Oak

The Friars Oak Planning application was then discussed and the likely impact of a successful application upon the Neighbourhood Plan.

The NPWG were aware the officer report for the above site recommends the application for approval. Members of the NPWG were also aware the application was scheduled to be presented at committee in June.

The Friars Oak Planning application and the likely impact of a successful permission upon the Neighbourhood Plan was then discussed.

Members discussed whether they should wait for the outcome of the committee meeting before submitting the Plan to MSDC for Regulation 16 (Submission) Plan.

Members did not feel they could wait for the outcome of the committee as the Parish is under increasing pressure and it is in the best interest of the Parish to submit the Plan as soon as possible to enable the Neighbourhood Plan to gain more weight in the determination of planning applications in the Parish.

Members discussed the impact of the granting of permission on the Plan.

LB confirmed the Parish Council had resolved to agree the housing need of the Parish was 210-270 and the Plan had sought to positively meet this need through the 3 identified sites within the Plan as drafted.

Members discussed whether the Parish could sustain an additional 130 units at Friars Oak on top of the 280-290 identified in the Plan.

LB confirm the SA had tested all sites as part of the SA process and had tested policy options with respect to housing numbers. LB confirmed the SA highlighted the allocation of 280-290 homes within the Plan as the most favourable in that it facilitates housing growth to meet identified need in the Parish over the Plan period, whilst minimising impact on the environmental strategic objectives and traffic.

LB confirmed once the NP was submitted to MSDC for Reg.16 the Plan could

Minutes of the meeting of the HNPWG 26<sup>th</sup> May 2016

not be altered as it would be 'owned' by MSDC.

The Lack of a 'made' District Plan and the weight attach to an unmade Neighbourhood Plan with regard to the Friars Oak application was also discussed

Discussions took place as to how much weight the Plan would hold at the various stages of its making. LB advised that the closer to referendum the more weight it would hold. If the Plan were submitted as a Reg. 16 Plan it would carry more weight than as a Reg. 14 document. IC advised that should the Plan be submitted to MSDC with the three sites allocated and then the Application be successful with regard to the Friars Oak application, then the additional housing of 130 units would have to be taken in addition to what was achieved via site allocations in the Plan. FG confirmed that it was a very difficult position to be in as the residents were not in favour of the Friars Oak site for development.

It was expected that the application would be heard on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2016 but IW advised if they received a significant number of objections this may delay the hearing. DW commented that if the NPWG delayed the submission of the Reg. 16 Plan for this application it may have a further application to cause another delay later. He concluded it was better to go ahead with the submission.

BH was keen to proceed on the basis that the Reg. 16 Plan would hold some weight at Committee IC discussed that if the HNPWG did await the outcome of the Friars Oak application before Reg. 16 submission and then, before submission, found it necessary to reduce to two sites for allocation in the Plan, there would be challenges as to which site was chosen for removal. He reported that there were many contradictory decisions at Judicial Review as to how much weight an un-made Plan held in the appeal process.

IW asked for clarification from LB whether, if the additional housing of 130 were imposed together with that allocated in the Plan, would the Parish receive some 'credit' for this additional allocation should MSDC have to reconsider its 5 year housing supply at an early date. LB confirmed given the site was not allocated within the Plan, MSDC would not be in a position to give credit to the Parish

7. Review of draft Regulation 16 Plan and decision to recommend to the Parish Council for ratification:

The Group went through the Reg. 16 drafted Plan and pointed out typographical errors and rearrangements of photographs to LB FG pointed out the suspension of a bus route which was included in Aim 10.

IW pointed out there were no contact details and LB advised MSDC would include these.

LB pointed out that 3.11 refers to the MSDC Transport Study and that when this was finalised a summary relating to the evidence included relevant to Hassocks NP would be included.

*IC Proposed that the Reg.16 drafted Plan, the Updated Sustainability Assessment and the Non-Technical Sustainability Assessment Summary, be recommended for approval by the Parish Council subject to inclusion of the MSDC Transport Study report, at their meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> June 2016, SH*

*seconded this recommendation and all were in favour.*

The timescales for submission to MSDC for Reg. 16 had been discussed with CT. She advised that the HNPWG give MSDC early site of the Reg16 Plan and that whilst awaiting the finalisation of the Transport Study a draft of the Reg. 16 Plan, without the results of this Study, could be sent to her.

The Group then discussed the arrangements for working towards the submission of the Reg.16 Plan:

27<sup>th</sup> May 2016

IC confirmed that the updated Plan following tonight's meeting should be sent to CT. ACTION LB

Thereafter the Parish Council would receive the Reg. 16 Plan together with the updated Sustainability Assessment and Non-Technical Summary of the Sustainability Assessment to be recommended for RESOLUTION by the Parish Council at its' meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> June 2016.

15<sup>th</sup> June 2016

Should the documents be ratified by the Parish Council, subject to inclusion of the Transport Study in the evidence, then MSDC would be notified that the documents had been ratified immediately. ACTION CLERK.

Thereafter

The documents would be sent to MSDC for Reg.16 once the Transport Study details had been included.

8. To consider any recommendation on response to West Sussex Minerals Local Plan consultation to the Parish Council:

Both BH and NO concluded it was a good quality document but there were no further comments for the Parish Council.

9. Correspondence to note: The correspondence had been noted by the Group.

a) Letter from Claire Tester Head of Planning MSDC of 6<sup>th</sup> May 2016

b) E-mail correspondence with WSCC LEA;

c) E-mail correspondence with WSCC Highways

d) E-mail correspondence with South Downs Park Authority.

10. To note the scheduled meeting for 9<sup>th</sup> June 2016 is cancelled. The Group noted the cancellation.

11. To note that there is a closed meeting of the NPWG on 9<sup>th</sup> June 2016 starting at 19.30. The Group noted the arrangements for this closed meeting.

The meeting closed at 8.35pm

Signed Chairman-----Dated -----