

MINUTES

Meeting held with Chris Owen (West Sussex County Council)

06 April 2016

Mid Sussex District Council Offices at 11.30am

Attendees: Sue Hatton (SH), Hassocks Parish Council.
Bill Hatton (BH), Hassocks Parish Council.
Chris Owen (CO), West Sussex County Council.
Mark Bristow (MB), Mid Sussex District Council.
Dale Mayhew (DM), dowsettmayhew Planning Partnership.
Laura Bourke (LB), dowsettmayhew Planning Partnership.

1. Regulation 14 Update - DM gave update on Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Pre Submission consultation.
2. WSCC response to Pre-Submission Plan - DM confirmed "general comments" from WSCC were OK.
3. WSCC comments on Ch4: Environment and Heritage Green Infrastructure (GI).

CO confirmed comments on this aspect had been obtained from the Public Right of Way (PRoW) officer. CO confirmed WSCC are keen for non-car modes of transport to play a role in GI with regard connectivity. Also confirmed WSCC are keen to see as much as possible is done to draw attention to GI to provide for movement which doesn't include the car, i.e. walking, cycling, riding.

DM agreed an additional reference to other modes of transport could be included in the Policy. **DM ACTION**

4. WSCC comments on Ch6: Housing.

DM explained HEDNA number for Hassocks (635) and confirmed MSDC are content with the proposed housing numbers detailed in the Hassocks NP.

Discussion followed on air quality and traffic issues associated with housing allocations.

CO confirmed for WSCC air quality is the dominant issue.

CO explained the WSCC Transport Plan sets out County objectives which include "security, safety and health" and how these are air quality/transport related.

CO advised air quality is not a matter for the District Council alone.

WSCC seek NP to look at traffic and air quality management.

CO confirmed Stonepound is a junction of concern for WSCC and they have had limited success in dealing with the problems at this junction.

CO confirmed there is no obvious solution. He believed minor improvements have been made by altering the timings of the traffic lights. The traffic consultants in support of the Ham Field scheme have identified further potential minor improvements to the geometry of the junction to improve its operation.

Discussion followed regarding current applications and housing numbers in the “pipeline” which may have an affect on Stonepound Crossroads.

DM highlighted there is an application pending determination for Friars Oak Field, totalling 137 units; a re-determined Appeal at Ham Fields for 97 dwellings; and a current application pending determination on the latter site for 51 units (DM/15/4609).

DM highlighted WSCC response to DM/15/4609 which stated “a sensitivity test has been included that included for the proposed 137 units as well as the 97 units dwellings that formed part of the two earlier planning applications. The LHA has concluded that a severe capacity impact would not result should these two developments have been permitted”.

DM highlighted WSCC had raised no objection to 234 dwellings on London Road, and that the Hassocks NP was seeking to allocate 130 units at the Golf Club, 140 units at Clayton Mills and 20 units at the National Tyre Centre site.

DM questioned what else is needed to demonstrate to West Sussex County Council that NP can proceed.

CO confirmed WSCC had looked at all allocated sites which total 290 units. CO confirmed Friars Oak is different to Ham Fields due to the distance from Stonepound Crossroads/access to Burgess Hill).

CO confirmed that allocations in Development Plan Documents and committed developments is what WSCC look at when reviewing and taking a view on the impacts.

BH questioned what further information can be provided. And highlighted that a Transport Assessment (TA) had already been undertaken for Friars Oak Field and Ham Fields.

DM questioned if the NPWG could submit existing information from the above apps and if WSCC could use this as a basis to determine if the NP can proceed?

BH: Explained how he struggled to see how the impact of the Golf Club is any different to Friars Oak Field. BH saw no reason why information submitted in support of other housing applications in the area should not be used. BH submitted this evidence would be proportionate.

CO confirmed that the Clayton Mills and National Tyre Centre sites are different and the sites are a matter of concern due to lack of evidence base. CO confirmed it requires some form of analysis - so WSCC can understand implications for Stonepound with respect air quality and capacity.

DM again questioned if there was not enough evidence now available to allow the NP to proceed. DM queried if the T.A. could follow at application stage.

CO confirmed the situation was an unusual case and agreed:

- Small scale/proportionate evidence should be done at NP level;
- Not appropriate for PC to undertake a detailed study;

CO confirmed WSCC cannot be certain that evidence is available now and so will not be a show stopper in future.

MB gave MSDC view on Air Quality

- MB gave update on response to Hassocks NP and stated no concerns were raised from internal MSDC Officers.
- Confirmed Stonepound is not a show stopper for the District.
- MSDC are aware of the site selection which has been done.
- MSDC are confident/satisfied enough has been done.

- MSDC are reliant on NP's to bring forward houses.
- Haven't raised concerns re AQMA.
- Everything has been done to allow NP to move forward.
- Quantum of growth right for Hassocks.

It was noted there is a difference between evidence needed by MSDC and WSCC. Different view between WSCC and MSDC.

DM highlighted Burgess Hill allocation and evidence which was provided for their Neighbourhood Plan.

CO confirmed WSCC are happy with this data and data for Friars Oak and Ham Field. However not happy with 290 identified in Hassocks.

BH asked if there was evidence which already exists and can WSCC response be revised.

CO response reiterated WSCC concerns re cumulative affect given all the applications.

CO stated with respect to Burgess Hill - evidence is still being gathered. WSCC have looked at the allocation and accept there will be some impact on Stonepound. However the Burgess Hill strategy will seek to mitigate impact via A2300 improvements. CO confirmed LEP funding has been sourced for this.

BH requested WSCC review position set out and comments provided so far.

Discussion followed on the potential methodology of preparing further traffic/ travel studies to support the NP allocations.

CO confirmed that in Tangmere developers of proposed sites, funded, and provided evidence to demonstrate development is acceptable.

CO confirmed that the Methodology involves a 2-stage process:

Part 1: Produce estimate of number of extra vehicles through Stonepound.

Taking into account Neighbourhood Plan allocations and committed developments, with the focus on Hassocks (relevant local commitments).

Based on:

- 1/A Number of vehicles and peak hours generated by NP allocations.
- 1/B Origin and destination of trips.

Part 2: Capacity Modelling

This is based on additional trips. The need for this work would be dependant on the results from Part 1.

Discussion followed on next steps.

CO confirmed WSCC will review response and will discuss the matter further with colleagues.

DM suggested an update is provided to WSCC setting out the response of NPWG to WSCC comments, provide further information on existing studies relating to air quality; and seek WSCC to review their position/ response.**DM ACTION**

Discussion followed re costs for work - WSCC confirmed it is appropriate for developer to pay.

DM asked if WSCC would scope out work for NPWG? CO confirmed WSCC would provide assistance for drafting of brief however Local Authority/Parish Council are to provide the Brief for WSCC to comment on.