

## Minutes of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Meeting 10<sup>th</sup> December 2015

Attendees: Ian Credland; Bill Hatton; Sue Hatton; Virginia Pullan; Nick Owens; Frances Gaudencio; David Withycombe; Judith Foot; Adrian Batchelor. Dale Mayhew and Laura Bourke (Consultants Dowsett Mayhew Consultancy). Graham Olway (Principal Manager Capital Planning and Projects WSCC). Jane Bromley (Administration)  
1x member of the public.

1. Apologies: Justine Fisher; Victoria Standfast; Georgia Cheshire; Ian Weir
2. Declarations of Interest: Ian Credland sites 1 & 2. Virginia Pullen site 7. Nick Owens sites 1, 2, 15. Frances Gaudencio site 8. David Withycombe site 12  
Local Green Space Declarations of Interest: Ian Credland LGS2; Virginia Pullan LGS5; Nick Owens LGS2; Frances Gaudencio LGS 5. Adrian Batchelor LGS 6.  
Schools Interest: Sue Hatton Downlands and Windmills Junior. David Withycombe Hassocks Infants; Frances Gaudencio Windmills Junior
3. The minutes of the meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2015 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.
4. Review of action points from 26<sup>th</sup> November 2015  
Action 1 – Agenda incorporated draft plan- Completed  
Action 2 – IC wrote the foreword to the draft plan- Completed  
Action 3 – IC corresponded with Clerk as to categorising responses to draft plan- Completed  
Action 4 – Draft plan sent to MSDC 9<sup>th</sup> December 2015 for review- Completed  
Action 5 – Distribution of draft plan discussed with Clerk – Completed  
Action 6 – Photographs suitable for draft plan to be located by VP- Further photographs of LGS to be sent to LB.  
Infrastructure map to be completed by Christmas.  
Action 7 – Branding of draft plan to be looked into- To be considered later in the agenda.
5. WSCC – Graham Olway – School progress  
*Establishing Local School Need*  
GO gave apologies from Councillor Jeremy Hunt who had kept up a keen interest in the Hassocks area.  
GO confirmed that WSCC had had conversations with the local Hassocks schools. Hassocks Infants were reluctant to be pushed into accommodating another class given the constraints of their site location.  
Following a meeting with Cabinet members it had been decided to move away from this approach and if this was to be considered again in the future it would only be as a short term arrangement.  
*Free Schools*  
Central Government had established a need for 500 Free Schools which was the current political process for achieving a new school. The Department of Education would like to see the endorsement of Free Schools by sponsorship Multi Academy Trusts (MATs).

The Local Authority were therefore of the view a free school was needed for Hassocks at Primary Level. If a sponsor approached the Department of Education they would make the decision as to accept the sponsorship. This would be based on proven record as they did not want a Free School to fail.

GO noted to all that Free Schools are not under the criteria of selection that a WSCC appointed school would be. A significant fact being that they are not obliged to provide a school playing field. The sponsor would come under scrutiny from the Regional Schools Commissioner.

IC asked how sponsor's got to know that a school was needed in Hassocks.

GO clarified that the Department of Education would advertise the fact and he knew that no formal offer of sponsorship had yet been made.

*Hassocks Parish Council Criteria for a New School and Available Sites*

IC confirmed that Vanessa Cummins from WSCC had promised to complete the feasibility appraisal of the five sites suggested by the Parish Council aligned to the criteria that the Parish Council had set for a school, by the end of February, GO confirmed that by the end of February the situation with regard to the September 2016 intake would be known and whether there was a shortfall in school capacity. In addition he knew that Graham Glenn and Vanessa Cummins from WSCC had been meeting site owners and GO undertook to feedback on this. **ACTION 1.GO**

IC expressed that Hassocks must be unique in being able to offer five sites where the land was available free of charge and therefore the sponsor could not possibly consider looking to purchase land.

GO thought that they may if the time scales for the free land did not suit.

IC asked whether planning permission would be needed if a Free School sponsor was looking to purchase land.

DM thought that certain changes of use would be under permitted development

IC thought if it were for a green space then planning permission would be needed and therefore be subject to the Neighbourhood Plan Policies.

SH asked for clarity that the criteria set down by WSCC for a new school, on which the Parish Council Criteria had in the main be based, were not then the same criteria used by Free Schools?

GO confirmed they were not, however he was sure that MAT would surely approach the Parish Council to discuss the needs of the community.

FG thought the feasibility appraisals form WSCC should be passed to the Parish Council as soon as possible.

DM advised that a template be sent to the Parish Council so they could see that the studies were along the lines that they anticipated, the Parish Council don't want to be presented with a fete accompli.

IC warned GO that something comprehensive was required.

GO understood this and that the appraisals would be what would be down by WSCC to satisfy their own assessments of sites.

IC mentioned that the Vicar of the United Reform Church had not heard back from WSCC following on from their meeting with them. GO undertook to check this.

**ACTION 2. GO** and further confirmed that the feasibility appraisals would be sent as soon as possible.

GO Left the meeting as all discussion seemed complete.

A discussion took place with regard to the planning that might be required for a Free School.

IC considered that there would be some protection as to an undesirable location via the Neighbourhood Plan. DM thought an application for a school would go to the County rather than District Council.

DM felt a letter to GO was appropriate to clarify what was expected from the feasibility assessments. **ACTION 3. IC/DM**. IC elaborated that they should be asked to bear in mind where new development, coming through the Neighbourhood Plan would be situated.

6. Regulation 14 Plan;

The Parish Council had RESOLVED to approve the draft Neighbourhood Plan to go forward to the Regulation 14 Consultation unanimously at their meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2015

IC confirmed he would set out to the Clerk the details of the notice of the consultation where it would be advertised and where hard copies of the plan would be situated. He would also confirm after discussion with the Clerk which e-mail address was to be used for the Consultation responses which would need to be included in the draft plan.

**ACTION 4. IC**

DM confirmed that the consultation would be from 5<sup>th</sup> January to 16 February.

FG asked about replying to responses.

IC confirmed the response could be generic and that the true response would be via the Consultation document which accompanied the Regulation 16 Plan at Consultation.

DM confirmed that the Plan and a Sustainability Appraisal would form the documents for the Regulation 14 Consultation.

At Regulation 16 Consultation, the Plan, the SA, the consultation statement and the basic conditions statement were all required.

A discussion around dealing with responses followed but it was clear nothing could be decided until the responses were received.

IC thought that DM's help would be required for any professionals' response.

Advertising of the Consultation would be via:

Email subscribers list **ACTION 5. JCF**

Advert in MSTimes and Local paper. **ACTION 6. IC and Clerk**

Notices in normal places **ACTION 7. CLERK**

Social Media. **ACTION 8. JCF**

Paper copies for the Library and Parish Council Office. **ACTION 9. CLERK**

IC thought that the branding would be via the pictures used for the front cover and LB confirmed that she had sufficient pictures apart from for the LGS which VP and DW undertook to supply. **ACTION 10. VP/DW**

DM asked whether he would need any sign off for the pictures and all agreed that the group would be guided by VP and DW.

DM asked whether the foreword was to be attributed to the chair and what form of signature would be required. IC confirmed his name in italics and also that the foreword was to be circulated to the group. **ACTION 11. DM**

DM asked what should border the map of the parish and all agreed that a faded area should surround the brighter parish. **ACTION 12. DM**

FG asked to be copied into any correspondence with regard to maps. ACTION 13.  
DM/LB/VP/DW

The Gleeson appeal was discussed and although the draft Regulation 14 Plan did not hold much weight DM highlighted that the reasoning behind the policies should hold weight.

BH confirmed he would draft a planning response to the appeal and send to DM for checking. ACTION 14. BH/DM

7. Schedule of meetings for 2016.

A schedule of meetings for 2016 was to be circulated via e-mail. ACTION 15. SH but the next Neighbourhood Plan Working Group meeting would be 7<sup>th</sup> January 2016 at 7.30pm.

8. Correspondence- None received.

9. Date of Next Meeting: Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> January 2016, 7.30pm

The meeting ended at 9.30pm

Draft

Signed Chairman-----

Dated -----