

## Minutes of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Meeting 26<sup>th</sup> November 2015

1. Attendees: Ian Credland; Bill Hatton; Sue Hatton; Virginia Pullan; Nick Owens; Frances Gaudencio; Victoria Standfast; Judith Foot (JAF); Dale Mayhew and Laura Bourke (Consultants Dowsett Mayhew Consultancy); and Jane Bromley (Administration)  
Apologies: Justine Fisher; Ian Weir; David Withycombe; Georgia Cheshire; Adrian Batchelor.  
1x member of the public.
2. Declarations of Interest: Ian Credland sites 1 & 2. Virginia Pullen site 7. Nick Owens sites 1, 2, 15. Frances Gaudencio site 8. Victoria Standfast 1 & 2.

Local Green Space Declarations of Interest: Ian Credland LGS2; Virginia Pullan LGS5; Nick Owens LGS2; Frances Gaudencio LGS 5.

2. The minutes of the meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> November 2015 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.
3. Review of draft plan.

DM confirmed he had deleted the policy re housing need and had included it as text in the Plan. He had moved the Village Centre policy to the Economy policy. He had moved Character and Design from the Housing policy to the Environment policy. DM advised that formatting and photographic additions would need to be thought about in due course but not for the purpose of the meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> December when the Parish Council would be presented with the draft Plan. It was the material content that was of consequence for that meeting.

IC made a reference that the Clerk should be reminded to put the Draft Plan review on the agenda. **ACTION 1. IC**

DM further advised that the appendices to the Plan would not be presented on 8<sup>th</sup> December and the maps would need to be prepared by Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) and would not be ready by then but also for that purpose they would not be necessary.

DM mentioned he would be adding more footnote references to the document and he felt this was a good way to keep the text succinct but for the appropriate references to be in place.

DM asked that the Foreword be written by the working Group and IC undertook this task. **ACTION 2. IC**

### *The Group Reviewed the Procedure for the Consultation of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan*

IC queried whether the responses to the Draft Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Plan Consultation should go to the general e-mail address for the Parish Office or whether a special address should be used? He also raised the point as to who should collate and categorise the responses to the Draft Plan Consultation.

BH felt that the office should be consulted with regard to the e-mail address, but that the Clerk should be the one to receive and categorise the responses.

DM mentioned whoever received the responses should also be the person to send out the notice of the Consultation.

IC would e-mail the Clerk with regard to this and let her know how to categorise the responses. **ACTION 3. IC**

SH asked for the time frame with regard to this.

DM advised that the Draft Plan would need to be checked by MSDC and that this could take 2-3 weeks.

IC said that the draft could be sent as soon now as practically possible to MSDC and that if anything material came out of the Plan going to the Parish Council on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2015 for Ratification MSDC could be advised of this. **ACTION 4. IC**

DM advised that the Consultation period start date be planned for the 1<sup>st</sup> week of January after the Christmas shut down.

IC asked what the procedure was for the Consultation Notice to stakeholders.

LB advised that the procedure was not prescriptive and that so long as the time frame of the consultation and where the Draft Document could be found was advertised then that was sufficient.

IC thought that advertising would be:

- Via e-mail subscribed survey monkey;
- A local paper advertisement;
- Notices in the normal places;
- Facebook; twitter and the website.

Hard copies should be available at the Parish Office and the library and a soft copy on the website.

IC undertook to advise the Clerk on this as well. **ACTION 5.IC**

### *Photographs and printing of the Plan*

VP undertook to locate photographs and pass them onto DM. She thought GC, AB would assist and JAF offered assistance. **ACTION 6.VP**

DM wondered if a certain branding would be wanted for the Plan

JCF was thought to be the appropriate person to look at this. **ACTION 7 JCF**

All agreed that the printing should be done professionally but that only the final Plan should be printed in colour.

### *The Group reviewed the wording of the Draft Plan*

VS queried whether the capacity of the secondary schools had been sorted out as this was not included under 2.15.

IC highlighted that the wording 'acknowledge constraint' was key here. LEA had not 'acknowledged' any capacity problem as secondary level.

FG felt that at this moment in time that wording was suitable.

Policy 1. And 2.

DM mentioned using the term 'Strategic Gap' would in the future be contrary to any Local Plan made by MSDC as that terminology had been replaced by Local Plan in their Draft Plan.

There was a great deal of discussion over the best way to describe the three gaps and it was concluded that:

1. Burgess Hill Gap;
2. Ditchling Gap; and
3. Hurst Gap.

Would be the best descriptions to use.

DM undertook to change the wording throughout the document to this effect.

### Policy 3.

VP asked if the Local Green Spaces were numbered?

DM advised that once the maps were drafted by MSDC they would be numbered to correspond.

### Policy 4.

DM asked for a definition of Green Infrastructure.

VP confirmed she would talk to DW to see if it encompassed the whole village and would ask MSDC to produce a map.

### Policy 7.

It was agreed by all that the second bullet point concerning uses to which the air quality would be detrimental, would not be permitted in the area, be taken out.

IC mentioned the amendments sheets to the MSDC Draft Local Plan which were definitive regarding the Northern Arc proposal. He asked that in the preamble to Policy 7 that a statement that, the Parish Council were mindful of the impact this would cause on the air quality.

### Policy 9.

The preamble to this policy should be Outdoor Space excluding the word 'children's' IC queried how the National Tyre site would fit this policy of play areas for development larger than 15 homes.

FG thought the wording 'creative use' would be sufficient to cover this.

### Policy 10.

It was decided that the cemeteries would be included as community facilities and the allotments as green infrastructure.

### Policy 15.

After much discussion it was decided that DM should include the wording to the effect that access to the site would be via Ockley Road, or to the South and/or other suitable access.

### Housing numbers.

The amendments to the District Plan numbers IC felt showed how important it was that the Hassocks Plan did not extrapolate the District numbers to work out the Hassocks housing need. Although the Neighbourhood Plan Housing need number for the District had not increased the neighbourhood plans across which this number was spread had been reduced to those Plans which had not yet been made or were to be made before the District Plan was made which was thought to be 14.

IC felt the Hassocks Housing Need calculated was sufficiently robust.

### Policy 20.

FG asked that 'affordable' be added to housing sizes.

### Aims and Policies

IC thought clarification was needed at the 'Plan Structure' section of the Plan regarding aims and policies.

### Aim 7.

Wording was described to DM for the preamble and Aim 7, regarding the PROW that crosses the railway between Clayton Mills and Shepherd's Walk.

### Aim 8.

NO to e-mail wording to DM re PN10 and PN2.5 particulates for the Pollution Aim.

### Aim 9.

Take out 8.19 and 8.20

In general

All agreed that it should be 'the Parish Council' that 'support' throughout the document and not just 'the Parish'.

*IC proposed the Draft Neighbourhood Plan document amended as discussed be put forward for Resolution by Parish Council*

AGREED

*Policy appraisals*

DM described the test each policy had undergone against 13 objectives with options for each policy being tested against the same objectives to see how well the drafted policy performed. The drafted policies were proved to score the best or the same as the options.

With regard to housing sites each site was tested on one table against the score of the other sites. Those that were included in the Plan were shown to be the best sites as they scored the same or better to those sites not chosen.

DM had a residual issue with site 4 and 13 now combined as previously they had been dealt with and tested separately but were now one site.

IC confirmed the site proposer had written to confirm he had control of both sites.

And so that would be the way to address the problem.

IC asked whether the Policy appraisal would be given to the Parish Council on 8<sup>th</sup> December for Resolution.

DM confirmed it would.

4. Review of precept projections.

*IC had submitted some finance projections previously to the group.*

*IC proposed the precept amount put forward to the Parish Council for Neighbourhood Planning should be £8,000.*

AGREED

5. Correspondence.- Previously circulated by e-mail

6. Date of Next Meeting: 10<sup>th</sup> December 2015 7.30pm

The meeting ended at 10.30pm

Signed Chairman-----

Dated -----