

HASSOCKS PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group held on 12 November 2015 at 7.30 pm in the Parish Centre, Adastra Park, Hassocks.

Present: Ian Credland (Chairman) (IC), Adrian Batchelor (AB), Justine Fisher (JCF), David Widdicombe (DW), Georgia Chesire (GCe) , Frances Guadencio (FG), Bill Hatton (BH), Sue Hatton (SH), Nick Owens (NO).

In Attendance: Dale Mayhew, Dowsett Mayhew (DM); Laura Bourke, Dowsett Mayhew (DM).

Members of Public x1.

1. Apologies for Absence.

Apologies for absence were received from Victoria Standfast, Jinny Pullen and Jane Bromley.

2. Declarations of Interest.

IC– Ham Field; VP – Pattendens (also known as Streamside); FG, JCF - land east of Ockley Lane; AB – Southdowns Farm and Friars Oak Field; DW - Land East of Lodge Lane

3. Approve minutes of the Meeting held on 15 October 2015.

Agreed to be signed.

4. Review of action points from 15 October 2015.

FG had sent around Paper re Proposal at previous meeting.

FG: Explained it was a proposal not a lobby group. It was intended to open discussion re community engagement. FG viewed the proposal as an opportunity for people to ask questions and/or seek clarity.

Recommended the NPGW can discuss and decide. It was acknowledged

perhaps the NPGW had gone past this now or perhaps people may wish to ask questions.

IC: The advice that had been received was clear. IC advised the NPGW cannot support proposal/sub group which is not aligned with the Neighbourhood Plan (NP). IC advised if people were to do this privately they would be unable to sit on the NPGW.

IC: Asked if those who had written the Proposal wanted it attached to the minutes.

DW: Expressed that if he is asked to attend a meeting in his capacity as Chair of Governors, he doesn't want to feel this is not possible/acceptable.

NPGW agreed this was a different matter and was free to attend such meetings.

GCe: Advised she is unlikely to have any meetings with WSCC

JCF: Stressed the Proposal was not intended as a lobby group. Advised that schooling issue is now where it should be i.e. with the schools. Justine acknowledged conversations are now happening with schools and WSCC. Explained the reason for writing the Proposal was to help facilitate the groups to talk to each other. Will accept if this isn't the will of the Group.

IC: Questioned whether the NPGW were talking about different things now, i.e. the school crisis now while the NP looks to and plans for the future.

JFC: Advised it is best to look for a long-term strategy rather than fire fight.

FG: If WSCC are saying NPGW are doing nothing re school site, it is not the role of the NPGW to solve the schools site issue. FG explained there are a lot of ripples in the community- people saying NPGW not doing anything. FG asked what is our role as a PC and NPGW to communicate what is happening with a school.

JCF: Expressed frustration re bad press from WSCC about the NPGW.

IC: WSCC are trying to cover up their shortcomings. Ian explained NPGW haven't had a response from WSCC despite numerous requests to engage on the school issue.

JCF: Stressed the Parish have to work with WSCC and MSDC and need to engage.

IC: The NPGW have informed WSCC of 5 potential sites, that should be considered. There is nothing more the NPGW can do at this stage.

DM: At Regulation 16 Stage, a Consultation Statement will need to accompany the Plan. This document will detail how the NPGW have engaged and consulted on the NP. This will be submitted to the Examiner. DM advised the NPGW to ensure all details of engagement are documented in this Statement.

IC: Has spoken to local residents as necessary to explain the extent the NPGW can support/facilitate delivery of a school site.

FG: Keen to ensure the community understand how much the NPGW have done to try and engage with WSCC.

SH: Asked what the next course of action is?

DW: Advised the NPGW have set out everything to WSCC and now need to move on.

IC: Agreed to not attach the Proposals to the minutes.

IC summarised the actions from the previous meeting:

- NPGW agreed a criteria policy re School: Action complete- to be discussed.
- DM agreed to make amendments re policies: Action complete- to be discussed.
- FG: Advised a discussion would be useful on a potential policy on healthcare facilities
- Parking Section of NP to reference Parish Council Report on Traffic: DM agreed this would be included in supporting text of Transport Aims.
- WSCC replies: IC shared correspondence
- Request to join NPGW: Ian responded.

5. Policy Options

a. Agreed Policies:

DM handed out copies

IW went through previous policy amendments

FG asked re Character and Design Policy about energy requirements. DM advised Code for Sustainable Homes is no longer policy compliant.

BH: Confirmed energy efficiency paper explained this a year ago and agreed policies not suitable for NP.

DM: Updated the NPGW on historic windfall rates and a number of 10 per annum is a precautionary number.

IC: Expressed this number is helpful.

IW: Stated a 5 year period is a good period of review

BH: Advised windfall continue to come forward. Number is defensible. No point in going back any further.

SH: Asked who agrees with 10?

FG: Asked where are these sites in the Parish?

IW: Describes where the sites could be.

IC: Asked if the vote was unanimous?

FG: Advised she was willing to vote.

All agreed to include an allowance of 10 dwellings units per annum will come forward over the NP period.

NO: Advised a grammatical error on the Tourism Policy.

NO: Asked if there was a risk that the Local Gap Policy wording of "other uses", could include fracking. Other wording suggested by the NPGW. DM explained wording cannot be unduly narrow. BH suggested to leave policy as is. NO agrees to leave as is, acknowledges it is useful to have the discussion. All agreed to policy wording as drafted.

FG: Health Facilities: suggested NP highlight the desire to enable retention and provision of health facilities. DM suggested it is included as an AIM rather than a Policy.

FG: Explained the earlier work done on health provision.

NO: Advised the Aim should read "Support will be offered to the local care commissioning group to deliver adequate locally based health care provision in the Parish".

All: Discussed and agreed AIM wording.

b. Policies to be agreed

Policy 1: New wording under bullet point 2

All agreed policy wording

Bullet one: DW recommended it is rephrased into positive language

Policy 5: DM suggested additional wording re Park Authority

IW: Asked a question re specific wording. DM explained the duty of the SDNP.

DW: Advised to have consistent wording re Strategic Policy, Local Gap and SDNP policy. Grammatical point raised re phrasing.

Policy 6: DW advised the Policy should read "Conservation Area", "Keymer Conservation Area" and "Clayton Conservation Area"

Policy 11: FG suggested wording is revised in first sentence. Suggested "provision of adequate school provision".

DM advised Policy 11 is specific for provision of a primary school but could have another policy/aim for other educational provision. DM explained if the policy is broadened out to cover schooling generally the criteria will not apply.

GCe: Doesn't want the policy to be too woolly. Fear of taking policy out.

IC: Gave update re unfunded WSCC projects in Hassocks.

BH advised he agreed with Georgia

DM explained the purpose of a sequential approach to the school site.

IC suggested Policy is agreed. All voted in favour.

FG: Asked could we have a subsequent policy on supporting the delivery of educational facilities generally?

DM suggested Aim.

Sue agreed to have an Aim re other educational facilities

All agreed to have a general Aim on supporting the delivery of adequate educational facilities for all ages in the Parish.

AIM to read: "Supported will be offered for the delivery of adequate education facilities to meet the needs of all ages of the local resident population".

Policy 15: NPGW advised to update golf club to "golf course", and wording from "east" to "west" of Blemont Recreation Ground.

All agreed to include an additional bullet point re future maintenance of public open space. DM explained how this could be done. It was noted the Golf Club expect to maintain golf course.

Recommended to remove "prepare" from policy wording.

Policy 16: Discussion re buffer, recommended to remove " positively respond to the prevailing character of the surrounding area".

Recommended to include bullet point re "protect the amenity of existing residential properties bordering the site".

Policy 17: NO asked why the development needs to be "set back" from Keymer Road, discussion re why it should be set back. All agreed policy wording to be left as drafted.

Aim 1: GCe suggested Town Centre is changed to Village Centre. All agreed wording.

c. Skeleton Plan

DM explained the skeleton of Plan.

NO recommended Town Centre is amended to Village Centre.

BH: Recommended reference to Clayton is included under Chapter 2. Make clear its Hassocks, Keymer and Clayton. DM agreed it will be addressed in Chapter 2. Discussion re Clayton being in SDNP and what development if any would be acceptable in the Park.

NPGW recommend Health Facilities to be included as an AIM on the Plan Outline.

6. Correspondence.

No further correspondence.

7. Date of Next Meeting.

Parish Council meeting 08/12/15.

NPGW meeting to approve material 26/11/15- DM circulate material prior to meeting on 26/11/15.

Date_____ Chairman_____

DRAFT