

Minutes of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Meeting 15th October 2015

Attendees: Ian Credland; Bill Hatton; Justine Fisher (JF); Sue Hatton; Virginia Pullan; David Withycombe; Georgia Cheshire; Ian Weir; : Nick Owens; Frances Gaudencio; Victoria Standfast; Judith Foot (JAF); Adrian Batchelor.Dale Mayhew and Laura Bourke (Consultants Dowsett Mayhew Consultancy); and Jane Bromley (Administration)

1. Apologies: None.
2. Declarations of Interest: Ian Credland sites 1 & 2. Justine Fisher site 8; Virginia Pullen site 7. David Withycombe site 12. Nick Owens sites 1, 2, 15 and 17. Frances Gaudencio site 8. Victoria Standfast 1 & 2.
Local Green Space Declarations of Interest: Ian Credland LGS2; Justine Fisher LGS5. Nick Owens LGS2 Adrian Batchelor LGS 6; Frances Gaudencio LGS 5.
3. To approve the minutes of the Meeting held on 1 October 2015
Graham Glenn & Vanessa Cummins, from WSCC and present at the last meeting, had suggested some alterations to the minutes of the meeting of 1st October. The Working Group discussed these suggestions and felt the minutes as they stood were a true reflection of the meeting and that the suggested alterations would not be accepted.
4. Review of action points from 1 October 2015
 - 1) A letter from Vanessa Cummins had been received in response to a letter from DM re phasing.
 - 2) The way forward with regard to the Neighbourhood Plan and the provision in the plan for schooling would be discussed later in the meeting.
 - 3) DM had circulated electronic policy drafts which would be discussed later in the meeting.
5. Consider the circulated paper “Education within Hassocks Parish” and related documents
 - a. To consider a RESOLUTION that:
 - i. we publish the draft plan as soon as possible; and
 - ii. we incorporate a criteria based policy as a basis to bring forward a potential school site(s) having undertaken an appropriate assessment;
 - b. In the event 5.a. is not resolved to consider any other proposal which may come forward

BH had recommended in his paper that the Neighbourhood Plan be published as soon as possible and that a non-site specific criteria based policy for the provision of schooling be included in the plan. The non- site specific policy would be required as there was no specific provision available from a preferred site currently.

FG commented that she supported this recommendation but that she had a proposal to put before the working group regarding schooling that she would present. FG asked DM if a non-site specific policy was to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan, whether the policy would

specify the site selection criteria that should be applied as had been carried out for site selection for housing?

DM The criteria for site selection could be laid out with reference to WSCC's own set of criteria that were used for physical attributes of a site when considering land for a school, together with other criteria, such as planning policy constraints. DM would undertake to write this policy if the WG considered this the right policy for the Neighbourhood Plan. Options in a Plan as to schooling sites would not be Regulation 14 compliant. If one site is identified in the policy but this needs to subsequently be amended to a different site, there is a risk that this would represent a substantial change and thus the Regulation 14 consultation would need to be redone.

IC advised that a Mid Sussex District Councillor had suggested that the housing numbers in the Emerging Plan may not satisfy the Inspector. IC thought there was every chance that site selection would need to be revisited. This combined with the fact that WSCC had a record of being poor at predicting the number of school places required may mean that a two form entry school may not be sufficient. A non-site specific policy would allow flexibility to accommodate a larger school if required.

Various sites and schooling provisions were discussed.

FG then set out her proposal for looking into a provision for schooling under an umbrella group of the Neighbourhood Plan. JF commented that she had drafted the proposal with FG and supported the proposal. FG said she would like the umbrella group to be made up of people with an interest in the issue and with knowledge of the schooling situation in Hassocks. The umbrella group would work with the community, WSCC and MSDC to talk to landowners and developers to move towards enabling a school provision. Initially she thought the umbrella group should consist of herself, JF, DW and GC.

DM asked for clarification that the umbrella group was to be under the umbrella of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group. FG confirmed.

DM expressed concern that this would represent a potential conflict of interest. If the Working Group were to recommend a non-site specific policy for a new school it would be difficult for a sub-group to then pursue a process to identify a preferred site. The risk is the Plan would need to be held up awaiting the outcome of the umbrella group to determine a site.

NO commented that BH's recommendation should be voted upon and that the umbrella group should be formed of people from the community other than Working Group or Parish Council members where a conflict with the Neighbourhood Plan policy existed. SH agreed that it should be accepted that there were other people who could run this group who would not jeopardise the timing of the Neighbourhood Plan.

IC felt that after the Plan was a 'made' Plan then members of the group would then be free to get involved in such an umbrella group and that if not held up, this could be as early as Easter.

Since the school provision would take some years to enact then in the scheme of things this was not too long a time. IC enquired as to how many of the Working group would like to vote on BH's recommendation. All who voted, voted in favour, VS abstained.

IC proposed that the Working Group RESOLVE to:

- i) Publish the draft Neighbourhood Plan as soon as possible.

DW seconded. ALL IN FAVOUR.

- ii) Incorporate a non- site specific criteria based policy to bring forward a potential school site(s).

BH seconded. ALL IN FAVOUR.

DM undertook to carry out the writing of the non-site specific policy after looking into the criteria to be used. **ACTION 1. DM**

FG asked the group whether they were agreed that they ask DM to give advice regarding the set-up of the umbrella group to enable engagement with the community on this matter.

IC Clarified DM was to look into whether or not being a member of the Working Group or Parish Council precluded the individual from pursuing school options before the Neighbourhood Plan was made.

The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group AGREED.

DM Undertook to look into to what extent with regard to existing responsibilities, an individual on the Working Group and/ or Parish Council could engage with the community on the schooling provision matter as compared to a non- Working Group/Parish Council individual.

ACTION 2. DM

6. Planning out draft Policy Options - reviewing the options suggested to date.

The Working Group went through the draft policy option document as prepared by DM. The document was marked up for wording additions and deletions.

H2 – Phasing of Development.

Vanessa Cummins from WSCC had written responding to a letter sent on behalf of the Working Group by DM requesting support for phasing. The reply was that WSCC would not support phasing.

DM added that phasing of the delivery housing through a NP must be justified. For example, this might relate to the delivery of adequate infrastructure. This can occur, for example on large housing sites, where new a school needs to be built as part of the development and be completed prior to a stated quantum of housing being constructed (e.g. 500 dwellings).

However, this is more difficult to achieve for a non-site specific school policy. It would be difficult to impose phasing controls across multiple housing sites, as it would be contentious as to which site could be built first.

The Working Group AGREED not to include a phasing policy. **ACTION 3.DM**

H6- Dwelling Place Standards.

To be removed as it is already covered in DP 25 of the District policy. **ACTION 4 DM**

H8- Affordable Housing

Reference to percentages to be removed. **ACTION 5 DM**

H9- Rural Exception Sites

Policy to be removed. **ACTION 6 DM**

H10- Rural Workers Accommodation

DM said that there were rigorous criteria set through the National Planning Policy for such accommodation which could be relied upon and that it was not necessary to duplicate this. Policy to be removed. **ACTION 7 DM**

H11- Windfall Sites

DM to carry out some historical analysis to determine likely projections for windfall numbers over the plan period. **ACTION 8 DM**

Retail /Office Space/ Non Retail Workshops And Stores-
Policy to be removed. **ACTION 9 DM**

Local Green Space-

There was some discussions as to the inclusion of Land South of Downlands as a Local Green Space as this could possibly provide land for schooling being WSCC owned. The Land was voted for as a Local Green Space by the Parish Council on 22nd September and therefore could not be removed.

IC thought it could remain as a Local Green Space at the same time as being playing fields for a school, the current playing fields providing the building land.

DM confirmed that it could be reconsidered at the time of consultation of the draft plan in the light of feedback from the community if necessary.

Air Quality Management-

With regard to this policy it was thought best not to specify distances within which development should be considered for its effect on the AQMA. **ACTION 10 DM**

Community Facilities-

FG requested that under Community Facilities, Health Facilities be explored and ideas for this were to be sent to DM. **ACTION 11 FG/ ALL**

Transport- Parking.

Reference was to be made to the Parish Council Parking Policy. **ACTION 12 DM**

7. Correspondence

A letter had been received from Vanessa Cummins from WSCC regarding a request sent from the Working Group by DM for support for the phasing of building to allow the school provision to advance ahead of demand from the new developments. DM was to draft a reply to this on the grounds that no reply might look like acquiescence and that the Working Group need to protect their position as the comments in the letter were not a fair representation.

ACTION 13. DM

All other letters had received the standard response that further comments could be made on the plan at the draft plan consultation.

A resident who had been present at the September allocation meeting had expressed a wish to become involved in the Working Group. Members of the Working Group felt that it would not be appropriate to take on a new member at this stage of the plan. IC would draft a response. JF commented that it could be mentioned that future projects may require his help.

ACTION 14. IC

8. Date of Next Meeting: 29th October 2015 at 7.30 pm.

The meeting closed at 10pm

Actions arising:

1. Non site specific school provision policy to be written. DM
2. DM to investigate, restrictions of engagement with the community to find a schooling site, for a WG/PC member.
3. 3-10 Policy amendments. DM
11. FG/All to provide ideas for a Health Facility Policy
12. DM to make reference to the Parish Council Policy on Parking.
13. DM to reply to letter from VC, WSCC.
14. IC to respond to resident's offer of joining the Working Group.