

Presentation of Site 12

The landowners and Surveyor friend of landowners presented the site. Bob Seabrook and Gillian and Nick being the landowners and Steve the friend.

The land discussed was wholly in the South Downs National Park.

A 'cartoon' map of the potential site layout was provided for the meeting only and a second plan containing narrative on Flooding and Highways risks was also provided.

Surface water flooding would be mitigated by a drainage scheme on site. Access would be across site owners own land and they did not foresee a problem.

Steve commented that there was every indication it would be a sustainable site. So as not to undermine the designation of the National Park adequate mitigation would be used.

Steve enquired what the group understood was the National Park's approach to Neighbourhood Plan sites?

IC confirmed that the National Park's default position to housing was no allocation of sites if other suitable sites exist.

IC mentioned the Lewis District case where the examiner had allocated 300 homes in the National Park as he felt it provided balance within the settlement. IW had requested a more detailed SHLAA report of the National Park but so far this had not been forthcoming.

IC suggested that the landowners contact the National Park themselves. Steve mentioned that there was a possibility of adding land to the south of the grave yard to the site and using more of the site for development but including this extra land as green space and ownership passed to the parish. VP asked what they felt to be appropriate housing density for the site. The Neighbourhood Plan having calculated 88.

Steve nothing has been set yet.

VP asked what the width of the southern buffer would be.

Steve not yet determined and open to discussion.

IW queried using land to the south of the burial ground as the burial ground may require this land to expand

Steve confirmed that this land was not a suitable burial site.

IW queried the second Keymer Park access

Steve confirmed this was a pedestrian and emergency vehicle access in all likelihood.

The owners queried why the site had a medium impact on traffic what extra impact did it have compared to a low impact site.

IC confirmed that all sites had assessments carried out equally and may be medium due to higher envisaged density, or size of site. He could not say how much weight would be put on this criteria.

Steve asked if it were possible to include in the detail of the site somewhere that development would only be carried out over 2/3 of the site and not the whole site.

IC advised that the detail would only come out at the planning stage.

Steve asked if the site would have more appeal if it were smaller IC advised he could not say.

Steve confirmed that the question therefore is if the site is suitable for development to some degree.

IC confirmed that this would be what the Parish Council would be considering.

DRAFT

DRAFT