# Minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group held on 14<sup>th</sup> May 2015 at 7.30pm in the Parish Centre, Adastra Park, Hassocks

Present:Ian Credland (Chairman)<br/>Justine FisherJudith Foot<br/>Geoff CopleyJane BromleyBill HattonAdrian Batchelor<br/>Frances GaudencioDavid Withycombe

Clerk: Elaine Gilbert

Also present was Dale Mayhew, Dowsett Mayhew, Jane Bromley

#### 1. To accept apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Virginia Pullan and Georgia Cheshire

#### 2. To accept Declarations of Interest

Ian Credland and Judith Foot declared an interest in Ham Fields, Frances Gaudencio , land east of Ockley Lane, and Adrian Batchelor, land south of Dale Avenue

#### 3. To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2015

The minutes were taken as read, agreed by the meeting, and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

IC reminded members that they needed to write individually to the Clerk for a dispensation - which the full PC had already resolved would be granted.

#### 4. Reports from Workstream Leaders

#### a) Housing

IC explained that work on policy options needed to now be brought forward to a discussion with the full group. They were currently concentrating on preparation for the next consultation event. It was hoped that the result of the July event would be an affirmation of the January results.

#### b) Economic Development/Tourism

Two surveys had been sent to local businesses and thanks went to Geoff Copley for analysing the results. It is believed that there are 500 home workers but only 19 had responded. Issues raised were parking, hubs for home workers and shared services. MSDC has a design vision and Dale advised that if this was relevant there was no need to produce a duplicate policy. Bill said he had looked at this regarding the design of shop fronts and felt that usual planning considerations together with District Plan would suffice. Other Neighbourhood Plans that he had seen adopted a similar approach.

Discussion turned to the Station Goods Yard and the development brief which was approved some time ago. The economic viability of developing the site might be questioned given that the development brief has never been taken advantage of. Additional consideration needs to be given to the loss of business / employment space if the site were allocated for development.

GC commented that the community had been asked for favoured sites for housing and had not been asked for an opinion on other potential uses.

There was general discussion regarding the factors which should be ultimately consider in site allocation. This would not only be the preference of the community, the NPWG would present the pros and cons of each site.

FG: asked if mixed development was possible?

DM commented that this was possible and that provision for other workspace could be made in a development.

There was discussion about the feasibility of adding additional questions to the ballot about use. It was agreed that this was a complex issue as there were many additional questions which could be added to each site. The discussion extend to how the PC would consider the allocation.

DM agreed the preference of the community was one of the factors to consider and the ClIrs must consider how much weight to place on that factor and on other factors such as economic need, employment need, schooling need.

All the factors must be placed before the PC and then the rationale for allocation will appear in the draft plan.

FC confirmed the surveys closed 14 May.

#### c) Amenities/Education/Health

Steven Ecroyd had written to the NHS enquiring how they were planning for increased numbers of patients. No response had been received.

Dale had composed a letter to WSCC regarding places available in local schools which will be used as the basis for commentary.

David said that at a meeting with WSCC it had been stated that the Infant school is at full capacity, but a feasibility study had been commissioned to establish whether the school could be expanded for 2016. Ian said that it had already been acknowledged that all the schools were full and bearing in mind that the projection for Hurstpierpoint was for another 300 houses this was of grave concern. However, this was not in the remit for NPWG but needed to be disclosed to the public in an unbiased way. Dale pointed out that the developer would argue that it they provide a financial contribution then it is WSCC's responsibility to determine where the additional school places will be provided. Apparently there is no limit to the distance that a child can travel to school and if necessary WSCC would have to provide buses. Ian said that two sites had been identified as suitable for schools to be built; one could offer a primary school and the other land.

There was some discussion about the weight that should be attached to offers made by proponents. These offers must be taken at face value.

GC commented that site 8 might not be the best location for a school, dependent on the location of other development.

# d) Transport

Geoff had produced a transport background paper which had been sent to WSCC and MSDC. Moving forward to the event he had now started to assess how much traffic would be associated with each of the sites. It was emphasised that this had not been done as a number counting exercise but rather as a 'traffic light' system based on the criteria of ease of access to and from the site, relevant traffic generation and access to the station. The conclusion was that 7 sites were at the low end, 5 in the middle end and 5 at the top end. He now had to ensure there were no anomalies. Ian asked if Geoff had looked at Gleeson and Rydon's predications. Geoff said he would look but did not think they would be very different from his own.

## e) Environment/Wildlife/Nature

David said he had met with Ginny and had started putting text together for the sites.

lan felt it was now time to bring the separate work streams together and that this should be started at the next meeting. Dale agreed and suggested starting with transport. However, Geoff is unable to attend the next meeting.

## 5. Newsletter

Justine said she wanted to put out a newsletter to promote the next event. She planned to use MailChimp and send it out to the e-mail database. She said she would compose a draft for approval before sending out. Ian expressed concern about the Data Protection Act and it was agreed that Justine would use the database from the office and ask everyone on the database if they would like to sign up for MailChimp rather than automatically putting them on MailChimp.

## 6. Next Consultation Event

This was scheduled to take place on 10<sup>th</sup> & 11<sup>th</sup> July. Georgia had ordered two banners at £90 each and leaflets. The banner text and front and back texts for the leaflets had been agreed and ordered. 500 booklets would be available at the event outlining site assessments, preference order, a map and ballot paper and a quote was required for this.

## 7. Planning School Places, Response to WSCC

It was unanimously agreed that Dale's letter be sent to WSCC, copies to lan and the clerk.

## 8. Correspondence

e-mail from Robert Seabrook re site 12 Site 17 – legal difficulties Planningsphere regarding the golf club and land for a school Hudson's – site 12 Barratt – would like to build on sites 13 and 20 Graham Glenn of WSCC re land on South Downs Farm

## 9. Dates of next meeting 28<sup>th</sup> May 2015 at 7.30 pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.30 pm

Date	Chairman