

## Minutes of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Meeting 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2015

1. Attendees: Ian Credland; Nick Owens; Bill Hatton; Justine Fisher; Sue Hatton. Frances Gaudencio; Virginia Pullan; David Withycombe; Georgia Cheshire; Victoria Standfast; Ian Weir.  
Dale Mayhew and Laura Bourke (Consultants); and Jane Bromley (Administration)
2. Apologies and not present: Adrian Batchelor; Judith Foot.
3. Declarations of Interest: Nick Owens sites 1, 2, 15 and 17. Ian Credland sites 1 & 2. Justine Fisher site 7 & 8. Virginia Pullen site 7. David Withycombe site 12. Frances Gaudencio site 8. Judith Foot sites 1 & 2. Carol Wise 1 & 2. Victoria Standfast 1 & 2.
4. To approve the minutes of the meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> August 2015. The minutes were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.
5. Review of action points from 13 August 2015.  
Local Green Spaces actions would be dealt with under 6 below.  
The 22<sup>nd</sup> September meeting of the Parish Council at which sites for the Neighbourhood Plan would be chosen by the Council, would be advertised as any other Parish Council meeting would be apart from in addition an E Newsletter would be sent out by JF. JF would be meeting up with Downlands staff to sort out the arrangements for the microphones and for presentations.  
DMs action points would be dealt with below.
6. Preparation for the Extraordinary Meeting of the Parish Council on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2015.  
DM had produced the Housing Site Suitability Assessments (SSA). There was some clarification from the Group required before they could be finalised but any changes as a result of these clarifications was not expected to have a substantive effect on the conclusions reached.  
DM queried the density of housing on site 10. This was a site that maybe the working group would want to treat differently due to its location and increase the density per hectare calculation which applied to all sites currently.  
FG asked who the landowners were and IW replied they were Star Garages. The car park area was owned by WSCC.  
DW suggested that the site could accommodate shop units with two tiers of residential housing above.  
FG confirmed that the Economic Development Working Stream had not found any evidence that further business/retail units were required and it was footfall that was needed.

DW suggested three tiers of residential would therefore be appropriate and all agreed. DM would use this as an indication of density for this site for his SSA.

GC suggested that a green area to the front of the development would improve the visual impact of the site. IC thought this would be part of the planning process. VP reminded the group that the market set up in front of the site on some days and that this should be accommodated.

DM confirmed that if this site was chosen as a site for the Neighbourhood Plan details of frontage could be incorporated into the policy

BH talked about the Aspiration Policy of redesigning the area as a village centre for which the frontage would be required. This depended on whether planning permission was given on other area, which was required for the redesign, which was currently with MSDC for approval for development.

DM advised that the area could be set aside if it was justifiable in planning terms for instance to maintain an open aspect. The area could not be specified as a measurement. A policy is not able to design a site.

IC asked Dale to find words for the policy which would recommend high density but being set back from the road. **ACTION 1 DM**

DM advised that other comments had been incorporated as changes into the SSAs. He had removed the requirement for TPO information about sites as this information was not easily available.

VP confirmed that she would go through the assessments with regard to mitigation.

**ACTION 2 VP**

DM discussed the difference between 'landscape value' as a result of being designated an AONP or National Park, for instance and a high value due to a 'contribution to the Strategic Gap' to prevent coalescence. The SSAs had been changed to make this clearer.

DM confirmed the SSAs would be incorporated into a documents entitled the Hassocks Land Availability Assessment (HLAA) and would be available in final form on 8<sup>th</sup> September. **ACTION 3 DM**

IC went through the documents that were required for the meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> September, where the Working Group will make recommendations to the Parish Council for the Neighbourhood Plan.

HLAA

- a) Constraints map and Constraints document
- b) Housing numbers recommendation to include the updated Housing Needs document. The Housing Needs document was already in the public domain but needed to be incorporated with the other information for this purpose.
- c) Site recommendation document (from Site Suitability Assessments, sustainability appraisal information and consultation preference data)
- d) LGS recommendation document (LGS Suitability Assessments and candidate comments)

DM cautioned that the sites should not be chosen to fulfill the housing numbers need. They should be chosen on their merit as a suitable site for development. The Housing Needs document suggests 500 housing units are required whereas with constraints applied to sites available it may or may not be possible to supply this number. The

Parish Council may also want to take a view on whether they formally want to agree with the Housing Needs number, entitled the Objective Housing Need (OHN).

SH reminded all about the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment (HEDNA) updated by Mid Sussex DC in June. If the Neighbourhood Plans across the District do not fulfill the housing allocation to Neighbourhood Plans then the deficit will be allocated according to capacity. The Neighbourhood Plan would therefore need to ensure it had allocated its capacity within the Plan regardless of numbers.

DM Site suitability resulted in a red, orange or green traffic light arrangement to indicate suitability for development. The working group would need to decide whether:

- a) They agreed with the red and green site value?
- b) Of the orange values were there any that could be included as green?

By way of example DM talked about site 9 being of orange value. It was in the Strategic Gap, however the group may decide that the gap was robust enough (being a large gap) that a small development here would not compromise the gap. It was in the flood zone but the group may decide part of the site had some capacity for development. This would then take the site from orange to green value. In addition the preference from the community may take orange sites into green value.

DM then spoke about the Sustainability Appraisal. This was a test for each site against 13 sustainability objectives, for instance an objective to 'Improve Non Car Transport'. These tests picked up separate criteria from the SSAs.

BH indicated that this was a huge amount of information to fit together to set out in a coherent way to those not already involved in the process.

IC said he had thought that the sites would be chosen tonight but recognised that not all have been able to go through the SSAs.

IC asked whether the Group would prefer that DM choose the sites to go forward as green to the Parish Council and after some discussion it was decided that the Group would choose these sites.

It was decided that all would be sent hard copies of the SSAs **ACTION 4 DM** and that these would be read thoroughly to enable a vote on sites at the meeting next week on 10<sup>th</sup> September. In addition all of the Working Group would need to go through the Local Green Space Suitability Assessments prepared by VP and DW to similarly choose sites to go forward. **ACTION 5 ALL**

*All those of the working group with dispensations would be able to take part in the recommendation of sites. Those who had not obtained dispensations would not be able to recommend sites in which they had an interest.*

IC stressed the fact that absolute decisions needed to be made at the next Working Group meeting together with a decision on the wording for BH with which to address the Parish Council both for sites and LGS.

BH pointed out that IC would be able to describe to the Parish Council the process so long as he did not include any site details. Due to IC's interest in certain Plan sites he would not be able to be part of the decision making process at the Parish Council meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> September for those sites in which he has an interest - as is the case for other Cllrs who have interests in particular sites.

DM advised that LGSs were not included in the SSAs although some of the sites were suggested as LGSs as well.

IC paraphrased replies received from LGS land owners/developers/solicitors, to the letters he had sent out advising that their land was a candidate for a LGS. He felt these replies should be incorporated in the LGS suitability assessments. DM advised the assessments could be completed with a phrase that 'landowners comments were taken on board before the suitability assessments were finalised'. You could go further and say 'full copies of comments were available if required'.

VP and DW confirmed the final LGS Suitability Assessments would be available for 10<sup>th</sup> September and would be e-mailed to all beforehand. **ACTION 6 VP and DW**

7. Policy Options- Housing and LGS update included in 6 above.
8. Correspondence.
9. Site 12 had written to say they were in correspondence with MSDC regarding the inclusion of part of the burial ground in their site.
10. Date of Next Meeting: 10<sup>th</sup> September 2015 7.30pm

The meeting ended at 9.35pm

#### Action points

1. DM to include in site suitability assessment a higher density for the site due to location and should the site go forward as a chosen site then the policy wording should enable this but also an area of space in front of the development to keep an open aspect to the area.
2. VP to check mitigation wording across SSAs.
3. DM to finalise the HLAA document in time for the preliminary meeting with the PC on 8<sup>th</sup> September.
4. DM to send hard copies of the SSA documents to all Working Group on 4<sup>th</sup> September.
5. All Working Group to go through SSAs and Local Green Space assessments thoroughly to be able to contribute to voting on 10<sup>th</sup> September (subject to dispensations).
6. VP and DW to finalise LGS Suitability Assessments and e-mail to all group before 10<sup>th</sup> September meeting.