

Minutes of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Meeting 10th 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. Adrian Batchelor; Dale Mayhew and Laura Bourke (Consultants); and Jane Bromley (Administration) Apologies: Judith Foot.
2. Declarations of Interest: Nick Owens sites 1, 2, 15 and 17. Ian Credland sites 1 & 2. Justine Fisher site 8. (JF made an amendment to her interest declaration as site 8 only); Virginia Pullen site 7. David Withycombe site 12. Frances Gaudencio site 8. Carol Wise 1 & 2. Victoria Standfast 1 & 2.

Local Green Space Declarations of Interest: Ian Credland LGS2; Virginia Pullan LGS5; Nick Owens LGS2; Justine Fisher LGS5; Adrian Batchelor LGS 6; Frances Gaudencio LGS 5.

3. The minutes of the meeting on 3rd September 2015 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.
4. Review of action points from 3rd September 2015.
Action 1. DM had included a higher density of units for site 10 now 15-20 units. Policy wording would be appropriate to allow an area of space along the frontage.
Action 2. It had been decided the mitigation wording would remain the same.
Action 3. HLAA document finalized.
Action 4. DM had circulated the Site Suitability papers to all working group.
Action 5. All Working Group familiar with SSAs and LGSSAs.
Action 6. VP and DW had finalized LGSSAs and sent around group.
5. Preparation for the Extraordinary Meeting of the Parish Council on 22nd September 2015- to agree recommendations to the Parish Council
IW read through a statement he had prepared as an opening introduction to all for the forthcoming extraordinary meeting of the Parish Council on 22nd September, which as the new Chair of the Parish Council he would Chair. Some facts were corrected by DM with regard to the number of Statutory Consultations that were required and SH clarified with DM to whom the feedback would be directed from each of these consultations. IC mentioned that IW might want to include that the feedback already received from the public consultations had been considered carefully by the Working Group and formed part of the evidence used to enable recommendations to be put forward to the Parish Council.

IC had prepared a framework for the wording to be put before the Parish Council containing the recommendations to the Parish Council from the Working Group concerning: Housing Need; Allocation of Sites; and Allocation of Local Green Space.

IC's introduction would run through what was to be achieved from the meeting and how the recommendations had been arrived.

FG thought it would be useful to have a visual display of what was being run through. JF Undertook to take the most important parts of the script and display them on a power point projection. In addition to display details regarding the sites and their location. **ACTION 1 JF**

DM asked whether the Working Group thought the Parish Council was to be asked to vote on individual sites or against recommendations.

BH thought it was important to keep discussions as brief and simple as possible and that recommendations should be put forward which the Parish Council may then accept or not.

IC considered that if the Parish Council did not agree to the Working Group's recommendation then they would have read the material given to them to enable them to make a counter recommendation which would then be put forward for Resolution.

Recommendations to be made:

1) Housing Need

DM suggested that the Working Group needed to acknowledge the District HEDNA allocation of 630 as a starting point but to point out that the methodology used in that assessment was not appropriate to the Parish. The HEDNA numbers assumes a flat distribution of housing across the District but the Mid Sussex Emerging Plan is encouraging higher numbers towards the larger settlement areas and for Parishes to come up with their own housing need using appropriate methodologies for the local area. The Parishes own Housing Need Assessment using different methodologies comes up with a range between 210 and 270.

IC had drafted the wording with regard to what was to be said regarding the Working Group's methodology of calculating housing need in the Parish. The allocation was put to the vote.

AGREED unanimously, the housing number need range of 210-270 be recommended to the Parish Council.

2) Allocation of Sites

The constraints on sites proposed as identified via the site suitability assessments (a test against local constraints) and sustainability assessments (i.e. a test against the PHLAA objectives) had placed the sites in three different categories: red; amber; green. Red being least suitable or sustainable. There was only one suitable site being Site 10.

The red sites were identified as: 1b; 1c; 2; 5a; 6; 6a; 7; 8; 12; 16; 17; and 17a The amber sites: 4; 9; 13; 15 & 20.

In order to satisfy the Parish Housing Need it would be necessary to choose from the amber sites.

IC put forward a suggestion of the following amber sites:

Site 15 and Sites 13 & 4 combined.

Sites 13 & 4 had combined to form one site. DM had received correspondence from the proposers of site 13 & 4 to say that they were putting themselves forward as one site. There was to be no housing on Site 4 it was to be used as a buffer to the North of Site 13 between the whole site and the Strategic Gap with Burgess Hill.

IC confirmed the three sites gave the following housing numbers to the Plan

Site 10.	15-20 units
Site 13 & 4 combined.	140 units
Site 15.	125-130 units

This met a housing need of 280 -290 units

IC asked whether the group would like to vote to agree this choice or whether they wanted to debate regarding the remaining amber sites.

A vote was called but FG stated she would like to debate the other sites before she offered her vote.

Site 9 and Site 20 were considered.

Site 9. The debate occurred around the site local constraints, being its location with regard to the strategic gap; its proximity to the railway crossing and its order in the order of preferences from the public consultation. It was thought that development on the site would have a more urban effect to the rural entrance to Hassocks along the A273 and that its location would have more impact on the Strategic Gap. It was not possible to overcome the proximity to the railway crossing and site 9 would increase traffic across this crossing. In terms of residence preference it was 13 out of 15 in the preference order.

Site 20. Due to constraints with regard to services running across the site and flooding there was only a small area of the site that was suitable for development. Site preference was 8th out of 15 available sites.

VS queried why Site 12 was not suitable and the answer lay in its location within the South Downs National Park. There needed to be overwhelming evidence to support its choice against sites not located in the SDNP which there was not.

VS also queried Site 7 but it was discussed that its low site suitability for development and its score of 11 out of 15 available sites in the resident's preference order from consultation had dissuaded from allocating the site.

After this debate all confirmed they were ready to vote on the recommendations as read out and set out above.

Of the twelve Working Group members present eleven agreed with the recommendation of suitable sites being Sites 10, 13& 4 combined; and 15. VS abstained from voting.

AGREED by majority that the sites 10, 13 & 4 (combined) and 15 be recommended to the Parish Council

DM advised that the developable area of Site15. had changed and that the constraints map and site maps needed to be altered to reflect this. VP would arrange with DM for this to occur. **ACTION 2. VP, DM**

3) Allocation of Local Green Spaces (LGS)

The recommendation was of those Local Green Spaces allocated those not recommended for development be put forward for LGS designation.

LGSs 4 and 9 would therefore not be considered further.

It was noted by DM that LGS 9 was site 4 and would the group not consider that albeit the space was allocated for development as it was not to have housing on it but be a buffer with the Strategic Gap it could still be designated. He reflected however, that as it was to be a designated buffer within the planning policy it would be adequately protected.

IC thought to allocate it as a site and also to designate it would be confusing and unnecessary.

IC reminded all that LGS8 was a SNCI but that SNCI achieves something different to LGS designation and therefore the two designations were necessary.

VP queried what if the LGS owner objected to the designation.

IC confirmed that all LGS owners had been written to and that reply from them had been taken into consideration but none of the replies had evidence to suggest that the land did not satisfy the LGS designation criteria. The owners would have a further chance to comment at the draft plan consultation stage and their comments would again be taken into account.

FG queried whether an LGS in the SDNP needed to be designated as didn't the SDNP give it enough protection. IC confirmed that development was not excluded from the National Park albeit that it was far more difficult to achieve planning permission in the Park. LGS designation did take away any threat for development and therefore gave the area further protection. The LGs selection was put to the vote.

AGREED unanimously, the LGSs 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 to be put forward for recommendation to the Parish Council.

The administration for the 22nd September 2015 Extraordinary Meeting of the Parish Council was run through.

It had been arranged that the Clerk would send out the agenda on 15th September. DM would hand deliver the appendices to the Councillors on 15th September with 4 copies going to the Parish Clerk as well as a soft copy to enable the Clerk to put the documentation up on the website. **ACTION 3. CLERK & DM**

IC asked if all Working Group members could attend the meeting of 22nd September even if they were not Councillors and for DM to attend as well. **ACTION 4. ALL** Questions from the Parish Council to be directed to the Working Group in the first instance. by the Working Group.

JF had organized the table and chairs for the Council and the 300 seats for the public. She had the projector and screen organised as well as the microphones and all would be set up on the afternoon of 22nd September. The hall at Downlands was booked from 6.30pm to 10.30pm.

JF, GC, BH volunteered to set up the hall. **ACTION 5. JF, JF, BH**

JF asked to receive the script for the evening as soon as it was finalized which IC undertook to send to her in the next couple of days after it had been circulated to the Working Group and they had approved it by midday on Saturday 12th September. **ACTION 6. ALL**

VP asked whether there would be a block vote on the LGS recommendation as some of the Councillors would have an interest in some of the sites. It was agreed that interests in LGSs would need to be recorded along with site interests at the start of the meeting. It would be up to the clerk to monitor the interests when voting occurred. **ACTION 7. CLERK**
JF informed the group that she didn't have an interest in site 7 as had been recorded in the minutes previously and this interest was removed from the minutes.

6. Correspondence.

Loxley solicitors had written to the Working Group on behalf of Gleeson and the reply to their letter was read out by IC. This had previously been sent around for the approval of the correspondence group.

7. Date of Next Meeting: 1st October 2015 7.30pm

Action Points Arising

1. JF to prepare power point summary of scripts and site map and site details.
2. VP DM site and constraints map to be altered for Site 15 developable area.
3. Clerk to post out agenda for 22nd September on 15th September to all Councillors. DM to hand deliver to all Councillors and Clerk's Office supporting documents for 22nd September on 15th September.
4. All Working Group members to attend the Extraordinary Meeting of the Parish Council on 22nd September. DM to attend.
5. JF, GC, BH to set up the hall at Downlands for the event.

6. All to check script written by IC and confirm by midday 12th September.
7. Clerk to monitor interest in sites and LGS during the meeting. If a debate occurred about a site or LGS in which a Councillor had an interest, they would be expected to leave the room. If a vote occurred involving a site or LGS in which they had an interest they would be expected to have no vote.

DRAFT