

## Minutes of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Meeting 3rd March 2016

Attendees: Ian Credland; Nick Owens; David Withycombe; Ian Weir; Bill Hatton; Frances Gaudencio; Virginia Pullan; Sue Hatton; Judith Foot (JAF); Georgia Cheshire;  
Laura Bourke and Dale Mayhew (Consultants Dowsett Mayhew Consultancy).  
Jane Bromley (Administration).  
Four members of the public present.

1. Apologies for absence. Justine Fisher; Victoria Standfast; Adrian Batchelor.
2. Declarations of Interest: Ian Credland sites 1 & 2. Nick Owens sites 1, 2, and 15. David Withycombe site 12; Frances Gaudencio site 8; Virginia Pullan site 7.  
Local Green Space Declarations of Interest: Ian Credland LGS2; Nick Owens LGS2; Nick Owens LGS2; Frances Gaudencio LGS 5  
Schools Interest: David Withycombe Hassocks Infants; Frances Gaudencio Windmills Junior. Sue Hatton Downlands and Windmills Junior.
3. The minutes of the meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> February 2016 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.  
IC went through the action points from that meeting. The action regarding social media will be carried forward. The second action had been dealt with in that the comments had been summarised and presented to the Working Group.
4. Discussion of Regulations 14 responses.  
Prior to the meeting the full comments from respondents had been sent together with their summary to all of the Working Group. The comments had been sorted into: those on the Sustainability Appraisal; general comments; comments per policy; and statutory consultee comments.  
For the purpose of tonight's discussion a three columned table had been presented to the working group. Each respondent had been given a reference number in the very left hand column, followed by the summary of the comments that had been made, followed on the right hand side of the table a column area for actions from the working group.  
No recommendations would be made tonight with regard to the comments but the working groups discussions would be noted by DM and LB and used in the recommendation process at a later date.  
The working group went through the summarised comments and referred at times to the full detail of the comments where further clarification was required.

### Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

There had been three respondents with comments to the SA.

15- The census data would be looked at again to ascertain whether there was a technical inaccuracy regarding the definition for 'higher education levels 3 & 4'. This would have no material impact.

163 -Had felt the SA was inconsistent with other information. DM felt that the SA tallied with all information but would come back with further clarification if it was required. VP confirmed that the analysis of sites had been reviewed

and change during the process but the changes had been consistent for all sites. DM felt in response to the contention that the heritage setting of Ockley Manor would be compromised, that it was possible to deliver site 13 & 4 without any detrimental effect on Ockley Manor. The NPPF policies safeguarded heritage assets and that if they were put under any detrimental effect by development that there was an onus to prove that the benefit outweighed the harm caused.

IC concluded that there was a general consensus that due regard had been made to the Ockley Manor Heritage Asset.

174- The respondent contended that there were not adequate reasons given not to allocate Pattendens site for the Neighbourhood Plan.

DW confirmed that all sites had been given the same consideration. The NPPF was clear that sites within National Parks (NP) should not be considered unless there were no other suitable sites.

IC concluded there was a general consensus that there was no reason to change the conclusion not to allocate the Pattendens site.

#### General Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan (NP)

23- Comments noted.

24, 60, 49- All brought up a query as to the partiality of the working group and in particular the chairman.

IC felt it necessary to mention that although the working group made recommendations they did not make the decisions with regard to the NP these were made at public meetings by the Parish Council. Working group members with interests had all declared these interests at all meetings. Work had been carried out in group and no one person had been responsible for one area of the plan. To carry out the work involved to produce the plan and not to involve people with some sort of interest would have not been possible. FG confirmed that at one time there were 21 sites involved in the NP and these covered the whole of the parish area and to find a group where no one had an interest in any site would not have been possible. IW considered that if one of the working group had been biased this would have been watered down by the many in the group that did not.

The respondents had felt the working group had not listened to professional advice given to them from their consultant. DM advised that he was not aware that the group had ever disregarded his advice.

49- General opposition to more houses. IC advised that no development was not an option.

75, 83- The respondents were aggrieved that the sites chosen were not as close to the train station as other sites. The group concluded that distance to train stations was only one factor in determining choice of sites.

76- IC confirmed that planning applications were outside of the control of the working group and DM clarified that sites with planning proposals applied for were not favoured sites but treated in the same way as other sites.

78- Noted

79- The respondent queried the housing needs figures. IC confirmed that a blend of methodologies had been used to calculate the housing need the working group had not relied on one particular calculation. IW advised that the Mid Sussex District Plan (MSDP) had been clear that it wanted NP to calculate their own housing need.

84- Noted

98- Noted

99- NO spoke about the process of consultation <sup>and</sup> that the final consultation, the referendum, had not yet been undertaken. IC confirmed that the Consultation Statement would provide all the evidence of the consultations taken place.

100- Noted

105- DM Standards of design are a buildings regulations matter now and not in the remit of the working group. The NP would not pass examination if it went beyond the reach given to it by the NPPF in this respect.

113- Same response as 105.

124- Noted and will change.

147- Noted

170- All sites were considered including green field sites and assessed in the same manner.

174- As per 24, 60, 27

175- Due process undertaken. DM The working group had taken into consideration all of the professional evidence available to the group.

176- A criteria based policy had been included for schooling in the plan and the group awaited action from WSCC. Phasing was not supported by WSCC.

186- as 176

Objects to NP

13-Noted

Support the NP

A total of 92 respondents

Policy 1 - Hassocks Burgess Hill Gap

16- Concern that Policy 14 conflicted with Policy 1. IC felt there was sufficient scope within the masterplan wording for a flexible design approach. DM advised that a design 'substantially' in line with the NP would be acceptable to MSDC.

108,166,184- All concerned with removing the Policy 1 from the NP. IC felt that the Policy 1 went further than the MSLP in protecting the gap and that MSLP had designated the strengthening of its own Gap Policy as the remit of NPs.

Policy 2 - Ditchling Gap

175- As for Policy 1.

Policy 3 - Local Green Spaces (LGS)

1. - VP There had originally been 8 LGS one was designated as a proposed site and therefore the numbering changed and respondent 1 is using the old numbering. Objection noted

A lot of support for Friars Oak LGS

21- For LGS8 read LGS7 in the NP.

The comments on the LGS were passed onto VP and DW who prepared the assessment of them.

VP and DW being Chartered Members of, The Landscape Institute each with 30 years of experience in the public and private sectors.

**Policy 4 - Green Infrastructure**

175 – Noted and will be annotated as such.

**Policy 5 – South Downs National Park (SDNP)**

30 and 184 - Noted but SDNP as a Statutory Consultee supports this policy.

**Policy 6 – Conservation Area**

No comments other than Statutory Consultee to be considered later.

**Policy 7 – Air Quality (AQ)**

175 and 184- Object to the use of 'no adverse impact'. DM NPPF requires compliance to EU limits and for consistency with the AQ Action Plan. The Action Plan requires that development does not cause 'unacceptable levels'. DM to make a recommendation for this policy based on this.

**Policy 8 – Character & Design**

175- Felt the Village Design Statement (VDS) should not be in the body of the Policy and hold so much weight as it contains areas which are not relevant. IC advised that that was why the terminology, 'have regard to' the VDS was used.

**Policy 9 – Open Space**

IC confirmed that the Policy was not talking about a specific open space but open spaces, within the criteria, in general.

**Policy 10 and 11**

No comments.

**Policy 12- Education Provision**

97 – Thought the Policy wording unclear. IC confirmed it was in line with the requirements of the Local Education Authority.

DM confirmed that recommendations up to and including respondent, other than statutory consultees, comments on Policy 12 would be put forward at the next meeting. Recommendations would relate to respondents comments only and no changes to Policies would be recommended at this stage without the group having looked through the Statutory Consultee comments.

IC that the remainder of respondents' comments on the housing policies would be looked at, at the next meeting together with the recommendations.

5. Correspondence. None

6. Date of Next Meeting: 17<sup>th</sup> March 2016 at 7pm and thereafter 24<sup>th</sup> March 2016 at 7pm

Signed Chairn