

Minutes of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Meeting 4th February 2016

1. Attendees: Ian Credland; Nick Owens; David Withycombe; Ian Weir; Bill Hatton; Frances Gaudencio; Virginia Pullan.
Laura Bourke and Dale Mayhew (Consultants Dowsett Mayhew Consultancy).
Jane Bromley (Administration).
Mark Johnson from Gleeson and John Woolmer, Terence O'Rourke Consultancy (Both left the meeting after item 4.)
Apologies for absence. Justine Fisher (JF); Sue Hatton; Judith Foot (JAF); Georgia Cheshire; Adrian Batchelor; Victoria Standfast.
Seven members of the public were present.

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;

Schools Interest: David Withycombe Hassocks Infants; Frances Gaudencio Windmills Junior.

3. The minutes of the meeting on 7th January 2016 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.
IC went through the action points from that meeting. The Parish Clerk had advertised the Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Plan. IC to Speak to JF regarding social media advertising action, is carried forward. **ACTION IC**

4. Presentation from the proponents of allocated development sites 13 & 4 with associated questioning from members.

Mark Johnson from Gleeson and Johnson Woolmer, from the planning consultancy Terrace O'Rourke spoke concerning the combined site 13 and 4 as allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Site Layout:

Print outs of a satellite image of the site and basic layout were passed around to the group. JW briefly described the site explaining that the land interest ended to the west of the site before the wooded area adjacent to the railway line and extending to the boundary of the existing Clayton Mills Mackay Avenue development to the South, to the East at Land bordering Ockley Road and Northwards into the Local Gap with between Hassocks and Burgess Hill. 10 hectares. Open space was to be provided to the North to provide a buffer between the development and the Local Gap. MJ pointed out that vehicular access from Ockley Road towards the Southern end of the site was awkward due to site lines and hence the access had extended Northwards into the Local Gap area and away from the Eastern area where land was not in the site owner ownership anyway. IW expressed concern at this. MJ confirmed all the technical detail would be provided on assessment of other areas for vehicular access in due course.

Questions and queries:

IW queried whether footpaths away from the site could be improved to provide a better footpath network with money provided from the development? MJ did not see this as a problem so long as the expenditure conformed to the statutory requirements.

FG asked whether any constraints could be identified with regard to the development? MJ advised that a Constraints and Opportunities document would be produced which would identify any constraints.

DW queried the density of the proposed development and IC confirmed it was in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan and lower than the surrounding development.

IW wondered if a link via Mackay Avenue could be achieved? MJ advised that although feasible this would involve purchasing private property and he was not sure what this would add to the sustainable credentials of the scheme. IC ask whether there were any issues with a single point of access for a development this size? MJ thought not. IC felt it would be desirable to find a way to lessen the impact of the new development on the existing development to the South.

MJ confirmed that similar to the Neighbourhood Plan process that they would engage with the local community and adjust their plan to try to accommodate concerns expressed. If from the consultation it would appear that a buffer between Mackay Avenue residents and the new development was popular then this could be accommodated. At this point MJ pointed out that he hoped there would be a degree of flexibility in the policies drafted in the Neighbourhood Plan to allow then to take on board local concerns in their designs.

DW queried whether there was any reason the development could not go further north to allow more space between the new and existing development? MJ asked if there were any Local groups which should be consulted sooner rather than later. IC mention the Mackay Avenue Residents Association. MJ confirm not from their point of view.

IC asked whether the buffer zone to the North of the proposed layout could finger into the development rather than being a straight line?

MJ explained that a landscape specialist would look at the design for features such as this to make the site as attractive as possible.

IW stated that the footpath to the North of the site has attractive views and it would be important the maintain these.

Site Proposer's Land Ownership:

DM asked for clarification as to the area of land under the site proposer's control, whether:

the woodland to the West was outside the site proposer's control;

land to the North was within the site proposer's control;

and the land bordering Ockley Lane was outside the site proposer's control?

MJ confirmed that was the case.

Progress of site development:

MJ mentioned that they intended to go ahead with the process of applying for Planning permission and how would this fit with the Neighbourhood Plan timescales?

IC confirmed that the group were pursuing an aggressive timescale but depending on the comments received on the draft plan it was not possible to

Minutes of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Meeting
4th February 2016

1. Attendees: Ian Credland; Nick Owens; David Withycombe; Ian Weir; Bill Hatton; Frances Gaudencio; Virginia Pullan.
Laura Bourke and Dale Mayhew (Consultants Dowsett Mayhew Consultancy).
Jane Bromley (Administration).
Mark Johnson from Gleeson and John Woolmer, Terence O'Rourke Consultancy (Both left the meeting after item 4.)
Apologies for absence. Justine Fisher (JF); Sue Hatton; Judith Foot (JAF); Georgia Cheshire; Adrian Batchelor; Victoria Standfast.
Seven members of the public were present.

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;

Schools Interest: David Withycombe Hassocks Infants; Frances Gaudencio Windmills Junior.

3. The minutes of the meeting on 7th January 2016 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.
IC went through the action points from that meeting. The Parish Clerk had advertised the Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Plan. IC to Speak to JF regarding social media advertising action, is carried forward. **ACTION IC**

4. Presentation from the proponents of allocated development sites 13 & 4 with associated questioning from members.
Mark Johnson from Gleeson and Johnson Woolmer, from the planning consultancy Terrace O'Rourke spoke concerning the combined site 13 and 4 as allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Site Layout:

Print outs of a satellite image of the site and basic layout were passed around to the group. JW briefly described the site explaining that the land interest ended to the west of the site before the wooded area adjacent to the railway line and extending to the boundary of the existing Clayton Mills Mackay Avenue development to the South, to the East at Land bordering Ockley Road and Northwards into the Local Gap with between Hassocks and Burgess Hill. 10 hectares. Open space was to be provided to the North to provide a buffer between the development and the Local Gap. MJ pointed out that vehicular access from Ockley Road towards the Southern end of the site was awkward due to site lines and hence the access had extended Northwards into the Local Gap area and away from the Eastern area where land was not in the site owner ownership anyway. IW expressed concern at this. MJ confirmed all the technical detail would be provided on assessment of other areas for vehicular access in due course.

Questions and queries:

IW queried whether footpaths away from the site could be improved to provide a better footpath network with money provided from the development? MJ did not see this as a problem so long as the expenditure conformed to the statutory requirements.

FG asked whether any constraints could be identified with regard to the development? MJ advised that a Constraints and Opportunities document would be produced which would identify any constraints.

DW queried the density of the proposed development and IC confirmed it was in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan and lower than the surrounding development.

IW wondered if a link via Mackay Avenue could be achieved? MJ advised that although feasible this would involve purchasing private property and he was not sure what this would add to the sustainable credentials of the scheme. IC ask whether there were any issues with a single point of access for a development this size? MJ thought not. IC felt it would be desirable to find a way to lessen the impact of the new development on the existing development to the South.

MJ confirmed that similar to the Neighbourhood Plan process that they would engage with the local community and adjust their plan to try to accommodate concerns expressed. If from the consultation it would appear that a buffer between Mackay Avenue residents and the new development was popular then this could be accommodated. At this point MJ pointed out that he hoped there would be a degree of flexibility in the policies drafted in the Neighbourhood Plan to allow them to take on board local concerns in their designs.

DW queried whether there was any reason the development could not go further north to allow more space between the new and existing development?

MJ asked if there were any Local groups which should be consulted sooner rather than later. IC mention the Mackay Avenue Residents Association.

MJ confirm not from their point of view.

IC asked whether the buffer zone to the North of the proposed layout could finger into the development rather than being a straight line?

MJ explained that a landscape specialist would look at the design for features such as this to make the site as attractive as possible.

IW stated that the footpath to the North of the site has attractive views and it would be important the maintain these.

Site Proposer's Land Ownership:

DM asked for clarification as to the area of land under the site proposer's control, whether:

the woodland to the West was outside the site proposer's control;

land to the North was within the site proposer's control;

and the land bordering Ockley Lane was outside the site proposer's control?

MJ confirmed that was the case.

Progress of site development:

MJ mentioned that they intended to go ahead with the process of applying for Planning permission and how would this fit with the Neighbourhood Plan timescales?

IC confirmed that the group were pursuing an aggressive timescale but depending on the comments received on the draft plan it was not possible to

confirm how quickly they could progress to the Regulation 16 stage of the plan. The draft plan consultation period finished mid -February.
MJ Confirmed the technical work required for a planning application would take 6 to 8 months.

IC confirmed that it was fairly certain the plan would be at Regulation 16 stage and beyond before then.

5. Headline summary of consultation Regulation 14 responses received to date from Dowsett Mayhew.

LB advised that to date 90 responses had been received of which 27 had been objections. The objections mainly from the Mackay Avenue area concerning site 13 and 4. There had also been objections to a Local Green Space designation and other general comments.

MSDC had supplied a detailed response to the draft plan. Sport England a general response. Hurstpierpoint Parish Council had responded with comments on policies 13 & 14.

IC asked LB and DM how the overall analysis would be achieved. DM confirmed the comments would be categorised and themed.

IC asked whether the categorization of responses should come back from DM with recommendations?

NO felt that the themed responses should be provided for discussion and at a later meeting, subject to the results of the discussions at a previous meeting, recommendations should then be provided by DM.

IC summarized:

Prepare a thematic summary and circulate to all on 26th February which was prior to the next meeting; **ACTION DM**

This summary will be discussed at the next meeting;

At the following meeting the Working Groups conclusions would be looked at in conjunction with recommendations from DM.

All Agreed.

6. Correspondence. Nothing further.
7. Date of Next Meeting: Agreed for 3rd March 2016

The meeting ended at 8.20pm