

**Minutes of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Meeting
24 March 2016.**

Attendees: Ian Credland (IC), Sue Hatton (SH), Bill Hatton (BH), David Withycombe (DW), Ginny Pullan (GP), Ian Weir (IW), Jo Whitcombe (JW), Nick Owens (NO), Judith Foot (JF), Dale Mayhew (DM), Laura Bourke (LB)

Withycombe

1. Apologies for absence: Jane Bromley, Adrian Batchelor, Francis Gaudencio, Victoria Stanfest, Justine Fisher.

2. Declarations of Interests:

Sites: Ian Credland sites 1 & 2, Nick Owens sites 1 & 2 and 15, David Withycombe site 12, Virginia Pullan site 7.

Local Green Space: Ian Credland LGS2, Nick Owens LGS2,

School Interest: David Withycombe Hassocks Infants. Sue Hatton Downlands and Windmills Junior.

3. Minutes of last meeting 17/03/16

IC let NPWG know DM amendments are to be included in minutes and updated minutes to be re-circulated and considered and agreed at next meeting.

4. Discussion followed on consultation responses received as part of the Regulation 14 consultation

Discussion on Planning Sphere comments:

- Policy 14: Hassocks Golf Course -Planning parameters maps handed out for discussion
- DM highlighted subtle differences between maps dated Sept 15 and Jan 16.
- DM highlighted Jan 2016 Map: Residential area has extended further west.
- Comments from Hurstpierpoint (HPP) Parish Council on policy 14 noted.
- Comments noted from Southern Water.
- Discussion on amended map and policy compliance.
- NPWG discussed the implications and it was noted the NPGW cant see any reason to be minded to allow further westward development.
- NPWG note the revised map is not more serpentine than the September 15 dated map.
- Members stated they do not accept there should be any further westward encroachment
- NPWG are not adverse to slightly less open space but against development spreading further westward.
- Proposals map is reflective of the Sept 2015 map which was provided to MSDC.
- Decision to allocate was based on Sept 15 masterplan.
- NPWG does not support any further westward development (All agreed).
- Housing development area to remain as 5.1 hectares
- NPWG noted the Gap is critical in this area. East/west Gap is practically vulnerable to encroachment.
- NO propose no further reduction in green space provision
- NPWG agreed that the area allocated should be sufficient to accommodate housing allocation. It was noted that the 5.1 hectares is a sufficient site size to deliver 130 housing units. Increasing the allocation in any effect would be detrimental to the Gap. 5.5 hectares to be left for open space/school site

- NPWG agreed Policy/Supporting text to remain unchanged.

Discussion on Gleeson/Terence O Rourke comments:

- Policy 1: Hassocks-Burgess Hill Gap (Burgess Hill Gap) and Policy 13: Housing Allocations, comments with respect to the Gap have already been discussed at 17/03/16 meeting.
- Housing number: NPWG have already discussed housing allocation. 280-290 is not the totality of the number of housing units to be brought forward. It reflects the number to be brought forward in allocated sites. Windfall development will contribute further housing development. The Housing Needs paper sets out the NPWG position on housing numbers.
- Policy 15: Land to the North of Clayton Mills and Mackie Avenue. Potential access arrangements discussed in response to comments made. The Policy as written does not allow for residential development to extend into the Gap. Suggest that the policy does not preclude the access road being allowed in the Gap.
- Policy 15: DM to recommend additional wording to clarify that if the access road is needed to be in the Gap this would be something the NPWG would support. (All agreed). **ACTION DM.**
- Further discussion re access arrangement.
- In response to comments made re 6.22, discussion followed re Masterplan. IC asked if DM could contact Mark to request submission of an updated Masterplan. Agree further discussion of Gleeson/Terence O Rourke comments would take place following receipt of Masterplan. **ACTION DM.**

Discussion on Mackie Avenue comments:

- NPWG has discussed comments re Site 15 at length at previous meeting on 17/03/16.
- NPWG also discussed comments re NPWG, failure of process, interests etc on 17/03/16.
- In response to 4.3 question, the LGS was not used as a method to frustrate housing development. The NPWG identified housing first and then turned attention to LGS.
- The NPWG were aware of the area of land which was designated as open space through the planning process.
- In response to 4.4, the Gap policy has been taken from the MSDC District Plan on the advice of MSDC.
- NPWG has had regard to the Strategic Gap and has not sought to focus the housing element of the allocation in the area identified as a Gap. NPWG has sought to focus open space within the Strategic Gap.
- Response referenced meeting minutes of 30/07/15. NPWG outlined how the meeting's focus was whether the site should be considered as a potential LGS. The NPWG resolved to consider the site for LGS. This was done and LGS9 was considered and formed part of the assessment process.
- A number of potential LGS sites were considered and were subsequently not allocated as LGS for a number of reasons. LGS 9 was one of these sites that was considered but was subsequently not designated as LGS.
- Response included comments re setting of listed building, the NPWG noted Policy 6: Conservation Areas seeks to conserve the conservation area therefore no conflict with Policy 6.
- Response included Comments re Policy 8: Character and Design. NPWG noted Policy 8 is to be applied across all development. NPWG discussed design criteria and agreed the detailed application will need to satisfy the requirements of Policy 8.

Discussion on general comments received in relation to;

Policy 16: National Tyre Centre

- Comments discussed.
- Site not big enough to accommodate open space.
- NPWG agreed comments should be noted.

Policy 19: Affordable Housing

- Consultation response 175 discussed, Comments noted, NPGW agreed the respondent should be directed to the wording of Para 6.43 in the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan.

Chapter 7: Economy

- Consultation responses discussed. NPWG agreed comments should be noted. NPWG also noted that the background business paper which has been undertaken, does not indicate there is a need for site to provide business use.
- In response to comment 151: The NPWG noted it is not the role of the Neighbourhood Plan to find funding.

Chapter 8: Transport

- Consultation responses noted.
- NPWG has sought to ensure the allocations are mindful of local transport issues

Discussion on Statutory Consultee comments;

SDNP

- 13-14. Comments noted re typo, colons, numbering instead of bullet points. NPWG agreed these to be amended. **ACTION DM**
- Discussion re Dark skies, tranquility etc. NPWG agreed wording to be included in Policy. **ACTION DM** wording as recommended by SDNP to be included in Policy 1 and 2.
- LGS- label on maps. NPWG agreed LGS to be numbered. **ACTION DM** to ask MSDC to update Map.
- GI maps. Comments noted. See previous comments re Policy 3.
- Policy 5: Comments noted. NPGW agree to amend policy to reflect SDNP advice on this matter. **ACTION DM**
- Policy 6: Discuss re non-designated assets. Comments noted. NPWG agree Policy 6 remains unchanged.
- Policy 13, Policy 14, 15: Comments noted. NPWG have agreed additional text to be added to Policy 1 and 2. No further changes to be made to Policy 13, 14 or 15.
- Policy 20: Comments discussed. NPWG agree for Policy to remain unchanged as the Policy as currently written reflects local circumstance and local desire.
- Policy 21: Comments noted.

5. **Correspondence:** None

6. **Other:**

Next NPWG Meeting: 29/03 meeting moved to 07/04 @ 7pm

Meeting arranged with MSDC and WSCC on 06/04 to discuss Reg 14 responses.

- IC unable to attend.
- SH and BH able to attend.
- Discussion re WSCC comments.
- NPWG discuss WSCC previous comments re Stonepound crossroads.

- Previous advice of Chris Owens re magnitude of Stonepound AQMA issue. WSCC advise previously was that it was an issue beyond the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.

PINS letter re Ham Field

- Appeal to be redetermined.
- Appeal to be on the basis of a reopened Public Inquiry.
- Invitation to send Statement of Case.
- Representation/Comments to be received within 21 days.
- Letter to be sent to Parish Council.
- Parish Council to respond and update PINS re Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan.
- Discussion re Ham Fields appeal and potential impact on Neighbourhood Plan.
- NP and supporting evidence to be submitted to PINS.
- Discussion re professional representation.
- PC to discuss response at next PC meeting.
- BH to present the issue at PC meeting on 12/04.
- IW asked DM to give an indication of cost associated with DM representing PC.
- Info pack to be submitted within the 21 days
- Extra Ordinary Meeting of PC on 12/04
- DM to discuss dates/timing with PINS and to request 10 working days from 12/04.
- DM to report to IW and JW.

Signed Chairman

Dated.....