

HASSOCKS PARISH COUNCIL

You are summoned to attend an Extraordinary meeting of the **Parish Council** to be held on 31st October 2017
at 7.30 pm in the Adastra Hall, Adastra Park, Keymer Road, Hassocks.

Parish Clerk 25 October 2017

Members of the public are encouraged to come to the meetings and there is an opportunity for them to address the Council relating to the non-confidential items on the published agenda.

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES

1.1 To Accept Apologies for Absence.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

2.1 Disclosure by Councillors of personal interests in matters on the agenda, and whether the Councillor regards their interest as prejudicial under the terms of the Code of Conduct.

3. MINUTES

3.1 To accept the minutes of the:

Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Parish Council meeting 12 October 2017 (for noting)

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

*Up to fifteen minutes will be available to allow for the public to make representations, answer questions or give evidence **in respect of any item of business included in the agenda**, in accordance with Standing Orders.*

In light of the anticipated interest from the public the Chair may use his discretion to extend this period of time however, these representations should be limited to under three minutes to allow other people to speak.

5. District Plan – DP9b Strategic site North of Clayton Mills

Members are requested to consider the proposals submitted by the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group (Appendix 1) with regard to informing the Council's consultation response to MSDC District Plan and in particular the proposed Strategic site North of Clayton Mills. Members are also invited to consider any other elements of the District Plan they wish to be addressed as part of the consultation process.

Recommend that the Clerk be authorised to submit the Parish Councils response in conjunction with the Council's Planning Advisor taking into consideration the agreed proposals.

6. **Urgent Matters** at the discretion of the Chairman for noting and/or inclusion on a future agenda.

7. To note that the date of the next Council meeting is **Tuesday 14th November 2017**

EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

In view of the confidential nature of the business about to be transacted Councillors will be referred to the Confidential Agenda. If any members of the public or press are in attendance they will be requested to withdraw from the meeting in the public interest.

11. FILMING, RECORDING OF COUNCIL MEETINGS AND USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA

During this meeting members of the public may film or record the Committee and officers from the public area only providing it does not disrupt the meeting. The Confidential section of the meeting may not be filmed or recorded. If a member of the public objects to being recorded, the person(s) filming must stop doing so until that member of the public has finished speaking. The use of social media is permitted but members of the public are requested to switch their mobile devices to silent for the duration of the meeting

Please Note

All members of the public are welcome to attend meetings of the Parish Council and its Committees.

Item 4 – a period of 15 minutes will be set aside for the public statements and questions relating to the published non-confidential business of the Meeting.

It may be necessary to consider particular items in confidential session and where this arises, these items will be considered at the end of the agenda

Appendix 1

EXTRACT FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING GROUP MEETING 12TH OCTOBER 2017 PROPOSED RESPONSES TO THE DISTRICT PLAN MODIFICATIONS

Hassocks Parish Council (HPC) appreciates MSDC need to provide 16,390 dwellings in the Plan period to 2031, and wishes to provide a constructive response to the Main Modifications Consultation however it is considered that:-

Proposal

- Policy DP9b which proposes a strategic allocation of approximately 500 dwellings at Clayton Mills would impose a disproportionate share of District housing Need on Hassocks.

Para 31 of Policy Document MSDC22 states that “overall there are a number of significant positives associated with this site which outweigh any negatives related to its landscape setting and potential highway impacts”. It further notes the development of a comprehensive masterplan with association landscaping and new infrastructure will reduce any negative impact that may arise from the site’s development and will ensure that the highway network is capable of accommodating the additional traffic generated.

Proposal

- HPC disagree with this conclusion and consider that the imposition of a Strategic site of 500 dwellings would be unsustainable and would have an adverse effect on the village environment for the following reasons:

1. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) supporting the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan (HNP) concluded that between 280-290 new homes would be appropriate to meet identified need in the Parish whilst minimising impact on the environmental strategic objectives and traffic.

The proposed strategic site plus existing commitments and HNP sites would produce in the region of 1000 dwellings.

The SA supporting the HNP includes ‘a policy which sets out the housing need of the Parish at 280-290’ is the preferred approach. The proposed housing allocations within the HNP would deliver this as a minimum with additional housing from windfall coming forward and determined against other policies.]

Proposal

- The proposed allocation would be contrary to Strategic Objective 2 of the Mid Sussex District Plan which seeks to ensure development reflects the distinctive character of district towns and villages.

2 & 6. As part of the Examination, the Inspector recommended MSDC should consider how to strengthen its 5 year housing land supply position. MSDC22 therefore sets out 2 options to strengthen the 5 year supply.

Option 1: Amend Policy DP6: Settlement Hierarchy, to increase the acceptability threshold for windfall development of the edge of settlements.

The Submission Mid Sussex District Plan, August 2016, supports growth of settlements where development is for fewer than 10 dwellings. The Paper considers this could be raised to 20-25 dwellings.

Option 2: Allocate a further strategic site that could deliver in the short-term and contribute directly to the five year supply.

MSDC have advised Option 1 has been developed in direct response to the Inspector's recommendation to raise the threshold of 10 dwellings in Policy DP6: Settlement Hierarchy.

In the Submission Version Mid Sussex District Plan, August 2016, policy DP6 sets out support for the expansion of settlements outside defined built-up area boundaries where the site is allocated in the District Plan, a Neighbourhood Plan or subsequent Development Plan Document or where the proposed development is for fewer than 10 dwellings; the site adjoins an existing settlement edge; and the development is demonstrated to be sustainable, including by reference to the settlement hierarchy.

Proposal

- HPC consider Option 1 which was suggested by Inspector Bore as a way to strengthen the 5 year housing supply by dispersing developments of up to 25 dwellings around settlement boundaries, was dismissed without adequate consideration by MSDC.
- Hassocks Parish Council therefore question why the potential increase to 25 units was dismissed
- HPC contend that the selection of Option 2 as opposed to Option 1, which would have enabled a more balanced and comprehensive approach to the release of housing land around other settlements in Mid Sussex, is not adequately justified in document MSDC 22.

3. Supporting document MSDC 24 (Implications of the District Plan Main Modifications on the Ashdown Forest (traffic impact on Special Area of Conservation) and on the strategic and local transport network), provides a summarised update on the position of the District Plan (DP) with respect to the impact of the DP Main Modifications on the Ashdown Forest and on the strategic and local transport network.

Proposal

- HPC consider the supporting documents are high level and provide no evidence to back up the assertions relating to highway issues. HPC has requested a copy of the updated Transport Report however this Report has not been made publicly available.
- MSDC 24, assumes that southbound traffic will avoid the centre of Hassocks and the Stonepound Crossing by using Lodge Lane and New road. HPC considers that traffic generated by the development will have an adverse effect on Ockley Lane.

Proposal

4. The proposed allocation would reduce the countryside gap between Hassocks and Burgess Hill by at least 25% and would destroy a valuable area of countryside which, in the opinion of HPC, has high landscape value

Additional responses to the Modifications.

5. MSDC proposes to allocate Land north of Clayton Mills, as a strategic site capable of delivering 500 dwellings. MSDC22 confirm approximately 150 of these would be deliverable within the first five years of the plan period. It further confirms the remaining 350 dwellings will be delivered in the period immediately following the current 5 year period and will contribute towards the total District Plan housing provision.

MSDC22 details how the Council propose this is “the best and most effective mechanism to improve the five year supply in the short term.

Proposal

- HPC have been advised that the proposed strategic allocations as set out in Policy DP9b seeks to strengthen the 5 year housing supply for MSDC. However MSDC 22 confirms only 150 will come forward in the first five years of the plan period.
- The Submission HNP, Policy 15, proposes to allocate Land to the north of Clayton Mills and Mackie Avenue for up to 140 dwellings and therefore HPC question the necessity for the proposed strategic allocation.

Note: Item 6 and 2 combined and considered above as part of item 2

7. MSDC22, paragraph 22, details that the development of the larger site would provide the benefits of:

- it enables a comprehensive scheme to be developed rather than in a piecemeal manner, which results in better planning of the infrastructure required to support the development
- a scheme that provides a much needed site for a new primary school, as deficiencies in primary provision have been identified within the village
- a scheme that provides a good relationship with the existing Clayton Mills/Mackie Avenue developments
- scheme that can be designed to manage the relationship of the site and the listed building, to ensure that the impact on the listed building is maintained

Proposal

- HPC consider the benefits indicated above would come forward with the allocation of the site as proposed in the Submission Version HNP.

Proposed that the following comments be made on modifications to:

DP7- General Principles of Strategic development for Burgess Hill

MSDC have deleted the requirement for 30% affordable housing within the main body of the policy as MSDC consider this requirement is set out under DP29: Affordable Housing.

Proposal

- HPC does not agree with this deletion.

DP26 Accessibility

The supporting text of the policy states ‘the housing requirements of groups with particular needs will be monitored and the Plan will be reviewed in this respect if evidence clearly supports a change to this level of provision’

Proposal

- HPC consider this monitoring suggestion is meaningless unless deadlines and dates are set for monitoring and review.
- HPC objects to this Policy as it is not clear enough.
- The Policy states developments of 5 or more dwellings will be expected to make provision for 20% of dwellings to meet Category 2. The Policy also highlights exceptions which include “where the scheme for flatted residential buildings of fewer than 10 dwellings”
- HPC objects to this as this reduces further the dwellings which need to meet Category 2- accessible and adaptable dwellings under Building Regulations- Approved Document M Requirement M4(2).
- The Policy also seeks to reduce the proportion of wheelchair-user dwellings from 5% to 4%. HPC objects to this and would like to see the evidence to support this reduction.

Proposal

DP28 Housing Mix

- HPC to raise the question as to why is there not a proportion of allocation for the elderly

