

BRAMBER NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP MEETING

Bramber & Beeding Village Hall

Thursday 13th December 2018 at 6.30pm

Present: Cllr Roger Potter, Cllr Mick Tilley, Cllr Sarah Green, Cllr Mike Croker, Mrs Paddy Robson, Mrs Christine Supiot, Mrs Brianne Reeve, and Mrs Diana Croker.

In attendance: Mrs Alison Eardley (Planning Consultant) - by Skype

Members of the public: 7 members of the public, including Mr Norman Kwan and Mr Gavin Curwen, HDC Neighbourhood Planning Officer and Assistant.

Notes: Rebecca Luckin

NOTES

1. Apologies for absence

a) Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr N Stubbs and Mrs R Rainbow.

2. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Notes of the previous meeting – 14th November 2018

a) Cllr Tilley **proposed** that the notes of the meeting of 14th November 2018 be approved as a correct record of the meeting. **Seconded** by Cllr Croker. **Agreed** and duly signed by the Chairman.

4. Matters arising

a) Public presentation event preparations – actioned.

b) Covenant regarding Clays Hill. Cllr Potter reported that DMH Stallards were not aware of any historic covenant. Cllr Croker had undertaken a Land Registry search and had found no evidence.

Action **Norman Kwan to advise on possible sources of information**

NK

Action **Cllr Potter to undertake a final search**

Cllr Potter

The Chairman adjourned the meeting

5. Open Forum

a) Mr Norman Kwan, HDC Neighbourhood Plan Officer, reported that HDC was busy reviewing the local plan; the final date for publication is Sept 2019. Parish Councillors will be invited to a further conference regarding the impact on their Neighbourhood Plan work.

Central Government is pushing hard regarding housing numbers. They will standardise methodology of calculating the number of homes required per parish, however numbers are likely to increase. The SA/SEA will lead to the development of an appropriate housing number as required by the NPPF. Made plans may need to be revised in light of the increased number.

Regarding potential development areas that sit on a parish boundary, the examiner has the power to extend the referendum boundary, if residents across the boundary are likely to be affected by any potential development, but will not include all of the residents of the neighbouring parish.

Regarding infrastructure issues, Norman Kwan would advise Housing Focus Group Members to contact the infrastructure providers (NK can provide contacts).

Action **Norman Kwan to advise on infrastructure contacts**

NK

Regarding the assessment of the proposed Clays Hill Site, NK advised that evidence led development could be provided on the site, with the remaining area designated as green space. A policy can specify that development is dependant upon the remainder of the land being available as green space in

perpetuity, for consideration by the Steering Group, supported by evidence.

Q - A member of the public asked about the Housing Needs Assessment – The current AECOM assessment is for 68 houses for Bramber, is this likely to increase? If Bramber cannot satisfy the number, and a significant number are on Clay's Field, if the developer later approaches HDC with a further application due to a wish to meet the unmet housing need, will the number be overturned by HDC?

A - NK – It depends on what goes on the site. A green space designation will protect the site. We have to consider settlement coalescence etc. I am unable to comment further.

Q – I don't think number can be met in Bramber.

A - NK – These are hypothetical questions, however Bramber would need to put a case forward regarding constraints that would limit development. The Housing Need Survey undertaken in the past only considered the Affordable Housing Number.

A – NK - Numbers are increasing and could be damaging to a Neighbourhood Plan that is trying to balance local need and developer plans. Any unmet need may help the developer. We have a 5 year supply of housing.

Q - Cllr Potter – The point is valid, the local district can override the NP if the figure has not been met?

A - NK – When the plan is completed a number of protections will be implemented provide you have done your best endeavours to meet the number.

A - AE – it will be interesting to see what the figures is when HDC revise their number, mindful that Bramber is very constrained?

A - NK – HDC will be looking at the constraints and opportunities that exist within the parish.

Q - Cllr Potter – An HNA was undertaken by AECOM, which calculated a number of 60, the group accepted the report and published it. Subsequently, residents have asked questions regarding the calculation of the number and the averaging using three projections. If you look at HDPF it says that those projections have been taken into account, therefore we should look at the HDPF figure?

Q - NK – The AECOM report projects up to 2031. We think it is the most appropriate robust methodology as agreed by Locality.

Cllr Potter has contacted AECOM, without a response, and will contact Locality since they commissioned the report and may be able to respond to questions.

Q - Cllr Tilley – Can you indicate under what conditions a green space could be built on in future, has it ever occurred?

A - NK – It is similar to green belt land, it is hard to build on. I can provide information on the exceptional circumstances and the stringent tests that would have to be met.

Action Norman Kwan to advise on exceptional circumstances

NK

Q – A member of the public asked – Supposing Bramber decided that it wanted to limit its plan to green space allocation only, is that permissible? Is it safer not to proceed with a plan?

A - NK – Billingshurst has decided not to go forward with site allocation. It is for parishes to decide if they wish to go ahead without site allocation. The Steering Group can liaise with the Clerk at Billingshurst to see how they arrived at that conclusion.

A - AE – They have already taken a large amount of development and they wish to see what the emerging NPPF will say, before they proceed with allocations. They will benefit from CIL and when they are ready to consider allocations, that will be their only focus. You would be wise to update the plan on a regular basis.

A - NK – HDC is required to review their plan every five years, with may trigger a review of Neighbourhood Plans. Any review of a made plan will require the whole process, including referendum.

Three members of the public left the meeting at 7.15pm

A - NK – Regarding any planning history that relates to a potential site, that will form part of the evidence base when assessing a site.

Q – A member of the public spoke regarding presenting the plan to a community, mindful of planning history of a site, it is a crucial piece of information, if it is not included in the assessment criteria. With

reference to SDNP, regarding the King's Mead proposal it was stated that the land was on the edge of the SDNP and not within the SDNP, I'm concerned regarding the information that has been presented and the assessment process so far. On the first line of the context, it states 'on the edge of the SDNP', which may sway people. It is an emotive subject and any inaccuracies could be misconstrued.

Q - It was stated that Clay's Field was not too big to be designated as a green space. I'm concerned that public opinion could be swayed by incorrect wording on the environment board at the drop in meeting.

A – Mrs P Robson – the Housing Focus Group has met subsequently and reviewed their assessments. We are mindful of wording bearing in mind that it will need to satisfy the examiner.

A - NK – For green space designation there are clear criteria, including that it cannot be an extensive tract of land. The examiner will have to look at it on a case by case basis. The NPPF provides for the development of housing in every local authority. Parishes should make their best endeavours and must provide sound reasons regarding constraints to development. Planning history will be taken into account along with the planning policy at the time of historic applications.

Detail is important, and the plan is work in progress. Constructive comments from members of the public are helpful, nothing is set in stone until Regulation 14.

A – Mrs C Supiot - An awful lot of work has fallen on a small number of people, it would be helpful if more people from the community came forward to help. The point of the drop-in event was to invite these comments.

Q – A member of the public expressed concern that wording on the drop in questionnaire had negatively influenced public responses regarding the number of house on Clay's Field.

A - Cllr Potter – Planning history will be part of the assessment for both sites.

Q – Next steps?

A - All feedback form the Public Drop-in Event is now on the website and will be reviewed by each of the Focus Groups during January 2019.

The Chairman – thanked members of the public for their comments, which will be noted.

Mr Norman Kwan and Mr Gavin Curwen left the meeting at 7.40pm

The Chairman reconvened the meeting

6. Chairman's announcements

None for this meeting.

7. Publicity / Community Engagement

a) Public Event 24th November 2018 – Steering Group Members to note feedback and questionnaire responses and agree next actions.

b) Following the event, a Newsletter had been circulated and posted to website

8. Focus Group updates, including policies

a) Housing & Development - Report attached to these notes as an appendix.

Mrs Robson reported a change in membership; Cllr Stubbs had resigned due to work commitments and Cllr Kitson had offered to join the Focus Group.

Action Contact WSCC re highways access to Clay's Field site

PR

b) Environment & Countryside – No report for this meeting.

c) Tourism, Commerce & Heritage – No report for this meeting.

d) Transport (Highways & PROWs) - Cllr Croker reported that responses had been analysed and were generally in favour of the polices and proposed 'Pegasus crossing' on the A283. The group will develop the polices to aid public understanding of the proposals. EV charging points will be considered.

9. **Community Facilities Policy** – No report for this meeting.

10. **Neighbourhood Plan Finance**

a) Finance update, income to date - £9,000, expenditure to date - £459.70 +VAT, balance = £8,540.30, although Planning Consultant invoices are due shortly and the public event has incurred some costs.

b) Groundworks had emailed to remind the Steering Group that the grant should be spent. The Clerk has requested an extension on time. Outstanding invoices will be chased.

11. **Call for Sites / Site Assessment update**

a) Progress update – Feedback and comments from the Public Drop-in Event had been noted.

b) Agree next actions – Feedback will be analysed and assessments re-drafted.

12. **Plan Programme**

a) AE to update and circulate.

Action Programme update and circulate

AE

13. **Correspondence**

None for this meeting.

14. **Items for the next agenda**

a) Focus Groups to present proposals.

b) Alison Eardley to attend.

15. **Date of next meeting – 6.30pm Thursday 31st January – subject to hall availability**

The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.33pm

Signed:
Chairman

Date:

Appendix One

Housing Focus Group Report

Notes from Housing Meeting 12th December 2018

Clays Field

- 1) There was approx 40% in agreement with the assessment and 60% disagreement.
- 2) Approx 70% of respondents were against development on this site and approx 30% in favour.
- 3) Main issue concerns **Access**
- 4) Other issues raised were inter village gap, size of proposed area of development, biodiversity and infrastructure.

It was noted that this site is seen by many residents as part of Steyning.

Actions:

Organise survey to check usage of the field

Check possibility of designating used footpath over 20 years (Roger has found out that this is not possible due to presence of notice on the field).

Saxon hoard (Worthing Museum) To follow up and archaeological survey to be mentioned in site policy.

Check assessment sheet to finalise at next meeting.

Legal queries to check with David Barling

Obtain more information about access.

Kingsmead Close

- 1) Approx 70% (40) of 57 respondents agreed with the assessment of the site while 17 people did not.
- 2) Approx 66% agreed with some development on the site with 33% against.
- 3) A total of 11 comments from the 2 questions objected because it was in the National Park.
- 4) There were 4 comments re access issues relating to the junction of Maudlin Parkway and Maudlin lane.
- 5) In addition to the completed questionnaires there were three separate objection letters which had scrutinised the assessment sheet and listed a number of objections.
- 6) Issues arising in addition to access were mainly concerned with biodiversity particularly the effect on the trees, insufficient attention to previous application rejections and the fact that the site is situated within the National Park.
- 7) The question of the viability of this site was discussed by the group.

Actions:

To contact Sussex Wildlife Trust re any biodiversity policies to include in site policy

Assessment sheet to be checked and amended where necessary -

Begin forming site policy- To include max. no. of dwellings, dense screening and biodiversity policy.