

HASSOCKS PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the **Neighbourhood Plan Working Group** on 11th January 2018 at **7.30 pm** in the Council Chamber, Parish Centre, Adastra Park, Hassocks.

Attendees: Parish Councillors Bill Hatton (Chair), Sue Hatton, Frances G, Ian Weir, Les Campbell

Co-opted Members Virginia Pullan and David Withycombe (arrived at 8pm).

Dowsett Mayhew Consultants: Dale Mayhew and Laura Bourke

Parish Clerk: Ian Cumberworth.

DRAFT MINUTES

1. APOLOGIES

To Accept Apologies for Absence. Councillor Foot and Councillor Batchelor

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 2.1 Disclosure by Cllr Frances Gaudencio site 8 and Co-opted Members Virginia Pullan site 7 and David Withycombe site 12

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan meeting held on the 12 October 2017 were agreed

4. DISTRICT PLAN HEARING 05/02/18

BH advised Pauline Butcher (Programme Officer of the District Plan Examination) has advised participants need to confirm who will be attending the hearing session on the 05 February 2018 as soon as possible.

BH advised the Working Group need to decide who is best to attend. BH advised that Consideration should be given to the purpose of the meeting and who can best contribute to discussions.

IW queried the format of the Hearing session in July 2017 and the way in which the Inspector managed discussions

BH advised Members of the note which the Inspector has issued which details the agenda and advice on procedures.

BH advised he wished Dale Mayhew to sit at the table and represent the Parish Council. BH also advised he believed David W should also sit at the table to present the evidence in respect of the landscape Report. BH confirmed he wished to also sit at the table. This approach was agreed by Members.

DM advised he has reviewed the agenda and confirmed it would be advisable for a number of people to sit at the table and to contribute accordingly.

IC confirmed programme officer had advised there will be 1 space reserved at the table for the Parish Council; but that it would be possible for the representative at the table to be changed when appropriate.

FG confirmed support for DM, DW and BH to attend. FG requested clarity on the agenda items

SH queried who else would be in attendance as there was uncertainty as to which statutory bodies would attend (WSCC, SDNP)

VG queried if SDNP were attending and their position. SH confirmed SDNP were neutral.

DM discussed the proposed agenda items.

DM advised written representations confirmed the Parish Council position. DM advised the Hearing session was not an opportunity to repeat these written representations.

SH advised, she had made personal representations. SH confirmed her view that insufficient time was given to Members of MSDC to review the supporting evidence base and to make an informed decision on the changes to the District Plan.

FG queried if it was possible to highlight that Gleeson have previously stated in representations that they did not favour a strategic site and preferred for development to be spread around the district. DM advised he would look into this matter.

IW queried whether MSDC presently have a 5 year housing land supply (HLS). DM confirmed MSDC committee reports states the District believe they have a 5.2 year housing land supply; however until such time as the Inspector agrees the housing number and issues his report they are unable to reply on this. MSDC do not therefore have a 5 year HLS at this time.

IW queried if Inspector Bore could give MSDC a temporary 5 HSL and therefore the District would not need to rush into allocating a strategic site.

DM advised the ability to demonstrate 5 year HSL would engage in light of conclusions on the District Plan. It would then remain dynamic going forward.

DM advised of Inspector Bores initial conclusions which recommended MSDC consider lowering the threshold of 500 dwellings for "strategic allocations". DM advised MSDC had not lowered this threshold but no clear reasoning has been given for this.

BH stated MSDC had advised the Parish Council that the site at Clayton Mills was the only available site which could deliver the housing shortfall.

BH sought to clarify agenda item 5. DM advised this appears to relate to the criteria/detail of the policy clauses. DM highlighted the criteria as drafted in the Main Modifications consultation.

FG queried if it is relevant to raise the issue re school capacity in Hassocks. FG advised WSCC have stated they no longer require a new school in Hassocks for September 2018. DM advised a new allocation could generate the need for a new school in the future.

VP queried how the District had identified the criteria for the policy? DM advised these had derived from a number of sources, i.e. Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan, general principles and feedback which had be given to the District.

IW queried traffic generation and whether consideration had been given to how the additional traffic will be managed. DM advised the Transport Assessment (TA), prepared on behalf of the prospective applicant, concluded the impact was acceptable. DM advised WSCC had reviewed the TA and broadly supported its conclusions.

SH highlighted previous WSCC responses which advised further work was required on local transport network i.e. Burgess Hill new road junction. SH highlighted concerns re pressures on highway network

SH advised she believed MSDC have allocated the site too quickly (.i.e. within a short time frame) and the evidence wasn't available in order to allow informed decisions to be made.

8.15- DW joined the meeting

BH summarised the meeting to date. DW confirmed he would be happy to represent the PC and respond to agenda item 4. DW queried how the discussion will be managed.

DW advised it would be useful to meet with BH and DM separately to discuss procedure and the hearing further.

Returning to agenda item 2, DM advised he would wish to highlight that the HNP was carefully considered and underpinned by robust evidence base and local people had been consulted widely.

DM advised in contrast it appears MSDC have sought to allocate the site in a short period of time and did not have detailed evidence base to justify its allocation.

IW highlighted the HNP allocation of 140 units fulfils the requirement to deliver 150 in the first 5 years of the plan period.

FG highlighted previous support which MSDC gave to the Regulation 14 consultation on the HNP which included the current proposed allocations/numbers.

DM highlighted the Government recent consultation re standard methodology to calculate housing need.

DW highlighted the process of how this site was chosen is questionable regardless of the need.

With respect to the site's relationship to the village, its scale and facilities, BH queried if he was best to lead on this point?

DM advised caution in highlighting for example doctors surgery is full etc. as a response to this could be – more houses will enable a doctor's surgery to come forward.

IW queried if it would be worth highlighting distances to services etc. DM cautioned against highlighting distance to facilities etc. as the HNP proposes to allocate the southern part of the site.

FG queried whether it is worth highlighting bus routes. IW highlighted the lack of bus services.

DM advised the counter argument would be it will be more likely that services could be increased etc. if more housing is provided.

IW asked DM what points could be highlighted in response to this point. DM advised others around the table will highlight relatively short distances to existing services and the train station.

DM advised it would be sensible to look at transport network and whether the appropriate modelling had been undertaken.

IW queried why the strategic allocation does not include a suite of transport improvement like Burgess Hill. DM advised TA has been agreed with WSCC.

SH queried the capacity of the sewage infrastructure. SH queried if the water provider will attend to defend position.

General discussion on SDNP response and the impact of the allocation on the South Downs National Park.

LB to send DW and GP representations and SDNP comments on London Road application.

DM informed Members of the policy's criteria and highlighted the criteria relating to the landscape buffer to be provided.

IW queried whether appropriate commuted sums would be provided for maintenance of buffer.

DW highlighted the significant development, which is to take place in Hassocks and queried if developments had been planned in the right way and whether the village will be properly connected. DW advised a landscape masterplan was required to ensure connectivity.

SH advised that the Parish Council should highlight safety concerns as more development will lead to more pedestrians crossing the railway. SH stated it was important to make the point re increased use of railway crossing. DW agreed with SH. IW highlighted need for alternative sustainable transport options. SH highlighted concerns re an allocation which also proposes a new school, as this could lead to more children using crossing.

5. FRIARS OAK APPLICATION

DM advised this appeal is one of a number of appeals which PINS is looking at further with respect to their impact on the Ashdown forest

DM advised the appeal decision on land at Sayers Common has been issued.

IW queried if the delay in decisions could be linked to the delay with the MSDC Examination.

DM advised this may be possible but the substantive reason is whether the proposed development will have an impact on the Ashdown Forest.

6. OTHER MATTERS ARISING

IC updated Members on matters relating to the Golf course applications and the associated S106.

BH, DW and DM to meet on 30/01/18 at HPC offices at 4pm to discuss representation at the MSDC hearing.

7. 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.