Steyning Parish Council

The Steyning Centre, Fletcher's Croft, Steyning,
West Sussex, BN44 3XZ

www.steyningpc.gov.uk

Telephone: 01903 812042

MINUTES OF THE STEYNING NEIGHOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 29th OCTOBER 2018 AT 7.30PM AT THE STEYNING CENTRE

Present: Cllr Tim Lloyd and Members: Russell Barnes (RB), Murray Van de Poll (MV) , Paul Cotton (PC) Mariella Alexander (MA)

In attendance: Cllr.Goldsmith and 6 members of the public

DRAFT MINUTES

SG/18/50 APOLOGIES

50.1 Apologies received from Paul Maidment and Sally Johnstone

SG/18/51 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

51.1 There were no declarations of interest from the Committee members

SG/18/52 QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

52.1 Question 1: Wrote in with a number of questions but there was no need to go through them if they were being dealt with on the agenda

Answer: Some have been addressed but others needed more people to discuss them with specifically the Clerk which was being addressed with TL. The letter had been circulated to all committee members

52.2 Question 2: Concern that the meetings were not being clerked and could a locum clerk be brought in? Could a locum be paid from the budget (PC)?

Answer: It has been a concern and was under discussion

52.3 Question 3: Focus groups - Would the built environment include the Green Spaces?

Answer: It was intended that the Green Spaces would be included within the FGs but as these were not set in stone this may change and Green Spaces may have its own Focus Group

52.4 Question 4: As some meetings in SWAB were inquorate as was the last one of the SG the meetings could go on without decisions being made

Answer: The website was not yet on-line and the intention was to have all minutes put on the website. Although the last meeting was inquorate it carried on as an informal meeting. MV said he had made notes of the meeting. TL had not received these notes but MV said he had circulated them

SG/18/53 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS

53.1 The minutes of the meeting of the 10th September 2018 were proposed by RB and seconded by TL **Agreed**

SG/18/54 MATTERS ARISING AND ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

54.1/2/3 RB. It was hoped that HDC would be able to have updated the SG on the status of the
NNPF which was put into circulation in July and HDC is going through its review stage of their local plan which will be sometime next year followed by a consultation period. It was hoped to have some feedback to give to the community as to where HDC were, but unfortunately it was not clear at this time. The key thing is how HDC and Locality would approach housing numbers. HDC were recommending that the SG carried on with its processes it is already engaged in which would be with Aecom which is a technical support facility from Locality. RB felt that the NP should continue as instructed and hopefully in January there may be a clearer picture of what HDC's plan is and allow the NP to be informed. At this moment there is no alternative to Aecom.

TL Had asked for a meeting with Barbara Childs, Director of Place who gave a briefing to get some answers to the key questions. In the meantime HDC are suggesting the SG carry on and by the time the HDC plan is ratified it will be late 2019 or early 2020 and the NP process will be well up on the schedule. RB said that as Enplan had already done considerable groundworks before their appointment that they could have the SNP out for consultation by October 2019. Which makes it more important that we continue with the processes already started. Following a HDC workshop it was clear that there was validity in doing a neighbourhood plan, regardless of housing numbers, as there were other elements that needed to be covered. When the picture was clear the information would be posted on the website.

54.4 MV There was no mechanism within the ToR to increase the committee members to prevent meetings being inquorate. Members had other commitments and couldn't always attend meetings but the SG was set on a commitment that could take 18-24 months and it was important that members could stay the distance and there was a danger of repeating the meetings, because they were inquorate. MV felt that the ToR could be changed to include minimum number of meetings that members had to attend and perhaps meetings could be diarised – and any other suggestions.

TL: As members were bound by the same rules as the Council where a Councillor need only attend 1 meeting in six months to remain a Councillor. Perhaps there should be a consideration of more members.

RB: Felt the SG needed a team and if there were members who felt that they couldn't commit the time required then they should leave the SG. He didn't feel that the number of 10 was inadequate but the level of commitment was important.

PC: He had missed some meetings because of holidays but his overall percentage was quite high because of the workshops. MA: Had also missed some meetings but had attended the workshops.

RB: Was happy with the 10 members but as long as those members attended workshops/meetings regularly and turned up for community events they were contributing to the process. However, some members were not.

Changing the number of SG meetings was not an option as it had been previously agreed to hold meetings monthly. Meetings are published in advance together with community engagement dates and will be sent out in diary form. Workshops were either Wednesday or Thursday on alternate weeks so that people could attend.

The feeling of the meeting was that the Chair would speak to those members whose attendance was low.

There was some concern that agendas were not being received and the Chair would check that the Clerk had all the correct email addresses.

SG/18/55 FARMERS MARKET POP-UP EVENT

55.1/2 Repeating pop-up event on the 3rd. November. The format would be as before as there was good feedback previously but the Chair wanted to concentrate on the focus groups. It was felt that members of the public who did not know about the process wanted to be taken through the process from the bottom up and this should be done before talking about the focus groups. It was important to inform the public that the SG was a community group.

Even though there had only been 1 farmers' market and word of mouth there had been a good response to the survey – 76 respondents with 60% over 60 but not many from the 18-25 year age group. A wider audience is needed.

55.3 MV had had a conversation with the school and they would be interested in engaging with the SG to understand the process and to possibly do this as a school project. It was important to engage with the under 24s and the survey had been created in such a way as to engage with all age groups through the schools, youth clubs, sports clubs and scouts etc. There is a Christmas fair at the school and it could be a useful event to meet younger people and their parents. MA would take this on. The Chair would like to get the Vision Statement draft out for the event at the Steyning Centre to encourage public consultation before the final VS is done.

The manning arrangements for the Farmers' Market were agreed.

SG/18/56 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SURVEY

56.1 The interim report was that 60% respondents were over 60 and only 1 over 24. There were 6 bands of ages and all except 1 were over double figures. It was a good start. It will go on website and be shown as work in progress. On the website there would be different sections for work in progress, completed projects and a private space for members.

The next phase would be the flyer, farmers' market, Christmas fair at the school and then the completion of the draft Vision Statement.

SG/18/57 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTANTS

57.1 RB Reported that the tender phase had been completed and Enplan were the most suitable consultants. There was a little delay in getting the instruction but hopefully that would be agreed at the F&GP meeting on the 30th October. Enplan would then take the lead in the neighbourhood plan process and it should change the dynamics of what the SG was doing. There were no comments on the NPPF2 from Enplan at the moment which didn't affect the NP process.

It was expected that RB/MV/TL would have a preliminary meeting with Enplan before Enplan briefed the SG. Enplan have been waiting some time for the go ahead and want to move forward quickly.

SG/18/58 LOCALITY

58.1 RB: Locality had approved phase 1 of the grant for £9,000 and the next phase of £8,000 would be approved next year. Locality were providing technical support in providing the housing needs assessment and other technical support was available that did not affect the grant.

RB: Brought forward item 12 on the agenda.

SG/18/59 AECOM

59.1 RB had spoken to AECOM and they were pressing ahead to put together the draft and thought that this would be ready in 3-4 weeks. It needed to be decided whether the housing information collected by SWAB was going to be used. Even though SWAB was done with the 4 parishes RB had looked at the information gathered and believed that the Steyning information could be extracted. As it was a SWAB document RB felt this could be used. There was a concern as to whether the SWAB information could be evidenced by this SG. It was felt that this information could be given to AECOM and TL would get this information from SWAB. **Agreed**

SG/18/60 BUDGETS

60.1 It had been agreed that the Council would do the budgets but the SG needed to get information from Enplan as to what their budget plans were for the following year. MV and PC would work together on this and give the information to the Clerk – if possible by the next Council meeting but if not it had to be included in the final budget approval for January 2019.

SG/18/61 VISION STATEMENT

61.1 RB: It seems to have been going on some time but part of the due diligence was to engage with as many members of the community as possible. The website has been delayed but should be up in the next week.

The size and content of the flyer/maildrop was discussed at length and the final size would be A5 for ease of posting through letterboxes. The library and Post Office were happy to be drop –off points. MV felt that the website should only be populated with facts – minutes etc. and other links such as to Your Steyning can be fed in.

RB had undertaken the setting up of the website but when completed he was quite happy for someone to take it over.

RB asked that members use the Community Plan emails to make it easier to access information through Outlook.

SG/18/62 CALL FOR SITES

62.1 The banners requesting sites had gone up. 5 sites have come forward:

Glebe Farm, Bayards Field, Sweetlands, Cancton House (HDC) and Penlands Vale (HDC)

RB reported that HDC may include 10% 'windfall' sites in the land allocation but this is under consideration.

Most of the local agents were not engaging in the call for sites process.

RB would look to get an OS map on to CAD to calculate the hectares of each site.

SG/18/63 FOCUS GROUPS

63.1 These may be revised after the farmers' market.

It was noted that some consultants were not pro focus groups including Enplan but they were willing to be guided and given direction. The important thing was not to waste time going off in irrelevant directions.

At the moment the focus groups were: Communication, Built Environment, Business Economy and Infrastructure/Transport.

The survey returns may change these groups and Enplan will be key in directing the FGs.

63.2 MV gave a brief report on an email received about Planning for the Environment and the advice was that NPs should include comments from the Forestry Commission, English Heritage and Natural England.

SG/18/64 ANY URGENT BUSINESS

64.1 There was no urgent business.

SG/18/65 CORRESPONDENCE AND INFORMATION ITEMS

65.1 There were no correspondence or information items

SG/18/66 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

66.1 20th November 2018.

The meeting closed at 9.10pm

Signed ………………………………………………………………………chairman