

Steyning Parish Council



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

Telephone: 01903 812042

www.steyningpc.gov.uk

MEETING OF THE STEYNING NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE

HELD ON 1st JULY 2019 AT 7.30PM
IN THE STEYNING CENTRE

Present: Cllrs Liz Trundle (LT), Paul Campbell (PCa), Georgia Saunders (GS) and Trevor Cree (TC),
Members: Russell Barnes (RB), Richard Bell (R.Bell), Paul Cotton (PC), Paul Maidment (PM),
Sally Johnstone (SJ), Murray Van de Pol (MV)

Clerk: Evelyn Stanford

Members of the Public: 13 plus Cllrs Bissett-Powell, Hanson, Goldsmith, Northam, Taylor and Young

Meeting started at: 7.30 pm

DRAFT MINUTES

ACTION

The Parish Clerk, Mr J Fullbrook, opened the meeting by welcoming members of the Steering Group, Cllrs and the public; he also stated the Points of Order before proceeding with the election of a Chairman for this particular meeting.

1.0 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Mr J Fullbrook asked for nominations for Chairman; Murray Van de Pol nominated Richard Bell, Trevor Cree seconded; there being no more nominations, Richard Bell was elected unanimously for this meeting only.

Richard Bell then took the chair

TC asked about the election of a Chairman for all meetings, it was stated that there would be discussion at a later date when the committee met for a workshop, the Terms of Reference needed to be consulted as to how the new Chairman could be elected, also, there could be a spread of roles which play to the strength of the members of the committee, i.e.. Joint chairman. TC thanked RB for all his work over the last year.

MV spoke about the balance for a quorum especially between Cllrs and the ordinary members of the group; more residents are required for the committee; see item 7.0

Terms of Reference to be circulated by the Parish Clerk to all members of the committee



Parish Clerk: John Fullbrook
Deputy Clerk: Hazel Roxby

Email: clerk@steyningpc.gov.uk
Email: hazel.roxby@steyningpc.gov.uk

2.0 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence

3.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS

There were no Declarations

4.0 QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

After discussion within the committee it was decided that questions from the public would be split into two halves, some at the beginning of the meeting and the rest at the end.

Two questions from member of the public – 1st about the buffer proposed for the Kings Barn Lane what would this consist of, the 2nd is this the entrance in the lane just for emergency vehicles

RB – no decisions have been made as this is just a proposal, these sorts of questions will be put to the developers when the time comes.

PC - the question had been put to the developer about they had replied that it would be just for emergency vehicles but it something to be looked into when the time came

Member of the public asked about the one presentation meeting as at other similar events there had been the opportunity for questions to the proposers and also feed-back forms, it seems that there should be a further event held in 3 or 4 weeks' time were all nine sites are presented to the public over a few hours where the public can ask questions and fill in feed-back forms but this is obviously for discussion for the SNP group.

RB – it was originally meant that the meeting would be held after the site assessment work which needs to be discussed, but the time scale has to be looked at

Member of the public raised the point that the committee which is discussing the Neighbourhood Plan is made up of 4 Cllrs and 6 members of the public there should be 2 more members of the public to make it easier to move things forward

R Bell pointed out that this was item 7 on the agenda

SN – item 1.0 - who decided that there should be a chairman elected who would preside just for this meeting, as the committee has delegated authority to elect a chairman, if a chairman is elected in private sessions how does this sit with the transparency of the committee

R Bell – unfortunately we don't know the answer; it is assumed that as there wasn't a chairman in place it was felt that this was the best way forward to enable the business to be carried out

Cllr Goldsmith raised the question again about the minutes not being available on the website

R Bell – this is something that he didn't know so passed over to the minute taker, *who stated that once the minutes were sent to the office, they had no more involvement;*

R Bell – said that it was important that the minutes were sent out promptly to the committee for approval and then made available on the website

Questioner – have the other 6 sites been discarded as there were only 3 proposers at the meeting

RB – only 3 proposers were available for that meeting but all 9 had been invited

TC – there should be another presentation evening held for all 9 sites proposed but once the site assessments have been carried out, the public will have their say

Question raised about the presentation meeting where only the committee asked questions, which were described as pretty brief, the National Park seemed to a minor inconvenience to some of the proposers, it was felt that the

committee didn't question the developers hard enough about the National Park and its status and also the Steyning Community plan.

R Bell – stated that all sites should have the same scrutiny plus there should be more public involvement at any other presentations

It was stated that the committee did not press Cala Homes enough about their proposals about the landscape

MV – the consultant was chairing the meeting which was for the developers to discuss their proposals for the sites, there were questions asked, what the evening did show that it is important to have this sort of consultation with questions from the public

5.0 DATES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

It was agreed that the dates for the next two meetings are as follows:-

Tuesday 30th July

Monday 2nd September

Both are to be held at 7.30pm

6.0 REPLY TO LETTER FROM HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL

Letter received from HDC which include a number of issues regarding the stage at which Steyning is at in the Neighbourhood planning process; there is an element of fluidity regarding planning, but this is the only response from HDC about the future of Neighbourhood planning.

Former chairman has had discussions about the time scale of Neighbourhood plans; whatever stage you are at in the planning there seems to be a rethink from the government about the numbers of houses required, this rethink should deliver the numbers sometime in 2020.

There are various issues, if planning continues on in the same way; the plan should be in place by the autumn, but only if the time scale is met as part of the neighbourhood plan after considering all sites that are around, if this slips Steyning will have less opportunity to influence the placement of houses and HDC will impose the housing within the areas that they have responsibility for.

PCa – the letter divides the neighbourhood plan into 3 types; there are 3 options set out, same for each stage of the plan, if the Steyning plan goes ahead, sites could be used that are not applicable to HDC which includes the National Parks sites. Need to establish if there was a greater benefit to the community if Steyning put in place the housing plan or if it was left to HDC.

RB – need to be aware that if there is no plan in place there can't be any influence bought by Steyning on which sites are used for housing. Keen to have a main plan in place that it is agreeable to HDC.

TC – Even if the main plan is agreed it still could mean that there will be extra houses allocated around the district if the government decides that more housing is required within HDC area.

MVP – should consider the pros and cons of the letter, there is a need of a strong plan which dictates the kind of housing required

TC – can't see any way that the plan will be ready by the deadline of autumn, already behind the timetable, so will miss HDC's deadline which seems to change

PC – should try to comply with the date but not get too hung up about it

TL – meeting with HDC the likely close off date will be Oct/Nov, it is still possible to make it, will wait for everything in which include the number of houses based on what is known now. What is being looked for is consultation in 2020,

examination Spring 2021, proposed publication 2021 then adoption of plan late 2021. It has asked that all parishes are sent a letter setting out all the dates for clarification

R Bell – seems that there is a working deadline of November to put the plan together, at next working group meeting to prioritise the feasibility of the timeline

PC - confused about Regulation 14 then goes on to Regulation 15 in this letter

R Ba - Regulation 15 is the target, there are two ways to deal with this one is to put the plan on hold, second to give HDC housing allocation and let them deal with then carry on with the NP, at this time the plan is in the early stage

PC - important that there are briefing papers regarding the discussion with HDC

MVP – there is a need to write to the HDC asking for clarification for stage 3

R Bell – important that discussion be held and move on it

RB – the committee still has to make a decision rather than have the Parish council make it

R Bell- does the committee have the delegated authority to make this decision

PCa – delegated authority up to Reg.14

R bell – need full and frank conversation regarding this at a workshop hopefully with Andrew present

MVP – need to let HDC that the committee are proceeding with the plan

R Bell – asked PC to draft reply to the letter and circulate it to the committee for approval

7.0 SPC NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP COMMITTEE VACANT POSITION RESOLUTION

After much discussion on how this procedure should be carried out and the realisation that some people are happy to contribute to a workshop but wouldn't wish to sit on a committee, also the importance of finding the extra skills required, it was decided to look at the original advert and edit as required then put out onto social media and all other avenues.

LT will edit the advert making it as simple as possible then put it out to the community via all means possible.

8.0 TAKING FORWARD POSSIBLE SKATEPARK DISCUSSIONS

R Bell – this is a serious proposition that has been raised by the Parish Council and it was felt that the NP should be included in the discussions; it may be part of the remit of the committee to see if something on these lines is required but not where it is to be located. Not quite at the stage where the committee needs to talk about the skatepark but may need to include in the plan.

TC – two decisions made by the Parish Council, one is that this passed over to the SNP group or the Parish council's working party look at it.

RB – could be included in NP but not allocated to any site

MVP – not appropriate for NP to discuss location

R Bell – need to make the decision as whether the committee decide or pass it back to the

Council, but it sounds like the committee will include it in the framework of the plan then leave it to the council

PC – the plan does not go into any other detail about recreation facilities so may not be right to include a skatepark

PM – feedback from the community could say if there is any need for this facility

PCa – thought that the skatepark was already in the remit of the committee

RB – it had been suggested that it was considered but didn't go any further

9.0 OPEN DISCUSSION

R Bell formally welcomed the new members to the committee and asked if they had any questions also, have access to drop box etc.

PCa – only just had access to drop box

TC – focus group names could they be on the website, also reports from the focus groups can they come to the SNP group. Is Steyning economy report available as on the timetable the end date is 2019

MVP – it is in draft form on drop box

TC – seem to be behind on deadlines but will need to check drop box, have questions about ACON report but that is for a workshop, worrying about becoming a dormitory town due to lack of employment generation

10.0 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

PM – environment group – will be working with his son on an element for the group on Bio diversity so will not be able to help with the work on green spaces, so, asked if there were 2 or more people to help as there is a lot of work required to be done particularly when comes to assessment work.

MVP – an invitation from Homes England to HDC to engage in community projects deadline of June, submitted application this for a register of all parish councils around Britain, MVP will be willing to carry it forward

11.0 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

30th July at 7.30pm

Workshop meeting required, Parish Clerk to be asked for dates

R Bell thanked everyone for attending

The meeting closed at 9.05pm

Signed Chair of the NP Steering Committee

Date - 30th July 2019