

Steypning Parish Council



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

Telephone: 01903 812042

www.steyningpc.gov.uk

MEETING OF THE STEYPNING NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE

HELD ON 7th FEBRUARY 2019 AT 7.30PM

IN THE STEYPNING CENTRE

Present: RB, MvP, PM, PC, SJ, Cllr TL, MA (took minutes)

Clerk: John Fullbrook

Members of the Public: 4 + 1 Late arrival

Meeting started at: 7.30 pm

DRAFT MINUTES

ACTION

SG/18/82 Apologies for Absence

82.1 R Bell; Councillor L. Trundle. G. Vidgeon has stepped down from being a member of the steering committee because of time constraints. It is hoped to recruit a replacement in near future.

SG/18/83 Declarations of Interest and Dispensations

83.1 None.

SG/18/84 Questions from the Floor

84.1 Disappointment was expressed that there is no clerk present to take minutes and that the minutes of meeting of 13/12/18 still not available. RB responded that 13/12/18 minutes only just printed, not reviewed yet. Member of public pointed out that other NPs have clerks provided; Parish Council is not giving NP support. Furthermore, the availability of £16,400 from Parish Council was not made clear. RB replied that a clerk has been recruited, misunderstanding about tonight. Hopefully matter is resolved.

84.2 T. Cree: AECOM housing needs assessment is not fit for purpose. He pointed out that Warnham consultant (Alison Eardley) reworked AECOM methodology for housing needs assessment for this reason. She rated different projections from high/medium/low.

When will EnPlan attend steering group meeting? Also, concerned about predetermination on the Glebe Farm site (concerns on access etc.); should wait for site assessment. RB replied Steering Group has not made any determinations on sites put forward. It will be part of assessment process that EnPlan will lead on; assume this probably refers to SHLAA assessment for HDC, which rated it as being a strategic site but based on current access, as unlikely to go forward. This has no bearing on NP committee, which is not considering it from that perspective.



Parish Clerk: John Fullbrook
Deputy Clerk: Hazel Roxby

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

Richborough Estates, who are managing the application, will carry out access assessment. Committee has not made any decisions on any sites put forward.

84.3 Mr Campbell: NPPF Policy 66: Cllr TL said would get housing figures from HDC at time of draft plan; understand can ask HDC for indicative figure. Why are we doing AECOM housing needs assessment?

RB replied that understood that HDC has offer to give figure to smaller parishes, not representative of the new figure being worked on and may not be firm figure. Process will now be 'bottom up'. Steering Committee is taking a lead from its consultants and Norman Kwan – this is approach to take.

Mr Campbell stated that he must be misreading it – in his view, anything but bottom up.

RB replied that HDC is reviewing its local plan, the number is part of review, so the figure of 1500 may go up or down. At meeting in November, advised to follow AECOM. PC suggested formal request for figure. Enplan's view is not to deviate from HDC route.

84.4 Mr Campbell: question on Policy 14a - review and update plan every 2 years forever. At last PC meeting, did they appreciate 2-year treadmill? Is the Committee aware of this? HDC advice is to be mindful of 2-year review.

RB: HDC advice is that as long as a local plan is in-date, there are protections in local plan that would prevent biennial review by local plan. At moment, advice is to be mindful of this two-yearly requirement. This will be clarified with HDC at follow-up conference on 8 February. Could be light touch review.

84.5 Mr Campbell: If our NP cannot deliver whole housing requirement, then the protection of a NP falls away.

RB responded that consultants are reviewing questions he has put forward to get answered asap. Looking at format for release to public domain in more structured way. Consultants want to review information before it is put in the public domain for clarity, not to withhold it, or change it but to review, in case additional information should be released for clarity. Outcome of meeting and 8-point session with consultants, waiting for them to give go-ahead.

84.6 Mr Campbell: Overarching issue is pro and con of not having a plan. Didn't have pro and con of NP without housing element.

RB: all 3 options are there in document section with survey. And their responses to the options. Hopefully in document section online this week. Consultants use a collection tool that cannot be edited.

84.7 Mr Campbell: Any concern among committee that housing number might be 'slightly increased' beyond that authorised by NP for a particular site? e.g. extra 5 houses for a 9 – 12 site ; 50% increase sounds like be a worrying margin?

MvP: Numbers are a big concern, but current discussion is not over numbers but constraints such as a national park boundary overlapping at the town boundary, flood risk areas etc., also the infrastructure required for that number. We have started looking at priorities for infrastructure improvements for the developments wherever they might be. It is a strategy of prioritising infrastructure for the town to enable the numbers; it would have to be robust. Must have evidence, criteria – a business plan, whether for town improvements, high street improvements, bus interchange or utilities. It should set tone for plan. Not looking at numbers as be-all and end-all. Might be untenable for other reasons.

PC: any site with homes built on it –ultimately planners will decide if it can sustain the numbers quoted.

Mr Campbell: Steyning will vote on the NP, then the sites may have extra numbers foisted upon them.

RB: HDC requires minimum numbers for site so must be more prescriptive. Must specify. We want to do as good a job as possible; to be thorough. Don't want to open the door for large developments.

Mr Campbell: – Regulation 14B or C could drive a coach and horses through it.

RB: May not be case that numbers are achieved, may not be case that community development achieved. May not have a problem in delivering community assets. Don't know it is undeliverable. RB don't want to pre-empt, and have to follow advice of lead consultants.

Questions finished at 7.55pm.

SG/18/85 Agreement of Minutes of Previous Meeting

85.1 Minutes of meeting of 13.12.18 only received within last 24 hours, not enough time to proof read thoroughly. Will then be uploaded. Agreement deferred until next meeting.

SG/18/86 Matters arising and Actions from the Minutes

86.1 Community Plan Leaflet – finalised, printed and delivered to all households in the parish.

86.2 HDC 8-point Questions and Answers session - completed and will be uploaded shortly.

86.3 Draft Vision Statement - published and leaflets distributed. Some comments received.

86.4 Web Site Content - updated to include NP agendas and minutes.

86.5 Clerking Assistance - no clerk present; possibly not informed in time to attend meeting. Council clerks JF and HR to organise and confirm availability for future meetings.

SG/18/87 Vision Statement

87.1 Some comments have been received, both online and by post. MA to revise working statements to include these for discussion by committee at workshop. Also start composing objectives from comments received.

SG/18/88 Next Pop-up Event

88.1 RB and TL attended Business Chamber meeting. Some ideas. Generally, supportive and keen to be part of the consultation process. About half traders are members of the Business Chamber. Need to engage with remainder; strategy for this.

88.2 Nothing planned yet for future community engagement.

88.3 Need to keep momentum going – ideas for possible future events in the town to link with. MvP noted and will pursue Steyning Greening February agenda - planning in rural areas. Possible stall at May Fair on 27 May, bank holiday weekend. Minimum to keep people aware, ideally something.

88.4 TL asked about possible date for first presentation of sites. RB originally suggested mid- February but now look at mid-March; check with clerks for room availability and email interested parties. Give landowners opportunity to promote sites and Q and A session. PC informed of 'Shaping Sussex Countryside' seminar on 27 February (clash with NP workshop date).

88.5 TL suggested delaying public event until April to give time to organise. Put together ideas at next workshop meeting. PM to contact SGS Head Teacher, Nick Wergan, to start process of engagement with 6th Form. Need suggestions for specific topics.

SG/18/89. Neighbourhood Plan Survey

89.1 Keen for another survey; no list of topics yet, but suggestions needed. Enplan guidance to come: Infrastructure; High Street; local green spaces; environment; plus others.

89.2 MvP relationship between building houses and infrastructure not clear. Need to get discussion going. Topics may arise as work progresses. Following on from business questions concerning High Street.

89.3 (Mr Cree: presentation mid-April: developers keen so positive, residents able to rate each site in Henfield.)

89.4 (Mr Campbell: nominating green space: MvP ideal opportunity - green space, open space, access to South Downs is avenue to get it in.)

SG/18/90 Neighbourhood Plan Consultants

90.1 EnPlan attended NP Steering Committee meeting at beginning of year. They will attend next public meeting. It was a constructive meeting for Steering Committee, setting tasks and processes for committee to follow. More info at next public session; format for this not set yet. Andrew M to lead. Alison still involved, mainly dealing with documentation at moment. One will attend next meeting.

90.2 Invoice received. To forward to SPC committee. MvP suggested drawing down to clarify 2 months better time interval. EnPlan invoice for £2686.69+VAT = £3224.03. RB **proposed** acceptance; Cllr TL **seconded; Agreed.**

SG/18/91 Locality and Finance

91.1 Agreed Budget of £24,540; based on SWAB figures. EnPlan had no budget for year to put forward. + £900. So, £33,000 funded as a mixture of grants and reserve. All agreed. TL advised producing income and expenditure statement for each meeting; PC to undertake.

SG/18/92 AECOM Update

92.1 Draft report still not ready. EnPlan has become involved because of length of time it is taking; Bramber's report was done quickly. Steyning's has been slow. Housing numbers uncertain. Disappointment at long delay.

92.2 (Member of public interjected to state that gross number can be calculated easily from ascertaining the number of dwellings in built boundary).

SG/18/93 Any Other Urgent Business

93.1 None.

SG/18/94 Information/Correspondence Items

94.1 Update on HDC conference; 8-point Questions. Last week's conference cancelled because of snowy weather. Rescheduled for 8 February.

94.2 Neighbouring parish plan: unfortunately, no-one attended Ashington NP public event.

94.3 Update on returned leaflets: replies received in hard copy and by email; hoping for and awaiting more. Some good points have been made. Open until 1 March. About 30 responses so far (SWAB received 22% responses).

94.4 Correspondence received: these are online in group folder. Questions forwarded to EnPlan and HDC as relevant.

14. Date of next meeting - 27 March 2019 at 7.30pm.

Meeting closed at 8.45pm.

Signed Chair of the NP Steering Committee

Date



Parish Clerk: John Fullbrook
Deputy Clerk: Hazel Roxby

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