

Steypning Parish Council



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

Telephone: 01903 812042

www.steyningpc.gov.uk

MEETING OF THE STEYNING NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE

HELD ON 20th August 2019 AT 7.30PM
IN THE STEYNING CENTRE

Present: Cllrs Liz Trundle (LT), Paul Campbell (PCa), Georgia Saunders (GS) and Trevor Cree (TC),
Members: Richard Bell (R.Bell), Paul Maidment (PM), Murray Van de Pol(MV)

Clerk: Evelyn Stanford

Parish Clerk: John Fullbrook

Members of the Public: 30 plus Cllrs M. Bissett-Powell, C. Young, G. Sullivan, S. Sullivan, R. Goldsmith, S. Northam
T. Lloyd and D. Hanson

Meeting started at: 7.30 pm

DRAFT MINUTES

ACTION

At the start of the meeting the Chair, Richard Bell, asked the members of the committee to introduce themselves to the public so they knew who everyone was.

1.0 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Sally Johnstone (SJ)

2.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest from the Committee

6.0 This item was brought forward on the agenda

RB informed the committee and the public that unfortunately the Draft Neighbourhood Plan which was to be recommended to the full Council after discussion at this meeting, was not available.

The Parish Clerk, J Fullbrook stated that the Consultant, who was due to attend this meeting, informed him that as there were still some tweaks to be made to ensure that the conclusions comply with the LGS report, also the other documents including the draft plan itself still requires review which need to be completed before the plan is signed off by the SNP committee.

Therefore, the Consultant could not recommend the SNP committee put forward the plan and other evidence



Parish Clerk: John Fullbrook
Deputy Clerk: Hazel Roxby

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

based documents to the Council in compliance with Regulation 14; it was felt that another NP Steering Committee meeting should be convened the week beginning August 26th. - The meeting was set for Thursday August 29th at 7.30pm; John Fullbrook reminded the committee that to be quorate, five members of the committee have to be in attendance.

3.0 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Member of the public stated that she was unable to access any documents from the website which included the draft plan; other members of the public also voiced agreement which gave them reason to be concerned especially regarding the sites to be potentially used for housing.

MV explained that although there is a draft plan it does not contain any housing allocations as there has been a timing issue, so it is subsequently a pared back plan. He said that the committee would produce a timetable detailing what happens next, but there will be no development plan which will be forced on to the public without due consultation process.

RB stated that the Neighbourhood plan does have advantages for the village but doesn't define any housing allocations for sites within the plan.

Member of the public asked if the plan is without site allocation is it prejudicial to seeking sympathetic liaison with property developers at this stage or is the lack of site allocation due to some other advantage or a failure to meet the deadline and if the latter how is this decision been left.

PC said that they were right to ask and there is a document which he personally would like to be put on the website, it being a letter from the consultant which stated as where they had got to and the problems with the timescale. This is because HDC had very belatedly given a deadline by which stage the plan had to be ready for them; this being the 30th November. The letter arrived on the 10th July which gave the committee 9 days to provide all the evidence; this date was able to be moved and everyone has worked extremely hard over the month to put policies together which normally take 2 yrs. Also, they have worked hard to get the plan in place, but now they are concentrating on the environmental policy as that is the one of most concern.

Public – why has it got to this tight stage when it was known for some time how long there was to put it together.

PC - the letter from HDC arrived on the 13th March, the committee negotiated with HDC to try and move the deadline as it seemed to completely unreasonable

Member of the Public – it seems that HDC is causing the issue so is there any point in lobbying them?

PC - unfortunately not as their timetable is driven by the changes in the national planning strategy which came in last year which meant that the local plan had to be re-visited, which means that Steyning either has to beat the deadline or wait to later until HDC has reviewed their plan. Once that is complete the Neighbourhood plan can be looked at again and policies reviewed, also, the housing situation can be looked at once the figures are known and also the site allocation.

Member of the Public – Surely site allocation will be inconclusive

PC - there will be less input as this is not part of the Neighbourhood Plan and it could mean lobbying HDC

RB the level of consultation with HDC will not be the same as it would be if it was part of the plan

Member of Public still concerned about the length of time

TC – In 2017 a white paper was produced, part of that contained methodology for looking at the housing situation; HDC had an allocation of 16,000 houses originally but under the new allocation need to find an additional 3,000. Each parish will be allocated the number of houses that they are required to accommodate, this will probably not be not known until 2020; the call for sites means that landowners can put forward land for consideration.

RB our Neighbourhood Plan will carry some influence with HDC; there is work yet to be done so that the committee can be proactive with HDC on this issue.

TL will there be hard copies of the plan available or emails taken?

RB note taken that communication has to be improved, it is not appropriate for the draft plan to be made public yet

Member of the Public – all parishes have had the same date so are we in a unique situation here whereby Steyning has not got a plan going forward

MV there is a good website which tells you of how all the parishes in Sussex are progressing with their plans, some started before Steyning, there was a committee called SWAB which was dissolved so the process was started again for Steyning, the timescale which was believed would be moved unfortunately wasn't

RB some of the work carried out by SWAB was reused

MV the vision statement which gets discounted was properly consulted and is available online and forms the basis of the core document that is being put together, this is looking at Steyning in 2031, no policies have been agreed as yet.

Member of the public – can the document that PC was talking about be put up on the Council website

Former Vice-chair – all documents relating to SWAB were made over to this committee for a starting point, this included a parish wide survey (2015) which showed the majority of residents supported some new development it also showed 90% of residents did not want one large single estate. There was also a document which showed 30 plus development sites and their assessments and the selections of which was recommended for housing. Over 60% residents attended consultations held in January 2016, they broadly agreed with the findings. This year this committee posted a public event to showcase development of 3 significant sites; public reaction was favourable as 2 sites included infrastructure and green spaces on land not currently open to the public, your plan seems to throw away those well balanced offers, it is very dubious to let HDC decide where housing should go as it could affect Steyning as a whole, so the committee were asked to think very carefully about their plan.

RB it is imperative that the committee consider things carefully and as widely as possible to make the right decisions with Steyning; the green space assessment is an area which is tricky getting that right is one reason why the plan is not being assessed fully tonight.

Member of Public – Green spaces policies should not be used as basis for stopping development of sites, Green Spaces assessments should be taken into account

RB - it is important that the committee follow the guidelines

TC stated that the public were not permitted to attend SWAB meetings, also the SWAB plan never allowed the public to attend an event where the housing was discussed as happened in May

RB not sure going back over the past will help, but there is evidence out there which needs to be reviewed especially on Green Space areas, this has been identified as needing special attention

TC pointed out that HDC is allocating housing numbers

Russell Barnes said Steyning Parish Council had given to HDC the right to allocate sites.

Member of the public pointed out that it has been stated on a briefing paper for the Parish Council that a decision had been made, the question is where on the agenda was this item listed and where does it appear in the minutes?

Member of the public - HDC has no authority to impose allocations in the National Park as there will be an independent examiner who will look at Green Spaces allocations and decide, also at the public event no questions were allowed from either the public or Cllrs this means that the public cannot understand how everything has got to this point

John Fullbrook believed that the 10th July letter was a supporting paper for a council meeting in July but that either way it will be put on the website plus any other relevant documents.

RB - the event held was just a showcase event for the committee to consider the kind of developments that the developers are considering; the public were invited to email comments

Member of public led to believe that the open spaces were not going to be there in perpetuity

RB there are various levels of protection for areas such as the National Park

Member of public - At last meeting the question was raised about the 9 sites and was informed that there would be another meeting to showcase all sites but that had not happened.

RB this is one reason why housing has been dropped from the Neighbourhood Plan because there has not been time to put together a proper assessment for housing, so the council will have to consult with HDC

PC - there will be a review of the plan once HDC has completed their plan and at that point the sites will be looked at again. The consultant made it clear that the housing option was not viable given the time restrictions so, either the plan was to be stopped or the committee carry on with the current policies which will influence the plan. There was another decision to be made and that was to allow HDC to allocate housing but not site allocation as

they have the expertise to accommodate any problems that arise, there will be consultation with Steyning as these problems will affect schools etc.

TC - the allocation of housing will change the boundary of the built-up area in the parish

Member of public what is the relevance of a Neighbourhood Plan if it doesn't protect the residents

RB the purpose of a Neighbourhood plan is not to block housing development but to encourage the design of housing to enhance the area, the advantage of removing housing from the plan to encourage the enhancement of the infrastructure. With a plan the council receive 25% of the value of property, without a plan this drops to 15% so Steyning could miss out on this money if the plan is not put in place. Policies that are being dealt with are to do with the environment which HDC will need to consider if any development is to happen.

Members of the public were unhappy with what is happening and felt that they have not had the information about the situation.

MV stated that the committee had committed a lot of time and effort into the plan but have been constrained by the timescale, that there are a number of volunteers to who have been putting together evidence regarding the economy and infrastructure but the consultant informed them that if the plan is not in place by this date then it was all a waste of time

Member of public complaining that the information is not in the public domain about what has been happening

MV any developer can put in for planning, but all the committee can do is ensure the policies are in place to protect the environment

PC understands that HDC has been working with the developer on one particular site

Member of public - that is the site that HDC will go for as it isn't in National Park

R Goring said everyone here has an interest in what is going on, what does the broader community require, the pie chart which showed what Steyning will be like in 20-30yrs time suggests the vision is there, but the plan needs to show the breadth of what is required

RB the personal position of everybody will be viable

Members of the public – the committee are saying that they wish to protect the environment but the impact of housing, which most of the public don't want, will have some affect; the public were also upset about the lack of consultation

4.0 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

4.1 To agree the minutes of the meeting held 20th May 2019 – PM proposed and TC seconded acceptance of the minutes, all the committee agreed to sign off the minutes

4.2 To agree the minutes of the meeting held 1st July 2019 – PC asked for an amendment to Item 6 where Cllr Lloyd gives the timescale for the Local Plan, to substitute the following:-

'There followed a lengthy discussion as to whether or not the cut-off date Cllr Lloyd had reported from HDC related to Regulation 14 readiness or Regulation 15. The distinction was important because a minimum of six weeks' consultation and a period for amendments arising from the consultation would need to be accommodated if it was Regulation 15.

It was agreed that clarification from HDC was essential but that in the meantime, and on the basis of an assurance that the consultant considered the timescale achievable after a meeting with HDC, the Committee wished to use its best endeavours to comply with the deadline, to include housing site assessments.'

The committee agreed to the amendment, PC proposed, MV seconded acceptance, all the committee were in favour of agreement

4.3 To discuss and agree the minutes of the meetings held on 7th February and 27th March 2019 – RB to publish these documents with a caveat that if there is a dispute about the minutes to let the Parish Clerk know, this is because of the lateness of receiving the minutes.

John Fullbrook stated that these documents could be returned too and agreed at the meeting to be held on the 29th August 2019 so that the minutes can be doubled checked for any inaccuracies.

PC asked about recordings of the minutes

JF replied that there are recordings but the minutes most importantly needed to contain accurate decisions made, what is also required of the committee is to agree that these minutes contain all the pertinent points made.

PC made the comment that these minutes have already been received by the Council whilst in draft form.

JF - the minutes were not agreed at the SNP group meeting as there was a suggestion that they were not accurate, but he had not been made aware when the comment was made and by whom.

PC - in the minutes of 27th March, item3, it was not a report but a letter from HDC which gave 2 options

RB agreed that the amendment should be included, he then asked for a proposer for the minutes of 7th February 2019 and the minutes of the 27th March 2019 subject to the amendment,

MV **proposed** acceptance, PC **seconded**, the committee. **All agreed acceptance**

MV asked if these minutes would be put on to the Council and the SNP websites

JF - certainly they would

RB the SNP website requires some improvement to enable people to navigate it more clearly

After discussion where several points were raised about how the website works as later documents are being added to the end rather than being at the top, GS offered to liaise with website administrator to look at the website to see how it can be improved, she will also bring ideas to the next meeting on how it can be improved and also try to sort out access to the documents if possible

RB asked if this can be an agenda item for the next meeting

5.0 MATTERS ARISING AND ACTIONS FROM THE MINUTES – to confirm matters arising from the Meeting of 1st July and report actions brought forward

5.1 Terms of Reference to be updated and circulated – **Actioned**

5.2 Work with full Council to ensure response to Horsham DC'S letter of 13th March 2019 – **Actioned**

5.3 To ensure Steering Committee Vacant position advertisements were published – **Actioned**

5.4 All Steering committee members to be able to gain access to Drop Box – **Actioned**

6.0 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN DRAFT COMMUNITY DOCUMENT - ITEM DEFERRED TO AUGUST 29TH 2019

7.0 STEERING GROUP VACANT POSITIONS

7.1 Report from the Chairman on the current interest involved with the Steering Committee –

Resignations from the Steering Group have been received from Mariella Alexander, Russell Barnes and Paul Cotton

Due to pressure of time and various other things that occurred RB stated that he has not been able to respond to those people who have expressed an interest, also made the observation that introducing someone new at this busy time could be quite tricky, but it will be dealt with and he will pass on his information.

8.0 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

8.1 To discuss and agree nature of any future Community engagement and plan for public consultation –

RB this is an important item as the draft plan has been changed from the original and it has to be carefully considered on how it will be explained to the public why it has been pared down because of the timescale and how it will be put in the public domain

MV - the Council meet to agree the draft on the 2nd September 2019 and the consultation begins on the 3rd.

RB - do we put out to the public after the meeting next week the reason for the pared down plan or do we offer a good and robust explanation for what has happened

PC - we need to know when there will be a day for a public event, once that is known, publicize it thoroughly, stating that there are copies of the plan available in various places around Steyning, so that there will be time for public feedback

PM - try and use social media to publicise as well

MV - post the letter from Andrew Metcalf on the Council website so that the public will know what our consultant is saying

TC - is there a notice board within the Steyning Centre that can be used to display the plan ready for the weekend 28th/29th September so there has been time to consider all the feedback

MV - Not everyone can access the centre, what about using the library for a display

RB - definitely a need to communicate, the other thing to be considered carefully is how the feedback is evaluated, so should the consultation be earlier to give the public more time to think about the plan before giving their feedback

MV the use of digital communication is one way to receive instant feedback

GS said that she would have gone at complying a survey using digital means working off the plan

JF – AM will understand timescales etc and it is hoped that he will be at the meeting next week and JF works out which dates are available for then. Also the boards in the centre, - there is one earmarked for the Neighbourhood plan which can be used immediately

MV – AM is to issue a consultation briefing which will cover what happens when to meet the time required

RB the committee will receive the consultation and hope to encourage feedback

PM ask the public what bits they like or don't like and if anything is missing from the policies

MV ask them to give a yes/no answer to adopting the plan and would they support the plan, there is confusion about where this plan is going

PM explain where the committee is at, what has to be jettisoned,

PC need to ask if they like the policy if not why not

PM is evidence going to be publicised for all the policies

PC all documents should be on the table as well as the draft plan

TC key pages should be displayed on the board

It was noted that there are various areas of green spaces that not in the plan and this may cause some comeback from the public

RB – AM needs to inform the committee on the consultation and date; the committee need to carry out a blitz on the way the publicity is carried out and have some clear thoughts on how the responses are co-ordinated and collated into a form of analysis

JF was asked to inform AM about the meeting next week

9.0 LOCALITY AND FINANCE

9.1 To discuss and agree acceptance of the invoices associated with the Neighbourhood Plan consultation process – See Supporting papers

JF the papers including invoices have been circulated, before these are approved at Full Council they go to F&GP. There is one large invoice which has to go direct to full Council because of the sum involved, looking for agreement to pay these invoices at this meeting

PC do the committee approve or recommend

JF the committee agrees and recommends F&GP / Full Council approves.

PC - the cost seems to be more than the quote possibly because extra work has been fed into the consultant, the committee need to be mindful of the cost whenever AM is involved in communications

MV - need to inform the public that time is money especially when the consultant is asked to compile more documents

PC - but as there is no housing allocation in it he thought that the budget would slightly lower

RB - is the committee happy to sign the invoices off?

There was further discussion about the fees and how they are arrived at, JF gave a breakdown of the details involved, he also informed the committee that an additional £5,000 has been reserved thanks to agreement at the recent F&GP meeting and there was still £2,500 left over from the allocated £15K and this will cover most of what AM has said the expenses will be. The review on the 10th September at the next F&GP committee meeting will see if there is a need to extend further what has been agreed in term of earmarked reserves, also JF mentioned that the cost for last year had been covered by a grant, the grant for this year of £8,000 is unlikely to be received as it was dependent on Housing allocations being undertaken, therefore the Council who had already allocated £15,000 of the £23,000 required for the year has needed to consider further funds and also the total cost may be slightly more.

MV - may be at the public meeting next week the public should be advised on how much the consultation is costing

JF – There could be an item to cover this on the next Meeting Agenda and perhaps AM at that meeting next week could give a more precise costing if that is possible which will be in time for it to go to full council or in time for the F&GP review

GS - no need to say exact cost but the committee do intend to inform the public the final amount

MV - the public need to be informed as it could look as if the committee is hiding something

GS - there is a need to be up-front with the public so that they know what is going on

RB - is there a table on how much other councils have paid for their Neighbourhood Plans

to give a comparison on the cost of Steyning's plan, also inform the public how much it has cost so far and how much it will cost to finish but it hoped that some of the money can be recouped

PC - can it be minuted that the estimate cost of completing the plan will be £23,000

RB - there is a need to be transparent or it goes out from the Parish Council as a cost, so the proposal is to make it an agenda item on how much the plan has cost so far

JF – could place it under 'Community Engagement' which will enable TC to report on any other council's cost of their plans

MV **proposed** acceptance, RB **seconded**, that the committee agreed all payment of invoices supplied as supporting papers and to recommend approval to F&GP / Full Council. **All agreed**

10.0 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None

11.0 INFORMATION/CORRESPONDENCE ITEMS

11.1 None

12.0 DATE OF NEXT MEETING - 29th August 2019 at 7.30m

Workshop to be scheduled shortly after 2nd September 2019

The meeting closed at 9.40pm

Signed Chair of the NP Steering Committee

Date - 20th August 2019



Parish Clerk: John Fullbrook
Deputy Clerk: Hazel Roxby

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