

Notes of PPC Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group held in the Sports Pavilion
18th January 2017 at 7.30pm

Present: Nick Beaumont (Joint Acting Chair and Chair for the meeting), Catherine Dampney, Simon Farmer, Tony Hutson, Catherine Jackson (Joint Acting Chair), Estelle Maisonnial (LDC), Denise Miller, Paul Stevens (Secretary), Simon Ward.

Members of the Public: 4

Site representatives: 2 (Julian Black and Canan Clatworthy)

1. Apologies for absence

Reg Stone.

2. Declaration of interests

None.

3. Previous minutes

The minutes were agreed and signed by the Chair.

Summary of actions:

- **CJ to arrange for all available and up-to-date plans for the proposed sites, including the latest race course site plan to be added to the website –** outstanding pending completion of the southern sites discussions.
- **CJ will arrange for the lay-out plans (of the northern sites) to be added to the website as soon as received –** as for above. Noted that detailed plans are not expected for all sites, but the SG would provide clarity to developers on planning parameters, especially the boundaries of acceptable development.
- **EM will send copies of examples of the Basic Conditions Statement and Sustainability Appraisal from other NPs to the steering group –** outstanding.
- **SW will obtain an estimate of costs for an up-to-date traffic survey –** initial contact made; carried forward.
- **NB to include a sum in the Parish Council budget preparations –** a notional sum of £4k has been included, pending completion of the previous action to obtain an estimate of costs.

4. Questions from members of the Public

- An update was requested on when members of the public would be receiving a reply to the issues raised in the responses to the draft plan.
- NB stated that the first discussions were with the statutory bodies as answers to their challenges and queries would inform any revisions to the draft plan and would therefore inform the responses to residents. To a certain extent this was also dependent on the ongoing discussion regarding sites, especially the southern sites, as these were material to the direction of the plan.
 - DM and CJ endorsed this and stated that the process could not be rushed,

but the expectation was that the revised draft plan would be available to the wider steering group at the end of January as indicated at the December meeting.

5. Updates on sites south of railway and meeting with owner of The Gatehouse

- CJ introduced the update with reference to the key issue of safe pedestrian access.
- Julian Black (JB) then provided an update that access to the site previously intended as from the south had created issues, but had now been revised to allow northerly access. With regards to the specific Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) issues raised by the County Council, three options had been prepared which were yet to be discussed with the owner of The Gatehouse due to the unavailability through illness of their legal representative. For that reason the details should not yet be regarded as for circulation. However, JB was cautiously optimistic that the options were all workable.
- In outline, Option A was the simplest amendment, but provided better landscaping than previously, in part due to the reduced width of the pedestrian access from 1.8m to 1.2m.
- Option B provided better traffic management by introducing a pinch point ahead of the access to slow traffic. This would be discussed with the County Council next week.
- Option C was slightly more radical and involved creation of DDA compliant lift facilities for the existing bridge crossing.
- In summary, all 3 were considered workable options, but had detail and commercial issues that would be discussed with the stakeholders from next week. One concern was the involvement of Network Rail, but that was inevitable.
- NB enquired as to the implication of the Racecourse proposals to the eastern site, in particular would they assist that proposal. JB responded that this could not be relied upon.
- CJ noted that the eastern site appeared to be largely waiting on the outcome of the Racecourse site discussions.

6. Site assessment and SEA review - progress

- CJ/EM/DM reported that they were on schedule for completion by end January. This would then be circulated to the wider SG, with the intention to discuss at the February SG.
- NB highlighted the urgency to maintain this timetable so that responses could be provided to the wider public, and especially those that had responded to the request for feedback on the draft plan.
- To ensure that this timetable could be met, it was agreed that the owner of the eastern of the southern sites should be informed that inclusion of that site in the plan was dependent on receiving the required information ahead of that date. **Action: CJ to inform the site owner of the deadline for inclusion of the site.**

- With regards to the northerly sites, a site plan for the land north of the Police House had been received, but did not conform to the parameters of the draft plan and therefore wider communication of that would not be of any value. CJ confirmed that detailed site plans were not the remit of the SG, but it must be made clear to the residents what the boundary of recommended development was.

7. Project Plan status and update for Residents

SF reported that there had been no material updates, and the plan would be publicised at the next SG meeting.

8. AOB

- CJ highlighted that the report from the Parish Council in the February Parish Magazine will address points made by David Hadden's letter to the Editor in the January edition
- CD queried the Newick decision, and in particular the reference in the judgment document to the absence of a development cap in the Newick plan. It was suggested that Plumpton should draft an additional policy to address this. EM responded that this reference in the decision was confusing as there was no capacity for a Neighbourhood Plan to include a cap. A policy could be drafted that might influence the allocation of windfall development, but this was intended for small sites (typically 1-6 units) rather than significant development. CD requested that whatever reassurances could be provided should be included. **Action: EM to circulate a suggested policy clause for windfall development.**

9. Dates of future meetings

15th February, Village Hall.

15th March, Village Hall.