

Notes of PPC Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group held in the Village Hall
6th June 2017 at 7.30pm

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

Members of the Public: 3

Site representatives: 0

1. Apologies for absence

Gail Murphy, Reg Stone.

2. Declaration of interests

None.

3. Previous minutes

The minutes were agreed, though SF did not recall the action on him regarding the consultation banner. As this is covered under agenda item 5, the minutes were accepted.

4. Site updates including meetings with developers for Oakfield and Glebe.

Note that whilst item 6 was reserved for questions from members of the public, there were a number of questions raised during agenda items 4 and 5. NB was happy to allow this, but these questions are not attributed in the minutes though the text does reflect the points queried.

NB reported that there was a working group meeting held at the request of the developers of the Oakfield site. For completeness, a representative of the Glebe site was also present. The meeting was considered very productive.

Both developers accepted the key policy constraints of developments of no more than 20 units on each site, and the need to minimise the impact on adjoining properties. Both were intent on preserving as much of the existing greenery as possible. Both also confirmed that the full sites would be developed, with no intention of adding additional units in a subsequent development. Sticking to 20 units allowed the density to be reduced, and greater attention to be given to positioning units to reduce impact on adjacent properties.

The developers of Oakfield provided an indicative site plan for 20 units, and would ensure that this was made available for the consultation exercise. They indicated that they were keen to start development as soon as practically possible.

The Glebe representative undertook to provide a similar indicative site plan, but

emphasised that the Diocese were not considering immediate development, but likely to be looking at a timescale of 5 years plus, and therefore were keen not to incur significant expenditure in the short term. This may compromise the ability to provide consultation material. It was confirmed that there was no intention to demolish the rectory in the development (though a new parsonage was required and would be included in the 20 new units).

On the issue of potentially sharing an access to the two adjacent sites, the Glebe developer indicated that this could be a significant problem due to the need for independence to meet the requirements of the Charities Act. The working group had requested a fuller explanation of the issues here, which hopefully could be provided for the consultation exercise. Cala (for Oakfield) indicated that the development would be a private road with a management company including the residents of the development.

In addition to plans for the Oakfield and Glebe sites, the developers of the remaining sites (Riddens and Strawlands) had been contacted for updated plans so that the consultation exercise could be as informed as possible with site plans for all proposed developments. CJ stated that the developer of Strawlands was waiting on some input from East Sussex County Council regarding flood risk issues.

It was confirmed that detailed site plans had only been requested for the proposed sites. SW stated that site plans were not relevant for those sites that were not proposed for development, but that having detailed plans for the intended sites would address one of the criticisms of the previous consultation exercise.

With regard to the reserve site of the race course, no update had been received, but NB was scheduled to meet with the Chief Executive on Wednesday 14th June.

5. Confirm actions for Public Consultation

NB stated that the first action was for the Parish Council to approve the new draft plan. This was on the agenda for the June 13th meeting. Planning was on the basis that approval would be received, but rejection would mean that the plan would have to be re-drawn, or even abandoned. Given the degree of syndication with the significant statutory bodies, there was confidence that the plan would be approved.

Printed materials would then be commissioned for circulation to the various locations (shop, pubs, village hall, church hall etc), which was not considered a big job.

A2/A3 laminations of the policy sections and especially the site plans would be created for the consultation displays. **Action** CJ to contact all developers to request they directly produce supporting material in laminated form.

Action NB to confirm with statutory consultees that timetable for consultation. EM advised sending the draft plan, together with the feedback form and a link to the supporting material. EM confirmed that these actions met all of the pre-requisites of commencing consultation. **Action** EM to provide supporting template for statutory consultees feedback.

Action NB would confirm that the shop was happy to receive feedback forms from parishioners, and that all locations for the paper copies of the draft plan were informed. It was confirmed that the school would not be a location.

It was discussed that the feedback form should be reviewed to ensure that feedback could be collated efficiently and effectively. Other parishes had structured the form around support for each policy within it, but also allowed some free text response to accompany that. EM advised that with respect to proposed development sites this should be at overall policy level, and not at individual site level. It was emphasised that the consultation exercise was primarily to assess the effectiveness of the draft plan, and not the popularity of individual elements within it. It remained the case that the draft plan had to operate effectively within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) otherwise it would not progress to examination. **Action** PS to review original feedback form to see whether it could be more structured for prompt and effective analysis.

Action SF to check who coordinated the banner for the previous consultation.

Action CJ to circulate the revised foreword to the draft plan for comments.

NB confirmed that the website would be updated with the new material, with particular emphasis on maintaining ease of access to the documents whilst keeping clear separation from the original draft plan to avoid confusion.

The venues for the two public consultation exercise had been booked, and the dates advertised in the Parish Magazine. **Action** NB to collate availability of the Steering Group members for these events, as it was known that some were on holiday during the period.

EM confirmed that the above activity satisfactorily covered the consultation requirements.

NB stated that Steering Group members were welcome to attend the Parish Council meeting to support any queries that might be raised.

It was agreed that responses to those that provided consultation feedback in the original exercise had been delayed, partially due to the sheer volume of

responses, and the important questions raised in those responses which led to the growing realisation that the feedback from the statutory bodies required significant re-working of the draft plan, but also due to the unfortunate illnesses within the committee.

Whilst these factors should be less of an issue this time round, the Steering Group acknowledged the need to provide faster feedback. It was confirmed that a single, consolidated summary response would be provided to parishioners, rather than individual responses. Anonymous feedback forms would be discarded – contact details would be required to ensure eligibility to feedback, and that feedback was welcomed at individual level (not per household as for the initial questionnaire). The explanation of this, and the process for responding to feedback would be included in the feedback form. **Action** NB to consider a dedicated email address for responses.

In response to a query regarding flooding concerns with the proposed sites, it was confirmed that whilst the original draft plan had included flood risk as an assessment criteria, it did not have the ability to reject sites on flooding grounds, as this is a matter for planning. With regard to the latest proposed sites, all are assessed as deliverable by LDC, and so developers would need to address flooding concerns in detailed planning proposals. This is not material that is required for the public consultation, so beyond including the flood zone maps, the public exercise would not involve the developers providing detailed water management schemes.

EM confirmed that the level of any amendments made following public consultation could result in the requirement for a further public consultation ahead of submission of the draft plan to LDC.

The Steering Group should consider meeting in private to assess any significant feedback emerging during the public consultation that would require structural amendment of the plan.

6. Questions from members of the Public

The Parish Magazine made reference to a referendum on the Neighbourhood Plan in summer 2018, and it was requested whether there was a supporting plan that set out the steps. NB confirmed that there was a plan, and that the detail should already have been published on the website. The process involved a number of steps, some of which (notably the external examination) did not have set timetables and practical experience indicated this could take several months. Each step was also dependent on the preceding step, and in particular the degree of amendment required. The basic steps were summarised as:

- Initial public consultation – completing end July
- Analysis of output from initial public consultation – complete mid September

- Submission and review by LDC – up to 8 weeks
- Appointment of external examiner and examination – variable, but typically 3-6 months
- Amendments post examinations – up to 8 weeks
- Referendum – 8 weeks
- LDC adoption – up to 8 weeks

It was confirmed that there was no hard deadline for completion, but LDC was now working on the Local Plan Part 2, and the absence of an adopted plan for Plumpton would represent a policy gap in that document. EM confirmed that once submitted to LDC, even if un-adopted the draft plan would carry weight in the policy and planning discussions.

7. AOB

EM queried the status of the Consultation Statement and Basic Conditions Statement. These were not required for the public consultation, but should be commenced now for LDC review ahead of external examination. **Action** PS/CJ to review the examples provided by EM.

8. Dates of future meetings

12th June - Working Group (i.e. closed session) to review material for public consultation exercise.

No Steering Group meeting was required during the consultation period.

A further Working Group meeting was tentatively agreed for 19th July to assess any significant feedback from the consultation process.

Meeting closed 20:45.