

Minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting 18th June 2015

Present:

Jack Cranfield, Don Cranfield, Ken Jordan, Mark Evans, Katherine Matthews, James Garside.

1. *Minutes* from the last meeting on 28th May were agreed.

2. *Matters Arising*

Annual Parish Meeting- leaflets were handed out and obtained email addresses of several people who were interested in helping.

23rd July Housing meeting- ME to put in Chailey News and on web. JC to email list.

3. *and* 4. *James Garside* was introduced from Lewes DC-Planning Policy Officer under Catherine Jack and Ed Sheath.

He provided an update on the Core Strategy. The Hearing was in January- the Inspector said they need to up the housing target up to 6,900 across District. This is an extra 200 across the district for the next 15 years. They are now making modifications. There are no amendments to the Chailey allocations at the moment. The increase in houses will be met by the Neighbourhood Plans or Core Strategy Part 2 maximising numbers on site.

Part 2 will be issued once Part 1 adopted. Preferred options will be at the end of this year/ start of next. It is not till after part 2 is adopted that app numbers start counting, before that they are windfall.

However, the councils position is that it now has a 5 year supply calculated on the 6,900 figure. They can now give weight to housing restriction policies. At this point, judging on his experience, it is likely that the developments outside the development boundary will be refused because there is now a 5 year supply, but they could then go to appeal.

ME- To what extent can Parish Council say that we have a N Plan in progress when commenting on applications, what weight does it have?

JG-Plans acquire weight the further they go through the process. Until it goes to examination it has v little weight. Once there is a draft plan it goes to stat consultation, then starts acquiring weight.

DC- If we went down the site allocation route would the developer left out object?

JG- of course, but Lewes DC would deal with the challenge. Parishes therefore need to be more robust in evidence gathering, formatting plans etc.

DC- Can we phase sites if not allocating?

JG- Would need good evidence to phase. Ringmer was allowed but it was taken out of the Newick plan by the examiner. It is difficult to justify phasing on infrastructure grounds.

ME commented on the design of the Oxbottom application

JG- The density of new housing is 20-30 houses per hectare in villages, but there is room for negotiation once app in. There is a policy in the Local Plan which refers to design. Part 2 will have more detailed policies- look at ST3 policy- design criteria.

KJ- If plan discusses design does that give council more strength?

JG- One of the most important points of the plan is detail e.g. in design, detailed tailored policies.

JC- What does funding have to be used for?

JG- Anything related to N Plan, if you decide to employ consultants, publicity. You have to clearly state what the funding will be used for. There is a guidance note on the website. Funding is for a 3 year period. Can apply 4 times within that period. Any money left over has to be returned. The money will be paid to the Parish Council.

In terms of engagement e.g. surveys you can employ consultants, but there have been issues. Discuss with Lewes first. Most parishes have done this e.g. A.I.R.S.

The statutory consultations on the actual plan take 6 weeks. Evidence gathering is up to us- you need to make sure it's fair e.g. questionnaires. Various strands of evidence base. Council will give advice prior to sending it out- keep it focussed.

ME- explained we have 3 task groups planned, some people view parish as 1 not different settlements.

JC- you can tailor policies to emphasize one village.

DC development boundaries actually protect villages from development.

ME- plan might look at a footpath linking the villages or a parking policy.

JG- Ringmer and Newick have parking policies. Can include a ratio policy. ESCC would comment.

DC- Part of S Chailey is recorded as a pocket of deprivation, would this enable extra funding?

JC- Very unlikely Chailey would qualify- extra funding is aimed at urban deprivation. In his experience most parishes have coped with the level of funding available, a few have had to ask PC for a bit extra. The biggest expense is time.

DC- can use P News, website, contact businesses

JC- keep first consultations broad, open ended.

KJ- Newick met with different segments of the population, is it sensible to use Newick as a model for this?

JG- Yes targeting specific groups is a good idea, Newick is a fairly good model in this sense. Thoroughly evidence plan. Keep Lewes in the loop.

JG- another important thing about N plans is that you can protect local green spaces- allocate them- NPPF, local green spaces, para 77?

KM- we could include a policy to protect the common

JG- but would need evidence to hold up against the examiner. P Policies can't be overly restrictive.

DC is there likely to be an extension to the dev boundary?

JG- Is possible, would be under part 2, but they haven't got that far yet though.

We can contact JG with any queries, esp in later stages.

5. and 6. Next meeting is 23rd July. Discussion over what to do- broad questionnaire to start with rather than specialising on housing.