



ARDINGLY PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Clerk: Sarah Mamoany

Tel: 01444 226 209

Email: ardinglypc@hotmail.co.uk

Office: Tuesdays 10am – 12 noon in Hapstead Hall, Ardingly

Minutes of the meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee held on Wednesday, 6th November 2013 at 7.30 pm in the Reading Room at Hapstead Hall, Ardingly

Present:

Mr W Meldrum (Chair)
Mrs S Chapman (SC)
Mr G Ruse (GR)
Mrs F Rocks (FR)
Mr K Monk (KM)

Mr N Moorey (NM)
Mrs S Karle (SK)
Mr P Simpson (PS)
Mrs. S Frohmader (SF)

In Attendance:

Mr N Holmer (Consultant rCOH)
Mrs S Mamoany (Clerk)
15 members of the public

Statements from the public

David Hill commented that he had sent a letter to all Councilors with regard to Policy 3 and stated that in his view the draft NP was seriously flawed with incorrect information provided, including the SANG and the number of houses on the Standgrove Site. He continued that it was not the intention of Ardingly College to just build 27 houses, nor to build only smaller houses and that the policy gave the wrong impression to people. He also said that the reasons for selecting the site were flawed and the site should not be chosen because it is owned by Ardingly College, but it should be chosen on the grounds of sound technical and planning objectives and looking at the future of the village. He asked for a corrective notice to be issued to the public. He stated that he felt the Chairman was not being impartial and was using every effort to continue along the lines of Standgrove site; he stated that all the sites should be assessed by a professional. He advised he would be making a formal complaint to MSDC.

The Chairman responded and advised that the whole process of the NP had looked at the future of the village and site selection had been carried out properly on technical grounds. The Council had sought the advice of a third party by using a consultant who has provided professional planning advice. The NP would go through a health check after drafting to ensure it met all requirements. In summary, best practice had been used throughout the procedure and the due process had been followed. He stated that the Site Selection document is a main document which is part of the evidence base of the plan. MSDC had not commented that they had any issues with the pre-submission draft NP at this stage. The formal consultation period had been completed and at a recent meeting the responses were discussed. The chair continued that the meeting to be held today

was to discuss making any necessary changes from that information including the SANG and footpath. The Chairman declined to comment on the personal comments that Mr Hill made.

Ivan Yateman (owner of Butchers Field) stated that he felt that the selection of Standgrove and naming of protected green field sites was a local abuse of power and process and that if a normal planning application had been undertaken, the Council would have talked to neighbours to discuss matters. He stated that Parish Councilors were a pre-conceived cadre, acting inappropriately and the fact that a large number of Councillors lived opposite Butchers Field, in Street Lane or Church Lane was why he felt that Standgrove had been promoted and the broad overview had not been looked at.

Rob Lawson stated that although he did not like that fact more houses were required, Ardingly had to expand although houses needed to be affordable in order to help the young people in the village. He stated that every year between 12 to 15 children leave school that live in the village and they had nowhere to live in the future.

The Chairman responded that a balanced view was being taken towards housing numbers and type and that took in the views of the community. This included hundreds of people who had responded to the consultations and attended meetings to discuss housing numbers.

It was mentioned that the Chairman had sent a letter objecting to the Butchers Field outline planning application. The Chair advised that was his personal view and that in Council meetings he did not settle on an answer and challenged people's views on issues of discussion. The Chairman stated that he was at one stage pushing the Borde Hill site and had always challenged other sites before moving on.

1.	<p>To accept apologies for absence</p> <p>Mr T Clement, Mr M Brixey, Mr D Hadden, Mrs P Dennis, Mr D Walker, Mrs B McNulty, Mrs R Chalk, Mrs A Howell,</p>	
2.	<p>Declaration of Interests</p> <p>SC declared a prejudicial interest on housing sites. SF declared a prejudicial interest in items relating to Butchers Field PS declared a prejudicial interest in items relating to Butchers Field SK declared a prejudicial interest in items relating to Standgrove</p>	
3.	<p>To confirm and sign the minutes of meetings held on the 2nd October 2013 and to confirm and agree amendments to minutes dated 30th July 2013.</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on the 2nd October were AGREED and signed by the Chairman.</p> <p>The Clerk noted that the attendance record at the meeting on the 30th July had been inaccurately recorded and should have stated that Mrs F Rocks and Mr N Moorey were in attendance. In addition, Mr D Hadden was not present. These amendments were AGREED and signed by the Chairman.</p>	
4.	<p>Matters arising from previous minutes</p> <p>SK asked about the item when DH had questioned the meeting held on the 30th July whether the minutes accurately reflected the discussion. The response to this was noted on item 4 on the minutes dated 27th August. The Chair also commented that as DH was not present at the meeting, it was not possible for him to question the</p>	

	<p>accuracy of the minutes.</p> <p>NH was asked to clarify whether Butchers Field met the criteria as a Local Green Space and if MSDC had confirmed this. He confirmed that it was consistent with paragraph 77 in the National Planning Policy Framework. 77, that reads as follows:</p> <p>“The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; ● where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and ● where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.” <p>NH noted that not all these bullets needed to apply to a given site but some of them.</p> <p>MSDC had made formal comments to reflect the above when NH had spoken with them about this issue.</p> <p>NH pointed out that currently there is no case in law where a NP has put forward Local Green Spaces. He stated that he felt that bullet points 1 and 3 were reflected in Butchers Field. He noted that Slaugham had a site removed from its NP as it was appealed and stated that Lindfield Rural and Lindfield PC had drawn up a report with additional detail and evidence to support the selected green spaces. NH suggested the Committee could consider adding this into the Ardingly NP.</p> <p>A question was raised as to why the landowners were not asked about Green Space designation. NH advised that the Committee was under no obligation to do so although clearly some landowners have no objections to the Green Spaces designation whereas others would not be in agreement.</p> <p>The Chair ran through the order of the meeting and how he intended to discuss the site selection again and that the Committee would look at planning considerations for the last time as the draft NP would be agreed at the following meeting. He stated it would be the last opportunity to have a conversation on this issue.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>To update Committee and discuss and agree policies in relation to points raised in last meeting:</p> <p>5.1 South of England Agricultural Society</p> <p>The Clerk and WM reported that they had spoken to Iain Nicol with regard to the South of England Agricultural Society policy. The following amendments were suggested:</p> <p>Replace bullet point 4 with: consideration is given to the ongoing development / replacement of existing buildings or construction of new buildings that are sympathetic to the rural landscape and well sited.</p> <p>Change the postamble point 4.63 to refer to the current Section 52 and Premises</p>	

	<p>License that govern the Society's activities as follows:</p> <p>4.63 In the period since 1967 the range of events held and the number of days per year on which they may take place has increased through a series of planning permissions. The South of England Agricultural Society operates under a Section 52 Agreement and Premises License under the governance of Mid Sussex District Council which regulates the use of the Showground including the type of events that are permitted and environmental factors such as the use of public address systems and equipment.</p> <p>This wording was agreed and would be amended in the plan.</p> <p>5.2 Ardingly College</p> <p>The chair reported that the Clerk, Chair and DH had met with Paddy Jackman at Ardingly College to discuss the issues of SANG, allotments and housing numbers. The Chair confirmed a brief discussion was had in relation to housing numbers and that the group reaffirmed the Committee's position on how it came to the number of 27 homes.</p> <p>It was confirmed that a SANG could not be created as the footpath did not create a long enough or circular walk. The Chair pointed out that the footpath was a point of process and that the college would not offer it to the Committee at this time. If Standgrove was to receive permission at appeal, the village would likely receive the footpath from the College at that time, however if was turned down the College would likely welcome being included in the NP and therefore the plan should include the footpath.</p> <p>It was stated that it was also possible that the College might have an allotment site that they could offer and the college was holding a Governors' meeting on the 7th November to discuss this further. The college stated they would report back to the Parish Council with the outcome.</p> <p>5.3 Mid Sussex District Council</p> <p>NH confirmed that with regard to Policy 20 the Committee had strayed into 'excluded development' area which includes County matters such as mineral and waste policies. The Committee therefore had to remove the first section of the policy as the NP could not state anything about minerals or restrictions of vehicle movements as this would be a Highways matter.</p>	
6.	<p>Report from Mid Sussex Community Planning Surgery Session 24 October 2013</p> <p>The Chair reported that he had attended the MSDC Community Planning Surgery with SC and found it a useful exercise in relation to the next stages of the process.</p> <p>The chair then described the process following plan approval by APC. Once the final plan had been approved the PC would submit this to the Local Planning Authority who would review the plan to ensure it complies with the legal requirements. The plan</p>	

	<p>would then be published for comments for six weeks and would be allocated to an independent examiner in consultation with the PC. Although not a formal consultation, the period of six weeks would enable people to comment further if they felt that comments had not been taken on board, or if they wished to withdraw an objection. Following the six week period if only small changes were required, the plan would move forward for examination. However if larger changes were required the plan would be returned to us for re-consultation.</p> <p>NH advised that once the Committee had approved the plan, the plan would be entering the Regulation 16 period and that in line with the recent NPPG government guidance following the six week period the NP would begin to gather weight and further weight would be added as the stages progress. The Examiner would either confirm the Plan could proceed to referendum, make minor changes or start again if large amendments were required. The timescale for the Examination stage could be from 2 weeks to 2 months.</p> <p>The total time frame to reach the end of the process would be approximately 4-5 months.</p>	
<p>7.</p>	<p>To discuss and agree final Site Assessment Report</p> <p>It was noted that the Site Assessment did not have some of the appendices and attachments. The following amendments were therefore noted: the reference numbers were not present, page 3 did not have the map included, page 7 the inspectors report was not attached and page 10 the planning decision notice was not attached.</p> <p>The Chair advised that he would go through the two sites again and compare the planning objectives. The areas that were considered were Landscape Characteristics, Landscape Capacity, Character, Access to regional and local services, Road access, Trees protection, Support for local businesses, Ancient Woodland, Footpaths and other benefits. A discussion was held to the merits of each of these factors and the Committee made various comments for and against both sites.</p> <p>It was noted that the connection with Ardingly College being an employer in the village was over emphasised in the draft plan and this would be amended to reflect the more balanced view that whilst they were an important employer in the village it was not the overriding factor in site selection.</p> <p>Discussions were also held regarding footpaths: SK was concerned as a footpath across Standgrove was under appeal and that land should not be designated whilst this was ongoing. The Committee discussed this and it was generally felt that the footpath could be rerouted or a new development could be designed around the footpath.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal was discussed on Policy 3. Discussions were held regarding Policy 3, options 1, 6, 10, 12, 13 and 14. SK raised objections to all of these ratings. It was agreed that point 5 (high quality, healthy lifestyle) should read the same for both sites.</p> <p>The Chair asked if anyone had any other factors or views they wished to express and whether the Committee should change its site selection in the plan.</p>	

	<p>SK/PS/SC/SF were requested to leave the room by the Chair as a vote would be taken to decide if the Committee should proceed with the site currently in the plan.</p> <p>NM chose to abstain from voting and it was unanimously AGREED by the four remaining members that could vote to retain the Standgrove site in the plan as the selected site.</p> <p>The Chair expressed thanks to the Councilors for the hard work that they had put in and highlighted the commitment they had to the task as preparing the NP was a difficult and sometimes invasive exercise to carry out.</p> <p>SK/PS/SC/SF returned to the room.</p>	
<p>8.</p>	<p>To discuss and agree potential changes to the pre-submission draft Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan and Sustainability Appraisal based upon Regulation 14 summary report provided by rCOH Ltd.</p> <p>The Regulation 14 response document had been circulated to all Committee Members together with a Regulation 14 summary document that had been prepared by NH. The Chair stated they would review each policy summarised as follows:</p> <p>Policy 1 & 2 – no major objections, therefore recommendation was for no changes to these policies.</p> <p>Policy 3 – It was noted that an error was made in regard to the allocation of housing type and that the text would be amended to require only the affordable homes to deliver a mix of 2/3 bed homes, not the open market homes.</p> <p>Following discussions with MSDC it was suggested that Appendix C would need to be deleted in respect of local lettings and accept that only 50% (4 homes) would be local lettings in perpetuity and the remaining (4 homes) would be local connection at first letting only. In addition the SANG would need to be removed as discussed previously as it was technically not possible, although the footpath will be retained in the policy.</p> <p>Policy 5 – suggested text change to replace ‘take account’ with ‘be sympathetic’ on page 30.</p> <p>Policy 6 – NH suggested that the Committee could add additional wording to this policy. This was discussed and it was agreed that the Committee should not add in any additional information or change the policy.</p> <p>Policy 7, 8, 9 – no major objections, therefore recommendation was for no changes to these policies.</p> <p>Policy 10 – NH highlighted the comments made that the school currently had existing car parking issues and these should be addressed as part of any future expansion. It was agreed and the text would be modified by NH.</p> <p>Policy 11 – The issue of the Scout Hut was discussed at length and it was suggested that the policy should be amended to state ‘new development will not be supported unless the Scout Hut has a satisfactory site to move to’</p> <p>Policy 12 - no major objections, therefore recommendation was for no changes to</p>	

	<p>these policies.</p> <p>Policy 13 – The Pavilion was discussed and it was noted that the building was currently restricted in planning terms for recreational purpose. Therefore if any changes were made then the PC would have to consult with the community through the planning application. It was agreed therefore that no changes would be made to this policy.</p> <p>Policy 14 – SC suggested in view of the comments concerning parking that the Committee should add the Village Car Park as an Asset of Community Value. This was agreed. It was noted a text error appeared on this policy and the first line needed to be removed which related to the previous policy.</p> <p>Policy 15, 16 & 17 - no major objections, therefore recommendation was for no changes to these policies.</p> <p>Policy 18 – Some objections had been made to the confinement of the policy to the ‘core’ and it was agreed that the Committee should remove that word from the policy.</p> <p>Policy 19 - no major objections, therefore recommendation was for no changes to these policies.</p> <p>Policy 20 – Due to ‘excluded development’ the Committee needed to remove the first paragraph. The second paragraph could be retained and therefore it was agreed that SC would draft some additional wording for that paragraph to go under the policy. Point 4.58 and 4.59 would need to be removed.</p> <p>Policy 21 – This policy was discussed as the College had commented that the policy was silent on the consideration of proposals outside the core group of buildings. It was agreed to make no changes as all proposals needed to be considered on its own merits in the context of the wider landscape.</p> <p>Policy 22 – Amendments agreed in minute point 5.1.</p> <p>Policy 23 – SC agreed to write some further descriptive text with regard to Kew and would send to the Clerk.</p> <p>Policy 24, 25 & 26 - no major objections, therefore recommendation was for no changes to these policies.</p> <p>SC mentioned that the Committee needed to clarify the conservation areas as there was no map showing them. It was agreed that this would be added together with a map showing listed buildings. The Clerk would request assistance from MSDC in producing these maps.</p> <p>KM left the meeting.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>Grant Application Update</p> <p>The Clerk confirmed that the Committee had been successful with our grant application and had secured the total sum of £4,130 from the Community Development Foundation acting on behalf of Locality and the DCLG.</p> <p>9.1 The grant would cover the consultant’s costs of £3,350 and the final costs of</p>	

	<p>completing the final stages of the NP.</p> <p>9.2 A quote had been obtained from Fortismere Associates for £500 plus VAT to provide a Health Check on the plan prior to it being submitted to the Local Authority. They had confirmed that they could also meet the Committee's timescales. The cost would be funded by the grant money received for that purpose.</p> <p>9.3 The grant would also provide for £280 for additional printing costs, banners for referendum.</p>	
10.	<p>Consultation Statement</p> <p>The draft document had been circulated to members prior to the meeting. The Chair informed that SC had made good progress on the Consultation Statement which would provide the evidence and explanation of how the Committee had consulted throughout the NP process. A few gaps needed to be filled and appendixes added. The Chair, the Clerk and SC would continue to work on this document before bringing it to the Committee for approval.</p>	
11.	<p>Basic Condition Statement</p> <p>It was noted that NH would prepare this document, the purpose of which is to demonstrate that the plan complies with the basic four conditions of a NP. This would be circulated prior to the next meeting for approval.</p>	
12.	<p>Items for information or inclusion on future agenda</p> <p>Signing off the Neighbourhood Plan and Sustainability Appraisal. Signing off the Consultation Statement Signing off the Basic Condition Statement</p>	
13.	<p>Date for next meeting</p> <p>Monday, 25th November 2013 – subject to documentation being completed by that stage.</p>	
	<p>The meeting closed at 9.45 pm</p>	