

STEDHAM WITH IPING PARISH COUNCIL

NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN (NP) STEERING GROUP WORK PARTY 3 NOTES

At : Bridgelands Farm

On: Friday 13 September 2017 at 6.30 pm

Attendance: Lucy Petrie
GB Debra Chalton
WC CD
Elizabeth Griffiths Adrian Hearle
John Wheelhouse
AM, Senior Planner
Jane Crawford, Clerk, took the work party notes

1. **Apologies:** Martin Drury.
2. **Introduction:** AM was invited to take the meeting.
2. **Clarification of SG setup within Parish Council & status of Memorandum of Understanding with SDNPA.**

AM sought confirmation of how the Steering Group had been set up and whether the group's formation had been ratified by SIPC. The Clerk thought this had already been done.

Afternote: Resolution to formulate a Parish Plan and form the Stedham with Iping Neighbourhood Steering Group (SG) made at SIPC meeting held on 19 July 2017.

Memorandum of Understanding between SIPC, SINSG and SDNPA signed and dated 1 August 2017.
3. **Summary of survey results** (Lucy Petrie)
 - The survey (questionnaire) had been completed and the results circulated and were on the website.
 - One of the major complaints was the parking at Common View.
 - On housing the majority wanted it on the Sawmills site, but this may have been because other options had not been given and nor was there an option for no housing.
 - They wanted businesses protected, but did not feel they would use the B1 units.
 - Young people to be helped to stay but that other than at the Sawmills site there was no employment for them.
 - The economy of Stedham will be directly affected by the removal of employment in favour of housing.
 - Cost and lack of suitable housing made people leave. 20 people were qualified and would be interested in affordable homes.
 - Green spaces: Field behind the Hall, polo grounds and Stedham camp site had been suggested.
4. **Why is the Parish developing a Neighbourhood Plan**

SIPC had decided to formulate a NP when SDNPA redrew the Settlement Policy Area to include the whole Sawmills BI business site on which they proposed a development of 36 houses.

AM said the key of making a plan was to be concise and decide what to cover. As progress was so good, it was realised that it could be drafted before 21 November 2017.

 - **What is the plan's vision?** To ensure development comes forward in appropriate locations which maintain our historic connection with the River Rother rather than the A272. New housing should fit in with the existing housing and open spaces whilst maintaining our district settlement that is separate from Midhurst.

AM: Confirmed there was no need to repeat anything that was already in the SDLP.

 - **What are the plan's objectives?** To provide 18 houses in appropriate places within the parish.

Stedham was a strategic site in the SDLP, but this should be an opportunity for us to demonstrate what is needed and where.

AM: The current SDNPA Sustainability Appraisal identified new housing in Stedham village. If the plan was to deviate from this, then SDNPA may require the NP to be accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal at submission. This, however, would be identified when a scoping opinion is requested.

SG: We do not object to 18 houses, but may object to all of them being in Stedham.

AM: Robust evidence would be needed to support alternative sites from SDLP's 18 houses at the Sawmills. By identifying alternative sites, we do run the risk of the Sawmills site being allocated by SDNPA and also the ones taken forward in the NP.

One approach could be for the SG to accept SDLP policy on Sawmills, but include a NP policy setting a development brief for the site which could include how it is designed and deal with concerns over flooding, trees, destruction of employment, connecting it to the village rather than A272 and any other concerns. When the sites are assessed, we would be able to tell which are the most appropriate for development and how we should proceed.

AM: What about businesses? SIPC's view might be different to SDLP.

SINSG: We would wish to redraw the settlement boundary at the Sawmills for a shared site.

- **What should the plan address?** Housing, economy, parking, heritage, transport, communications, green spaces and settlement boundary.

SG: Protecting green spaces so that development is in the right place respecting historic pattern. 4 sites already in SDLP (sports field, Recreation Ground, allotments and Common View Play Area), but suggest others (Hall field, polo grounds)

AM:

Review of public open space and other spaces – NP could have its own criteria for green space.

The landscape assessment would look at all sites and feed in to the site assessment work.

Economy: If looking to dispute the proposed business floorspace, a review of the local economy would be needed to establish what kind of floor space was needed locally and set it out in a document. An approach could then be formulated.

Listed buildings did not need to be in the plan, but if SG looked to designate local heritage assets, it would add value.

5. Preparing the Evidence Base

AM: To support the policies within the neighbourhood plan it is important to have a robust evidence base. From this evidence base the SG can formulate a plan.

A document should review open spaces – Lavant had a good evidence base and set of criteria.

Economy: Lavant did not do it.

Infrastructure: This section was to enable claims for CIL funding and would include parking, broadband and cycleways.

- Assign tasks to members of the SG

Sites Assessment: John Wheelhouse and Adrian Hearle

Heritage: MD and GB

Open Space: Elizabeth Griffiths and CD

Business: BC and Debra Chalton

Transport & infrastructure: Lucy Petrie and Clerk

6. Call for Site's Submissions & Site Assessments

AM: All sites would be assessed. Some were complicated and some simple. We do not know which sites would be suitable and which not at this stage. After sites assessments are completed we should meet and run through them. The objective was to assess all sites impartially.

Examples for the site assessment work were Lavant and Bury. Lavant had a two-tiered approach, Bury had a simple one. When considering site suitability, SG will consider things like: SSSI, bus stop, overlooking neighbours. Methodology was factual. Lavant first question: "is site available?" If no, it was discounted. A methodology will need to be agreed.

7. **Plan Preparation Timeline**

The Draft Plan should be published by 21 November 2017 which meant it had to be written in full with the evidence and ready to go out for consultation. All evidence should be prepared within three weeks. It could be stretched out to submit plan at the end of January or early February, but if the SDNPA wanted Sawmills site, the NP would have to show how it could be done better without preventing provision of housing, loss of jobs.

By the beginning of November all evidence and reports should be done and sites assessments completed.

8. **Parish Council response to SDLP Pre-Submission Consultation**

AH was formulating the SIPC response to the SDLP. It was agreed that the response would depend on If we managed to get the NP ready by the 21 November deadline which we would know by the beginning of November, by which time SINSG must have done the research and obtained the relevant evidence.

9. **Date of next work party:** Monday 6 November 2017, time and venue to be decided.

10. **AOB**

AM said he was very happy to answer questions and give advice at any time.

Conclusion 8.40pm