

STEDHAM WITH IPING PARISH COUNCIL

Chairman: Lucy Petrie
Clerk: Jane Crawford
email: clerk@stedhamwithiping-pc.gov.uk
website: <http://www.stedhamwithiping-pc.gov.uk/>

MINUTES: Meeting of Stedham with Iping Parish Council No.4/Year 3/15-19

Held on: Wednesday 13 September 2017 beginning at 7.30pm

At: Stedham Memorial Hall

Present: Lucy Petrie 18/19
Elizabeth Griffiths 7/8 Eddie Lintott 19/19
Rowland Page 8/18 Martin Perry 4/5
John Wheelhouse 13/14

In attendance: Kate O’Kelly, County Councillor (part) Caroline Neville, District Councillor(part) and Sue Payne, representative on LNR Management Committee, Police & Neighbourhood Watch. 19 members of the public.

The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations are in force, giving a right to members of the public to record (film, photograph and audio-record) and report on proceedings at meeting of the Council and its Committees.

1. **DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS:** None.
2. **APOLOGIES:** Debra Chalton 16/19 and Olia Mitskevich 10/19
3. **MINUTES OF MEETING: 3/15-19 of 19 July** were agreed and signed.
4. **WSCC and DISTRICT COUNCILLORS and POLICE/NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH**
 - 4.1. **County Councillor:** Kate O’Kelly (KOK) reported.
The Midhurst recycling/waste site: There would be new opening times of 9 – 4 from 1 October (tip closed on Sundays and Mondays). A new planning application for Sunday opening was being made and if approved the closed days would move to Monday and Tuesday.
Big Hello event: Had been held at the Grange with 28 organisations represented.
Big Society fund: KOK was supporting a bid by Foresight which supported people with vision impairment.
KOD drop-ins would be in 4 places: The Grange 25 September and Rogate Village Stores 2 October. Milland and Harting dates to be confirmed. These should be put on SIPC website.
 - 4.2. **District Councillor:** Caroline Neville (CN) reported (after No 6).
The S106 money made available from the large development of new homes in and around the King Edward VII development had not yet been fully allocated. In order that for to be used for the benefit of nearby parishes CN asked that we should give her suggestions of on how we would wish the money to be allocated She and colleagues would then take a list to SDNPA.
LP said there had been lots of suggestions in the parish survey.
 - 4.3. **Police and Neighbourhood Watch:** SP continued to forward police messages.

A⁸⁹⁴

5. **MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC:** A parishioner had a motorbike stolen and someone driving a Ford Fiesta tossed a boulder into his car.

6. **STEDHAM WITH IPING NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (SINP)**

The Chairman explained that the SD draft plan started out with 40 houses on the Sawmills site and because there was an embargo, we were unable to inform parishioners. However, the latest draft had 16-20 houses. Because there had been no consultation about changing the Sawmills site from Business B1 use and including it in the settlement policy area, SIPC had decided to do a neighbourhood plan and do it fairly quickly.

The SINP process had started by undertaking a survey of residents and holding 3 drop-in sessions held at the Memorial Hall. 141 surveys had been returned and 306 people had answered the questions. The results of the questionnaires would be available as soon as they had been collated and verified. So far, the indications were:

The Sawmills Site had particular issues both good and bad:

- 90 respondents thought it would be good for local businesses and 23 thought the opposite.
- 88 people had concerns about the effect on school lane parking,
- 85 thought there would be pressure on school places,
- 52 people thought there would be a noise issue and
- 47 had other concerns.

The majority of people opted for a development on the Sawmills site, however the questions which got the greatest agreement were:

(a) that businesses should be protected from housing development

(b) that the Settlement Boundary should be determined by the SINP rather than the South Downs Local Plan (SDLP)

(c) there was little demand for B1 units

The current proposal in the SDLP was to redraw the Settlement Boundary for Stedham right round the Sawmills site and place the allocated 18 houses in place of the existing businesses, rather than on the vacant western side. This would also mean Stedham would become a village lying along the A272, rather than a village centred on the river Rother. It could also be detrimental to the areas of common land between School Lane and the A272.

Other Sites for smaller developments of housing: Suggestions were:

- by farm buildings in Minsted
- disused dairy buildings in Ingrams Green
- north side of the road leading to Rotherhill Nurseries
- Cross Ways cottages
- beside the track to the Waterworks off Mill Lane
- Bus garage next door to Stedham End
- fields leading down to the River
- in Common View
- Bridgefoot Studio
- St Cuthman's site

90% felt young people should be encouraged to stay in the parish with the cost of housing seen as the major barrier to this. 20 people indicated that they would be eligible and willing to buy/ rent social or affordable housing and 20 had a relative who would be eligible. This response was evidence to enable us to push for local houses for local people. The number of people registered on the CDC housing list for Stedham was 6.

A 'call for sites' letter had now been sent to landowners and other interested parties in our parish. This was also on the notice boards and SIPC website.

Once sites had been submitted, they would be assessed, together with the Sawmills in terms of suitability, availability and achievability. This would be done by a professional planner. The fees incurred for professional advice including planners, should be met by grants of up to £15,000 which were available specifically for Neighbourhood plans. An application for £9,000 of this, which was the initial amount allowed, had been made and we should be informed about the grant within 2 weeks.

As the Sawmills site had already been assessed by SDNPA, and was the preferred site of the parish residents, it was highly likely to be included on the SDLP. However, because of the concerns about the effect on the current business use and the Settlement Boundary it may be that the SINP would have a smaller development on this site, which could be social or affordable homes. We would certainly wish the development to be integrated with the village rather than the A272. The assessment would look at other sites where the additional allocation of houses could go.

Green Space: 57% wanted other areas of green space protected in our Neighbourhood Plan. The most cited place was the Polo fields, but there was also strong support for the field behind the Memorial Hall & Common View, the common land opposite the pub and between the school and the A272.

Parking in Stedham: 60% thought there should be more parking in Stedham – the majority of these were in Common View.

A Landscape Assessment of the whole Parish would be undertaken by professional planners to ascertain the effects of any development in our Parish and consider all the special features we seeked to protect. This would also consider the effect of any proposed sites on the surrounding landscape. It was important to remember that the SDLP covered the whole national park, with only one page devoted to Stedham. Our SINP allowed us to consider all possible housing and employment sites, including the design and types of dwellings, traffic movement and parking while maintaining the quality of landscape we enjoy.

It was hoped that the Landscape assessment and Site Assessment would be completed in the next couple of months.

Parishioner comments:

Some of the questions did not allow for certain answers. In particular, there should have been a question about if the village wanted any housing at all.

The chairman said it was a risk that we ended up with a situation where there were 18 houses on the Sawmills site on the South Downs Local Plan and additional housing we might put in our Neighbourhood plan, on other sites. But the opposing risk was that if we did not have alternative sites, then the parish would have no say on the siting of housing.

The Chairman said everyone could comment on the plan and all comments would be sent to the Inspector.

John Wheelhouse said that In order to clarify the situation as it stands, we must first remember that two draft plans were being prepared at the same time but on differing timescales. The draft South Downs Local Plan being prepared by SDNPA included only one site in our Parish - the former Sawmills land which was in two ownerships. It was understood that the site had been referred to SDNPA by one of those owners despite CDC refusing a previous application for 35 houses on the grounds of protecting employment opportunities. Although an early draft of the SDLP suggested up to 36 houses and no employment, SIPC raised serious objections at SDNPA Planning Committees and the

current proposal in the plan to be published at the end of September provided for a mixed-use site of 3000m2 B1 Business Use and between 16 and 20 Residential Units. In order to defeat the inclusion of housing on that site, it would be necessary to prove to the Inspector at the Examination in Public next spring that the proposal was unsound in accordance with Government criteria and should be removed from the SDLP. SIPC does not believe that the planners have done their homework properly with particular reference to need and we would be preparing such a case.

Secondly, Stedham with Iping Neighbourhood Plan was being prepared by local residents to identify what was needed in the whole Parish by way of development and would include policies and appropriate locations for housing, tenure, employment, traffic, parking and open spaces. It was entirely possible that the final document would not recommend any housing plots. However, from the drop-in sessions SIPC understood there was support for providing some houses and 50% of those on developments of 8 or more houses would have to be affordable. It would therefore be essential for SIPC to have a Neighbourhood Plan to drive future deliberations on planning applications and any interim SDLP review in a few years. This could include alternative procurement and management methods such as the Midhurst Community Land Trust who required cheap land for building affordable houses for local people in perpetuity.

Please support the Stedham with Iping Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group in their work and I hope that speedy progress would allow SIPC to say to the Inquiry that the SINP is well advanced on its journey to approval by SDNPA. SIPC will urge that its contents should be incorporated into the SDLP and our wishes over housing should take precedence over the draft SDLP.

The Chairman asked if parishioners supported the drawing up of a Neighbourhood Plan: Yes.

The SINP had 10 stages and we had reached no 4. The next stage was to draw up a landscape assessment. It would entail a lot of hard work, but if we could achieve the SINP by the March cut-off date for the SDLP public inquiry, we might get it accepted into the SDLP.

Parishioners comments:

In answer to a question about St Cuthman's AH said that planning for housing at the site was relevant as the school was now closed. However, there was complicated ownership and it was not known if the owners would sell it. Durand Education Trust claimed ownership and had charitable obligations. There could be residential development, but the question would be how many units. There would certainly be objections if it was anything like the King Edward VII Hospital site. There had been previous approval for 9 or 10 units. If there was a Field Centre on the site, it would have to be residential.

Martin Perry said that the SDLP needed 4,500 houses so Stedham had got away quite lightly. Some parishes had to have 100s of new houses.

The Chairman asked if there was anyone who did not want new housing: No-one. 100% for new houses.

7. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT AND MEETING REPORTS

CDC Community Forum meeting of 6 September 2017 held at Midhurst Old Library was attended by the Clerk.

Chris Paterson of SDNPA planning (10 mins)

The SDNPA had agreed that the consultation period of the SD Local Plan would be 26 September to 21 November – 8 weeks. Everyone was encouraged to respond online.

There would be explanations of how to do so at the parishes meeting on 4 October as well as the context of local plan, next steps, and partnership. There would also be an item on CIL.

The comments should be on the soundness of the plan, however they would take any comments and it would be up to the Inspector whether he would consider them or not. He did not think completely

new sites could be considered at this stage, but there would be periodic reviews of the over the plan period when new sites could come forward.

The planners would be taking the report to the SD whole authority meeting on 18 March 2018.

Chief Inspector Justin Burtenshaw, Arun & Chichester District Commander, Sussex Police (40 mins) said that police now provided a more flexible and better service with PCSOs removed so they could go where needed and not be in a place because it had one.

Health and well-being presented by a District Councillor from Selsey with ideas which were not really suitable for country parishes.

Midhurst Area Cycling (10 minutes) presented by the Clerk and basically asking the parishes to support each other in efforts to get more funding for cycleways.

The Clerk would circulate the minutes in due course.

A 895

8. **MINERALS Minsted Sandpit:** No report.

9. **PARISH ACTION PLAN**

9.1. **Stedham crossroads globe shielding:** No further information.

9.2. **Parking by Recreation Ground (RG).** The work had been completed. The barriers would be kept in place for 30 days after which any areas of subsidence would be rectified.

9.3. **Defibrillators:** No report owing to DC's absence.

10. **FINANCE AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE**

Financial report

Receipts since last meeting			
NatWest	Interest (.21 July and .17 August)	H	£0.38
CDC	Precept	K	£9,750.00
Cash	SI book	M	£6.50
Payments since last meeting			
NatWest	Charges		£6.50
SSALC	Neighbourhood Plan booklet	A02	£7.20
SSALC	Legal and Finance training (Clerk)	A08	£108.00
LM	Iping bus shelter & new glass St kiosk	C13	£95.00
J Crawford	Clerk's remuneration	A01	£879.48
L	Stedham Bridge watershed	G	£11,433.60*
Due for payment			
Business Stream	Allotments water	C10	£37.90
JSS	Iping signpost renovation	C13	£100.00
SSALC	DPA training (DC)	A08	£57.60
CPRE	Membership subscription	B04	£35.00
KW	Stedham and Iping grass cutting	C01,06,11	£3,091.73
KW	Stedham Church mowing & strimming	B01	£1,154.52
KW	Clearance of bridges and ditches	C09	£160.00
PFK L	External auditor	A06	£240.00
PI	Play equipment inspection	C04	£198.00
WSSC	Allotment and CV play area land rent	C05	£325.00
J Crawford	Clerk's remuneration	A01	£879.48
L Petrie	NP paper and cartridges	A02	£345.66
L	RG parking works	D	£18,427.20

ICO	Data protection registration (DD)	A07	£35.00
Invoices due			
DH	Domain name renewal	A09	£150.00
		Total	£25,237.11
Balances			
Current account	£11,844.88 - £11,433.60 *= £411.28		£411.28
Business Reserve A/c			£29,808.67
		Total	£30,219.92

*Lahad not been paid yet for the Watershed works because the work was still not satisfactory. The Chairman and CM had met with L and explained that the water flowed down the ditch into the drain and not down the road. WSCC had changed the original design to include a new gully which was not needed while the ditch drain was already partially blocked. L would contact WSCC to see what could be done.

**CPRE subscription had been £30 since 2014 – It was agreed to pay £35, particularly as they might be useful in helping with the SINP.

DH: Permission was given to pay before the next meeting.

NB: NatWest charges were not reported at last meeting.

£2,500 first tranche for Minsted Sandpit would be paid in the following day.

After all above payments there would be £7,208 (£4,708 without the Minsted sandpit) in the reserve account. However, the grant from CDC of £5,000 was due and at the end of the month £5,161 VAT would be reclaimed from HMRC leaving a total of £15,000 for the rest of the year.

Resolution: To make the above payments and transfer £22,600 from reserve to current account

Proposed by the Chairman, seconded by MP, with all in favour.

PI quotation for new swing seat £155 (see Equipment Inspection report)

Grit bin request for Stubb Hill: estimated cost £130 + post and packing.

Resolved to purchase the above. Proposed by the Chairman, seconded by EG, with all in favour.

Charity Commission Annual Return: £2,141 total expenditure on the Recreation was agreed and the Chairman signed the form. The Clerk would complete the Annual Return.

External Audit completed: No comments. Notices of conclusion will be put on website and noticeboards before due time 30 September 2017.

Allotment charges: It was agreed to confirm the charge of £30 per whole allotment (Total £300). RP would collect the money.

Neighbourhood plan finance: The Chairman reported that she had applied for a £9,000 grant for the neighbourhood plan. She advised that the best planning consultant to use was AM who had been recommended by AIRS to Lavant PC. Other firms charged similar sums, but were not so efficient. When confirmation of a grant came through, SIPC should make the appointment. The Stedham with Iping Neighbourhood Steering Group (SINSG) would be doing as much work as possible to keep the costs down.

11. ENVIRONMENT AND AMENITIES COMMITTEE

11.1. **Play areas: Inspection of equipment and signing the books:** The books had been signed. PI had completed the Annual Inspection in August, but only just sent the reports – the matter would be on the next agenda.

11.2. **Risk assessment: Overgrown trees at Common View and the allotments.**

There had been no reply from the neighbouring landowner. RP said one of the trees was spreading 25' over the play area. MP said the children were able to climb it from the place equipment. The green fence was in bad repair and the children were able to walk through it into the woods. The Clerk would write again to the landowner.

11.3. **Highways and footpaths:**

Logs on verge on left leading down to Stedham bridge: The Clerk would ask WSCC Highways to look at what were actually tree branches to see if they were safe. WSCC Highways had not responded to the query.

Junction of Mill Lane with The Street: The land belonging to Tye Hill was now so overgrown that it had become impossible to see round the corner when coming out of Mill Lane. WSCC Highways said that visibility was fine.

Iping to Chithurst path: The Iping to Chithurst path had been reported as it was impassable with a broken gate.

Stedham to Iping path: There was a fallen branch blocking the path and the Rotherhill fence was falling down. The Clerk would contact the landowner for the tree and WSCC about the fence.

Afternote: The path was closed by WSCC because of the fallen branch. The Clerk contacted the landowner who immediately removed the branch. WSCC was dealing with the fence.

A parishioner had help the Clerk with the above problems. He pointed out that he had volunteered to be a footpath warden, but WSCC had not bothered to get in touch with him.

11.4. **Flooding:**

Watershed

Stedham Lane works near Meadowhills: A photograph of the flood had been sent to WSCC, but so far no reply had been forthcoming.

Works south of Stedham bridge: See 9.1 above

11.5 **Commons and open spaces:**

Iping and Stedham Commons: The questionnaire had revealed that 61% who walked on the common did not mind the cattle being there while 39% disliked them.

SWT had held a meet the cattle day for dog owners.

The cattle would be removed any day now.

Tree warden: The parish tree warden had sadly died and the Chairman asked if there was anyone who might volunteer. AC said he would be happy to be contacted by WSCC and find out what it was about. The Clerk would arrange this.

A⁹⁰¹

12. **PLANNING COMMITTEE:** Report on meeting 4/3 (15-19) held prior to this meeting would be circulated.

13. **MEMORIAL HALL:** The Chairman of the Hall Trustees reported.
A survey was being carried out by the Government on solar panels.

14. **ACTIONS LIST:** See below.

15. **CORRESPONDENCE/EMAILS:** None

16. **DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS:** **Wednesday 15 November, 7.30 pm at Stedham Memorial Hall.** The meeting would include an update on the Neighbourhood Plan.

CONCLUSION 8.45

Chairman..... Date.....

ACTIONS FROM MEETING 13 SEPTEMBER 2017

A ⁸⁹⁴	DC	KOD drop-in sessions	Dates on website	✓
A ⁸⁸⁵	Clerk	CDC Forum minutes	Circulate	
A ⁸⁸⁶	Clerk	Cradle seat & salt bin	Make orders	✓
A ⁸⁸⁷	Clerk	Charity Commission	Make annual return	✓
A ⁸⁹⁸	Clerk	Audit conclusion	Put on website and notice boards	✓
A ⁸⁹⁹	RP	Allotments	Collect rents	ongoing
A ⁹⁰⁰	Clerk	CV trees	Write to Rotherhill again	✓
A ⁹⁰¹	Clerk	Tree warden	Contact WSCC	ongoing

ACTIONS FROM MEETING 19 JULY 2017

A ⁸⁸²	DC	Defibrillator grants	Contact SE ambulance	
A ⁸⁸⁴	Chair	L cheque	Send when work done	
A ⁸⁸⁶	Chair	Rec Ground	Check re status of charity	ongoing
A ⁸⁸⁷	Clerk	Rec ground	Find out when became a charity	
A ⁸⁹¹	Clerk	Iping footpath	Inform WSCC re broken gates	✓
A ⁸⁹²	Chair	CC Group	Respond	
A ⁸⁹³	Clerk	Allotment	Inform tenant to quit	✓

ACTIONS FROM MEETING 17 MAY 2017

A ⁸⁶³	Clerk	Broadband	Ask WSCC for another update	✓
A ⁸⁶⁸	Clerk	CV trees	Contact landowner	✓
A ⁸⁶⁹	RP	CV ash tree	Ask MH's advice	✓
A ⁸⁷⁰	RP	Football nets	Swop around	
A ⁸⁷¹	RP	Allotments fence	Replace rotten posts	
A ⁸⁷⁵	Clerk	Iping Lane signpost	Arrange renovation	ongoing

ACTIONS FROM MEETING 15 MARCH 2017

A ⁸⁶²	Clerk	WSCC Footpath list	Identify paths	ongoing
------------------	-------	--------------------	----------------	---------