

**Notes of meeting at SDNPA on Thursday June 21<sup>st</sup> 2018 attended by JW/LP/EG/JWaller (observer) and Alma Howell.**

AH noted that it may be that the NP will be ahead of the LP in terms of examination.

**Sawmills site**

AH told SIPC that housing allocation cannot appear in both Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan (eg Sawmills site must go into one or the other), especially if the allocation policies are contradictory. This had not been known to SIPC before this meeting. JW commented that it made it even more important, if the LP allocation is adopted, that affordable housing should be included at the Sawmills site. There is a demand for low-cost houses for those with local connections, especially for the young (“starter homes”) and the elderly. If the LP cannot guarantee such affordable housing at the Sawmills site then the West of West Lodge site must be retained as a site within the NP.

The SDNPA explained that the LP policy is that 50% affordable housing should be provided on sites of 11 or more homes. SIPC explained that they intended to involve Midhurst Community Land Trust. The idea was that, of the proposed “up to” 16 units, 10 should be at market value and 6 should be owned by the CLT. A sect 106 notice may be required in any planning approval for the housing element of the site.

The particular appeal of the CLT for SIPC is that they establish their own housing eligibility criteria and are free of the restraints of Chichester District Council’s assessments. The latter assessments can result in individuals being given temporary housing who have no desire to be in Stedham and with no connection to the area. They tend not to take care of the properties which has a knock-on effect on the value and desirability of neighbouring houses. This creates resentment among genuine residents who see their own needs pushed aside in favour of people who have no interest in the property itself nor in the community. The NP consultation process had revealed a wish for local housing for local needs.

AH asked that SIPC provide evidence of that need but that in principle, with the involvement of CLT, it would be comfortable with that arrangement at the Sawmill site.

JW then asked AH to confirm that SDNPA would guarantee it would oppose the expressed intention by the owners of the Sawmills site to develop the entire site for housing in the future. Would SDNPA insist on retaining a certain sq foot for light industrial use even if the land owners subsequently say that it could not be let. This is a necessary assurance from SDNPA in the face of the owners’ objections to the NP that such an approach is contrary to various NPPF guidelines in the light of the “national housing need”?

AH commented that the SDNPA would seek to defend its position at the Local Plan Examination.

**Settlement Boundary** – There was discussion regarding the difference between the SB in the NP and the SB in the LP. SIPC were concerned that a boundary as drawn in the LP implied that housing would be acceptable in the entire Sawmills site area. Moreover, the site West of West Lodge was entirely excluded from the LP boundary. AH explained that in the proposed schedule of changes to the LP, the settlement boundary is proposed to be amended to provide a buffer between the Sawmills Site and the SSSI. . The SDNPA explained that the Local Plan has now been submitted for Examination and the therefore the NPA would need to look into how best to resolve the differences in settlement boundary between the LP and NP.

**Buffer zone** – AH suggested that SIPC should refer to the Natural England “Magic” website to see the exact dimensions of the SSSI buffer zone, which the LP would follow. SIPC was determined to have a buffer zone to reduce noise from the A272 corridor.

**Vehicular access** – if SIPC accepted the SDNPA recommendation to delete para 9.222, the obligation on a developer to ensure that vehicular access to the Sawmills site should only be from the A272 would be lost. It was not acceptable in any way to route even more traffic along School Lane. AH explained that the supporting text to policy SD92 of the LP states that access should be from the A272.

**Gym Equipment** – LP felt very strongly that any developer should be obliged to provide fitness equipment in a new development. AH had some concerns that it would look incongruous to have pieces of equipment small development potentially in many parts of the village. LP explained that such equipment would be part of a larger “gym trail” around the village and therefore would not look incongruous and would encourage healthy activity for all residents. AH found that arrangement acceptable in principle

### **Key Views**

SDNPA had commented on the breadth of the cones used in the map to illustrate key views. AH confirmed that the purpose of identifying important views was to seek to control any development which might affect them. LP and EG were happy that that was the purpose of the 5-6 views, but agreed that the breadth of the cones could be reduced or in some cases reversed.

### **Bat Screening**

A recent EU Habitats Regulation pursuant to the Sweetman case meant that, mitigation could not be included as part of the screening opinion but instead only at the Appropriate Assessment Stage. Land West of West Lodge was affected by this because it contained linear tree and hedge features which can be important for bat flight paths.

### **Vision**

JW remarked that one or two responses had suggested that the “vision” of the NP was anti-development and had regard only for the next few years rather than for the full plan period of 15 years. Some editing of the text could be useful in overcoming this objection.

Although not part of the NP objectives, it would be worth mentioning longer term issues for the village eg local school, bus services and parking.

### **Rectory Field**

JW mentioned the recent application by the Matthews to have permissive footpaths established across Rectory Field. This had been a source of great concern for parishioners at the most recent Parish Council meeting. They believed that an application for the declaration of a permissive footpath was a bar to the area being designated as “local green space” as proposed in the NP. AH said that the establishment of a permissive footpath may aid the designation as a “local green space” as this can make it of more value to the community.

### **Actions**

SIPC to write to SDNPA setting out details of the demands of local people for local housing, the reason why CDC’s policies did nothing at all to satisfy local needs and to explain why the site West of West Lodge was important to deliver housing for local needs if they could not be accommodated at the Sawmills site

SIPC to commence in-depth discussions with Midhurst CLT about the Sawmills site.

When ready, SIPC need to submit a Consultation Statement (detailing which comments were taken on board, which rejected and why), a Basic Condition Statement and the revised draft NPlan.

AH would prefer it not to be submitted during August because this is the school holiday period and it is not normally a good time to consult with the public.

However, there was nothing to stop discussion / agreement between the parties on the necessary wording changes during July; in time for formal documents to be issued towards the end of August.