

STEDHAM WITH IPING PARISH COUNCIL

NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN (NP) STEERING GROUP WORK PARTY 5 NOTES

At: Minsted

On: Monday 20 November 2017 at 7.00 pm

Attendance: Elizabeth Griffiths chaired the meeting
Debra Chalton William Crawshaw
Caroline Douglas Adrian Hearle
John Wheelhouse
Jane Crawford, Clerk, took the work party notes

1. **Apologies for absence:** Gina Beresford, Martin Drury and Lucy Petrie

2. **Notes of Meeting No 4 of 6 November 2017** were still with AM.

3. **Objectives of meeting & topics for AOB** EG

Topics: There was a lack of vision, policy and objectives for the NP. We never had the opportunity for discussing what is important. Now was the chance to come up with ideas.

AOB: Other ideas would need to be aired and discussed, but this evening we really needed to focus on vision which will ultimately carry more weight. It might also provide a mechanism for resolving the differences in different sections of the plan. Anything else that people want to raise should wait until the end please.

4. **Update of meeting held at SDNPA on Thursday 16 November 2017** which was attended by EG, AH, JW and AM.

The Steering group members met with officers from the SDNPA who highlighted the options available if we wished to proceed with our Neighbourhood Plan, possibly allocating different sites rather than the Sawmills site or reducing the number of dwellings on this site.

The South Downs Local Plan (SDLP) was at a fairly advanced stage and would be submitted for examination in March 2018. Therefore, for the Inspector/ SDNPA to consider alternative proposals and give sufficient weight to the Stedham with Iping Neighbourhood Plan, it would need to be at an advanced stage with certainty that new sites or different combinations of sites were deliverable, and in general conformity with the SDLP, including in terms of providing similar amounts of affordable housing in a sustainable location.

The SDNPA did highlight some risk in terms of the challenging timetable to prepare an advanced Neighbourhood Plan by March 2018 and also warned that a few Examiners of Neighbourhood Plans had waited to examine Neighbourhood Plans until after key stages of the Local Plan had been decided.

SIPC would need to get their objection to the SDLP in before the closing date explaining the reasons why it considered the Sawmills site did not meet the Tests of Soundness and also provide the timetable for the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.

The conclusion from the meeting was that even if the SINP was sent out for pre-consultation by late January, it would be unlikely to influence the SDLP sufficiently for the SDNPA to remove the Sawmill site from the Local Plan assuming the SDNPA current timetable continued. It was suggested that the Examiner may even wish to delay the NP examination until after the SDLP was approved. However, it was agreed to support the advice of having fully worked through our own site assessments so that we would be in a position to discuss/negotiate them with the SDNPA should the opportunity arise during the examination process of the SDLP.

With regard SIPC objection to the Sawmill site, no additional clarification was given on why 16-20 residential units had been allocated to Stedham other than it being site driven, nor was any reason given as to why the landscape assessment was changed from being 'not suitable' in 2014 to one that is 'likely positive' in 2017.

Policy SD92: We needed to tick the box on the consultation form that we wish to speak at the public examination. **Afternote: Action completed** (by AH).

Although we hope the Inspector will call us in, we have no automatic right to appear before him. We are now in the hands of the Inspector.

CD: The process does not work in its current form. In Petworth a builder had permission to build 20 houses, half of which were to be affordable. He reneged on the agreement and this was upheld on appeal so he did not have to build any affordable homes.

DC was concerned that we had not taken enough notice of the 60% of respondents to the questionnaire who supported the Sawmills site and felt there was some feeling in Stedham about it.

AH: This was partly due to faults in the questionnaire, he himself had ticked the box for the Sawmills.

The Clerk said the SIPC response was not saying there should be no housing on the Sawmills site, it was attempting to get back control from the SDNPA on what would happen on the site and the NP would also be important in achieving this objective.

There would be a 6-week parish consultation which would start ideally in January once we were happy with the topic reports. Parishioners needed to work from something.

AM had suggested the 6-week formal consultation starting in February + 1 month for the SDNPA and the referendum. It could then be submitted for examination in March/April/May.

If the SDNPA agreed with it, it would be possible that the Inspector could consider it at the same time as examining the SDLP.

It would be a negotiation and potentially there could be a compromise. Proper consultation was necessary. The plan would be implemented in 2019.

5. Vision brainstorm – 60 mins

The brainstorming was run by AH and the following includes some phrases from LP and MD's input:

2017 – special qualities	2033 - vision
LANDSCAPE	
River Rother	
Commons/SSSI	
Iping/Stedham Rise	
Green space in the village	Increase green space and access to them. Ensure green space included in developments.
	Rectory field owned by National Trust
	Tye Hill triangle owned by SIPC
Key views – South Downs, fields, trees	
Long thin parish – geological variety	
	Restoration of Minsted sandpit – landscaped and taken into local nature reserve
ENVIRONMENT	
Dark Skies – intrinsically dark part of Park?	Continue to appreciate the darkness & night-sky Limit external lighting
	Tranquil environment
	Reduce A272 road noise, e.g. resurface with noise reducing tarmac
HERITAGE	
Historic settlement on the Rother	No development to adversely affect heritage assets. Built environment to protect heritage assets and character
Central conservation area	
Housing stock	
Deep sided lanes/tracks, water system, old quarries – historic links to past	

SETTLEMENT	
Shape of the village	Settlement boundary to be preserved
	Ribbon development to be avoided
	150m 'no build' zone from A272 Polo fields and Eddie's field safe from development
	Terrace of five social houses built and a model low-rise development has replaced farm buildings at Ingrams Green
"small"	development, when it occurs, will be small in scale and in sympathy with the heritage and history of the parish
DESIGN & HOUSING	
	Look of the parish will remain the same, i.e. developments small
	Redevelop parts of the Common View Improve Common View landscaping
	Limit extension/enlargement to protect smaller housing stock. Encourage sub-division into smaller units.
Unfulfilled local social housing need	Housing – sustainable where possible. Small units to answer need. High percentage affordable for young & old with connection to parish. Pursue rural exceptions to facilitate
	Building affordable housing Midhurst Land Trust so housing in style for local people – using local wood
	Accept contemporary but 'good' design
	Encourage innovative 'green homes', e.g. straw bale, local wood.
INFRASTRUCTURE	
	Infrastructure development to keep up with housing development, e.g. sewage
Broadband & mobile signal very patchy – improving in Stedham & Iping villages, poor outside	Excellent communications – mobile, broadband
	future orientated in terms of energy and transport
COMMUNITY	
A collection of neighbourly small hamlets	Hamlets feel Stedham village provides the natural community hub
Limited facilities for teenagers and young adults	
School	Thriving school
Pub with restaurant	Popular pub
Village Hall - much used for village functions; monthly pensioners' lunch, annual Horticultural Show, WI	Active village hall – community events Draws people from surrounding hamlets
Two churches & choir	
	Village shop? - Rotherhill
	Small number of 'empty' second homes
	Pride to live in the parish
	Integration Social integration, recreation, health
	Sharing of facilities to promote community spirit

	Promote use of local contractors/businesses Know 'who to go to get something done'
Diverse community – although above average retired population	Embrace the diverse mix of people Avoid one particular category growing too large, e.g. retirees, commuters Available for all ages and all incomes
	Proactive parish council
	Positive discrimination on parish council
	It will go above and beyond in integration with the existing communities it is built alongside
	Our community will have a small, cohesive identity, diverse in age, occupation and econ-social grouping.
Health & Wellbeing	
Sports club and field – bowls, football, stool-ball, cricket & tennis Pavilion for private functions	Sports Club is thriving, generating an annual surplus, and Stedham once again fields a cricket XI and an under-sixteen side
	Day-care available for working mothers
Childrens' playground on recreation ground	
Allotments in Common View	
Community campsite	
Network of paths	Better footpaths along the river
Many dog walkers	Better facilities for
Cycling	Mecca for on-road and off-road for cyclists
Fishing	
Equestrian	
Role of National Trust and the Sussex Wildlife Trust to manage and care for hundreds of acres of common land	
	Residents will be encouraged to have a healthy lifestyle in this rural setting by improved cycle and other paths, as well as good playground equipment for children of all ages
	It will welcome visitors to the parish and to the National Park.
TRANSPORT & ACCESSIBILITY	
Rural location – but London, Heathrow, Gatwick, Southampton etc easily accessible in +/- 1 hour	Leverage location as a desirable place to live/work in an increasingly 'connected' world
Poor public transport, particularly to outlying hamlets	Driverless cars could/will revolutionise accessibility for all
	Live better with the carparking Traffic & parking to borne in mind during planning Traffic calming & parking solutions, cycle routes Carparking does not disfigure the views
	Children cycling to school in Midhurst
	Underground parking on recreation ground!
	Less traffic through village
	Parking at east end rectory field for users of Memorial Hall
	Well-designed carpark for walkers on Sawmill site
EMPLOYMENT	

Diverse range of employment across the socio-economic spectrum	Vibrant economy
Majority of residents leave the parish for employment	More opportunities within the parish
	Live/work units
	Thriving businesses on Sawmill site Several businesses have premises on the sawmill site
	Encourage small 'home-based' businesses, e.g. architect studio, florist Encourage cottage industries Embrace small local businesses, both manual work and other as well as the farming that distinguish it.
Active farms (2 stock farmers) & land related businesses	
Garden centre and tree-nursery	

It was felt that we could do better with our introduction and make it less like a designer brochure for the national park that other parish Neighbourhood Plans had done.

AH: Everything needs tidying up and we need to bring in the policies we want.

JW: The statement what life is like now and then in 2033 is an attractive idea.

CD felt the NP was still being rushed and she would like to delay the parish consultation. AH said we could delay it for a year, but we would still get to this point, he felt it better to keep going and hope to have the parish consultation in January.

EG: 2 December was out. We had to agree the vision and whatever goes out to the public.

DC thought it would be possible to go for January. We needed to:

Write the vision document (5 days): AH

Write the objectives and policies (5 days)

Amend the evidence documents (3 days)

Approve the evidence and agree them (1 day)

Review each evidence document and amend errors/omissions and then write out key points for flipcharts. (5 days)

Create the flipcharts (5 days)

Create adverts (1 day)

Prepare maps (5 days)

We would need feedback on evidence. It would be quicker on big topics to say what is missing.

6. Any other business

CD: Produced a personal plan for Common View. No-one had been given prior knowledge of this idea, but as there was no time to consider the plan, CD would bring it up at another meeting.

7. Date of next meeting: Wednesday 29 November 2017 at 6.30. Venue to be decided.

CONCLUSION: 9.10

..... Date.....