**SLAUGHAM PARISH COUNCIL**

**2 Coltstaple Cottages, Coltstaple Lane, Horsham, RH13 9BB**

**NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**Monday 17th August 2015, 7:30 pm Pavilion, High Street, Handcross**

Sally Mclean – Clerk to the Council

Email clerk@slaughampc.org.uk

Website: http://www.slaughampc.org.uk

**Present**: John Welch, Lorette Holborn, Debra Logan, Sue Hance, Ed Hadfield, Stewart Cooper, David Dunn, Lesley Read, Mike Whiteford,

**Others Present**: 4 members of public

**Apologies:** Pete Clark, Kim Godwin, Bob St George, Patricia Simmons

1. **To approve the minutes of the meeting held on the 20th July 2015** APPROVED.
2. **To receive declarations of interest from members in respect of any items on the agenda.** Lesley Read 5.2 Property backs on to the Land
3. **Open Forum** Committee to consider adjournment of the meeting for questions from the members of the public: None
4. **Co-Option – Committee are permitted to co-opt in accordance with Council’s standing orders. To consider possible candidates to fill the vacancy for a Handcross representative.**  In accordance with the Councils Standing Orders 5 (xi) - to receive nominations to a committee or sub-committee. The Committee is empowered to co-opt additional members where there are insufficient Members; it is actively seeking new co-optees. If the co-option is successful, a paper (signed) version of the code of conduct form will be completed. **Julia Elliott voted unanimously and co-opted**
5. **Chairman’s Update**

Update Freedom of Information Request (FOI) that was sent to MSDC requesting information on pre application discussions for developments of more than 20 houses in the Parish of Slaugham. MSDC response below:

*Thank you for your request for information. Whenever the Council receives a request for pre-application advice, we have to consult with the person who paid for the advice to see if they are happy to release it. Once we have their decision the Council then takes a view on whether or not to release taking into account the representations of the person who paid for the advice.  In this particular case there are two pre-applications that fit your request.

The owner of the first set of pre-app advice has decided they are happy to release the information, so there are no representations for the Council to consider.

The owner of the second set of pre-app advice has not agreed to the release and has stipulated that as they are still in an ongoing dialogue with the Planning department that they believe that to release any information at this stage may prejudice their future plans for the property. The Council currently upholds their decision to not release and therefore we will not be providing information relating to this pre-app at this time.

Please find enclosed copies of the information regarding pre-application advice for DM/14/04596. Please note, pre-application advice does not form part of the process for considering the application once received.  As with all pre-application advice the following statement is always enclosed - "The views expressed in this letter are at officer level only and do not prejudice the Council from making whatever decision it considers appropriate on any application subsequently submitted."

Once an application has been received members of the public can make comments or objections relating to the application. In the case of  Pease Pottage Golf Course (DM/14/04596) this has now been submitted as an application - you can view planning applications on our Online Planning Register,* [*http://www.midsussex.gov.uk/planning/8085.htm*](http://www.midsussex.gov.uk/planning/8085.htm)*.

If for whatever reason you are unhappy with our response you are entitled to pursue any dissatisfaction, in the first instance, by contacting Tom Clark, Solicitor to the Council, Mid Sussex District Council, Oaklands, Oaklands Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 1SS, email:* *tom.clark@midsussex.gov.uk**, quoting your FOI Reference Number.*Discussions surrounding whether or not this group could challenge the FOI response on the pre applications talks being held with the landowners was deliberated, the Clerk was asked to explore this further with MSDC.

 **5.1 To receive updates from Council** To include any meetings, decision or documentation that maybe relevant to this Committee.

* 1. Update on the progress of any planning applications that have a bearing on the NHP -NONE
	2. Update on Warren Cottage Fields option.

The Councils Land Agent was instructed to advise by way of a general scoping report, on a development proposal involving the land swap. The report summarised the issues and provided a technical backdrop to the proposals as well as providing guidance to the Council as to the manner in which it might asses this proposal. By way of background information it includes some general comment on certain costs, but no formal valuation advice was given.

The document produced does not purport to tell the Council which way it should decide matters, rather to inform and guide the Council as to the issues and options so that proper democratic decisions can be taken in satisfaction of and accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Guidance from the Department of Communities and Local Government and the attendant statutory obligations.

The scoping report has now been reviewed and approved by full Council and sent to the Hyde Estate and their agents for review. The PC have asked that a meeting is arranged where the detail can be discussed. The purpose of that meeting will be to determine as to whether the proposal will be investigated further based on the analysis of the scoping report.

The Clerk will issue a copy of the scoping report and executive summary to the members of this group.

Members of the sub-committee looking at the proposal were informed by MSDC that a call for sites will be required due to the allocation of the northern corner of the recreation ground.

The guidance provided by MSDC was as follows:

*As the northern corner now benefits from planning permission, it is recommended that a call for sites is undertaken to allow the northern corner to be allocated for development in the Neighbourhood Plan. If the call for sites was not undertaken, and the northern corner was taken forward in the Neighbourhood Plan then it may result in a risk of challenge by the promoter of an alternative site. By acknowledging that the site has been given planning permission within the neighbourhood plan should the Council agree to release the land in the future, it will be in accordance with the policy. The Council still have veto over any development and are by no means under any obligation to promote the land.*

The PC were faced with two options on the allocation of the land during the call for sites consultation planned:

**Option1: Northern Corner**

If the Council put forward the northern corner only then this would reflect the extant permission that has been granted by the Secretary of State, but would potentially frustrate the intention of the proposed land swap. It would not be necessary for the Neighbourhood Plan to include the whole of the Recreation Ground as a housing allocation in this scenario at this time. There would however be a risk that the Hyde Estate would promote the Warren Cottages Fields for housing as has been done previously instead or challenge the Neighbourhood Plan on the grounds it does not reflect an extant permission.

In this scenario, if the land swap were to proceed and the whole of the Recreation Ground was then to be promoted for housing development in a planning application separate from the Neighbourhood Plan, permission for the housing development could only be granted as a departure from the development plan unless the land was allocated at a later date as part of a Neighbourhood Plan review.

**Option 2 Whole Site**:

Alternatively if the Council put forward the whole of the Recreation Ground during the call for sites then this would facilitate the whole of the Recreation Ground being considered for development and allow for the land to be allocated for housing in the Neighbourhood Plan from the outset.

This in turn would facilitate the potential land swap with the Hyde Estate should it be agreed to proceed, as this would be in line with the intention of the Hyde Estate, and could negate the risk of the Hyde Estate challenging the Neighbourhood Plan. It would also result in a potential uplift in the land value if subsequently allocated for housing in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Others factors would apply in relation to the allocation of Warren Cottage Fields should the proposal for a land swap go forward.

On the basis of the guidance provided by MSDC, members RESOLVED that Open 2 Whole Site would need to applied in the instance to prevent potential challenge in the future should the land swap progress.

The Clerk will issue copies of the briefing note to this group. Stewart and the Clerk will develop the call for sites documentation for publication. The group agreed the call for sites should be published in the local newspapers from the 27th August – 24th September as recommended.

**6 To discuss next steps for the Neighbourhood plan**

 6.1 To receive an update on the site assessment work – subcommittee report

This is progressing well, a traffic light system using the scoping report criteria has been developed some questions were raised surrounding assessing sites see below. Sue cc’d the group in advance of the meeting, some observations were made on the night surrounding the layout and the addition of a table that explains the workings of the form.

If SPC's call for sites results in new sites coming forward, ie not in MSDC's SHLAA sites, will MSDC do an assessment on those sites?

If the call for sites results in some of the sites excluded from assessment sites being put forward again, would we need to look at those in more detail?  Or can we rely on (agree with) the original MSDC view that they should still be excluded as too remote from the built-up area?

 6.2 Assets of Community Value – The group discussed the process for AOCV and the management

of the list and registering of assets identified by the community. Some felt that this maybe something that the Community Land Trust Group (CLT) could take on. Sue agreed to produce a briefing note on the AOCV procedure and inquire as to whether this is something the CLT would like to manage.

**7 Update NHP Communications Plan**

* 1. To report on any communications subcommittee meetings; updates. Nothing to report

**8 Agree Next Steps**

8.1 To review the neighbourhood plan timeline – Sue to review

 8.2 To review assignments

 Call for sites (SM/SC)

 Draft Plan (All)

 Traffic – condensing it to a policy (BDG/LH)

9 **Matters for future discussion**

Date of Next Meeting/s: **21st September 2015 -** 19 October; 16 November; 21 December

Signed \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_