MINUTES of the Meeting of the STRATEGIC POLICY WORKING GROUP held at 8.00pm on Tuesday 7 February 2017 held in the Village Centre, Trinity Road, Hurstpierpoint.

Working Group Members Present

John Lowman (Chairman)
Stephen Hand
Bob Sampson

Also Present:

Stephen Hoyles – CLERK TO THE COUNCIL

SP16/32. Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest: The following apologies for absence were received prior to the meeting and accepted: Allan Brown, Rosemary Burns. There were no declarations of interest.

SP16/33. Minutes of the meeting of the Strategic Policy Working Group 10 January 2017: The Working Group received and accepted the minutes which were then signed by the Chairman.

SP16/34. Projects: There were no matters to consider.

SP16/35. Current issues: The Working Group considered the current matters which of were particular interest or concern to the Parish Council, and to offer suggestions for further action.

(1) District Plan Examination: The Working Group reviewed the current proceedings:

(a) The Inspector had published the following timetable for the next stage:

Wednesday 8 and Thursday 9 February	Further Housing hearings to take place
Tuesday 14 February	Deadline for statements in response to the Inspector's Matters and Questions from the District Council and Representors (Representors to inform Programme Officer if they wish to participate at the hearings)
23 February	Inspector to issue Agendas for the hearings
w/c 27 February	Hearings for the remainder of the Plan – a timetable showing dates and times for each topic will be confirmed after the 14 February deadline
By 1 March	Inspector to issue interim findings on OAN and Unmet Need

(b) Housing hearings (8 and 9 February 2017): The Examination agenda suggested that the Inspector is testing the role of the MSDC SHLAA list in determining which sites can be delivered. The issue appears to be a straight contest between developers and MSDC about what can be actually delivered. MSDC are putting their case that the District is constrained to 800 dpa because of the limited number of deliverable sites. *(Ref: Inspector's comments and questions: the effect of constraints on the supply of housing within the plan period – 30 Jan 2017)*
It was agreed that the Council has already put the case against 'west Burgess Hill' (our letter of 4 November 2016) and no further action is appropriate at this stage.

(c) Site allocations and non-housing policies (from 28 February 2017): The Inspector had questioned the policy relating to the Science Park (Policy DP2 Sustainable Economic Development) asking: is it an allocation, and if so, should it be the subject of a separate policy? The Inspector has also questioned the justification for the 30Ha Business Park on the A2300 (Policy DP9 Strategic allocation to the north and north-west of Burgess Hill).
It was agreed that the Council asks MSDC what response it proposes to make regarding the Inspector's questions on Policy DP2 (Science Park).

Policy DP11 (Preventing coalescence) had been raised by the Inspector, suggesting that countryside policies should be sufficient to protect local gaps. The Inspector had asked: What kind of development does this policy have in mind? Is it actually necessary to include this policy, given the control over the countryside exercised by Policy DP10? For the same reason, why would it be necessary to identify local gaps?
(Ref: Inspector's comments and questions: site allocations and non-housing policies - 26 Jan 2017)
It was agreed that the Council makes representations on Policy DP11 defending the role of Local Gaps as a valuable tool in protecting the identity of our community, and quoting where appropriate form NPPF. The response should be incorporated within the Council's letter regarding the role of the Neighbourhood Plan (see item (e) below).

(d) Examination into the soundness of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031 - Note from the Inspector: The Inspector's note referred to clarification on a number of general policies, of a technical nature.
(Ref: Examination into the soundness of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031 Note from the Inspector - 31 January 2017)

(e) The role of Neighbourhood Plans - Parish Council response to Inspector: Following the meeting of the Strategic Policy WG on 10 January 2017, the Parish Office prepared (with the guidance of planning consultant Dowsett Mayhew) a draft response to the Inspector's letter of 10 January 2017, regarding the role of N'hood Plans and the 3-year housing land supply. The Working Group approved the draft. It was noted that this was only reinforcing the Council's existing policies and did not therefore require the further approval of Council. *(Ref: HP&SCPC DRAFT ltr 8 Feb 2017 – MSDC District Plan Examination)*

(2) Burgess Hill transport issues – Workshop 6 March 2017: The Council had been advised that WSCC had recently appointed consultant WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff to undertake a detail design of the 'transport package'. It was understood to be the upgrading of the A2300 link road. An invitation was to be issued to attend the Workshop on 6 March 2017. *(Ref: MSDC Judy Holmes email 31 January 2017)*

(3) Pre-application meeting – land at College Lane, Hurstpierpoint: The Clerk reported that he had met representatives of the developer (Baobab Developments) at the Parish Office on 18 January 2017, at which initial proposals were tabled for 10 houses on a site immediately east of the Barn. This site had previously been granted permission for a single large dwelling. The Clerk explained the policies of the N'hood Plan and Council's wish to protect the local gap in the land to the east of College Lane. The applicants advised that the 'meadow' south of the Barn was covenanted against future development, except for a single dwelling. The clerk requested evidence of the covenant. An application for the 10 units is expected shortly.

(4) Pre-application meeting – land north of Kings Centre, Reeds Lane, Sayers Common: The Clerk reported that he had met representatives of the developer (Reside) on 7 February 2017 at which initial proposals for 38 houses on 4.8 Ac had been tabled. The developers were looking for initial responses from the Council before lodging an application. An area of about 3 Ac of ponds (former clay pits) to the north were included and could be offered to the Council as amenity or conservation land. The land to the west (about 10 Ac) was open for discussion about its future. The clerk had explained the policies of the N'hood plan and the wish to limit the amount of new housing in the village. Discussion had taken place about possible community benefits which could accompany the development.

SP16/36. Current issues - CONFIDENTIAL: There were no matters to consider.

There being no other business the Chairman closed the Meeting at 9.02 pm

Chairman