

## **Neighbourhood Plan Project Management Group**

### **Notes of the Meeting**

**Wednesday May 13th 2015**

**Present:** Trevor Kirby, Tony Gedge, Tom Dufty (Chair), James Standing, Mike Burr, Don McBeth, Edwina Rowling

**1. Advance Apologies:** Amy Tyler-Jones, Richard Flack

**2. Declarations of interest:** None

#### **3. Correspondence received/pending**

Mike reported on the content of the SDNPA's Draft Transport Policies report forwarded to the project group by Amy. He found the report a little confusing but generally supportive and useful in the context of the policies drafted by the Traffic & Transport focus group. It was agreed that we should argue for our plan area to be treated as a case study/test case for the realisation of SDNPA's aspirational policies vis-a-vis ESCC's strategic accountability for highways in the park. We should aim for an early meeting with Andrew Lee, SDNPA's Director of Strategy & Partnership. The policies do not address the issue of developments outside the park impacting on settlements within the park. We should argue that proposed developments north of the area add to our need to be treated as a special case.

**Action:** Tom to write to Andrew Lee asking for a meeting

#### **4. Ditchling Rugby Club Planning application – letter of objection**

Tom apologised for the fact that he'd had to send a letter objecting to the application without final approval from the project group but the deadline for submission had been surprisingly soon after the last meeting. He hoped the letter contained what the group had debated. Attendees confirmed that it had.

Tom had subsequently circulated the statement of the Rugby Club's chairman that if its application for two rugby pitches and a car park is approved by the SDNPA then the club would next be applying for a discrete club house of its own. This only served to confirm the fears that had been expressed at the project group's previous meeting that the formal application left a lot unsaid about its future intentions and more than justified our letter of objection.

#### **5. Locality Grant Funding**

Tom reported that he had started to draft the application for a new grant based on the anticipated costs of room hire, publicity and printing for the six months from June 1st. He was basing it on the hope that by the end of the six months we would be in a position where we had a draft plan that would need printing, distribution and attendant publicity, with invitations to open mornings etc. In discussion it was agreed that the final draft policy document should be produced in two formats 1) a very limited edition of the formal comprehensive document and 2) a summary document for distribution to all households. There would of course be cost implications and this

should be reflected in the grant application.

**Action: Tom and Edwina** to liaise over completion of the grant application and the grant sum applied for.

## **6. Mid Sussex IDP application submission – Project Proposal**

Mike reported that he had been unable so far to get the sub-group together on the same date to agree a project for which we could apply for funding.

**Action:** Mike to keep trying

## **7. Focus Groups - progress update**

**Community Infrastructure Group:** The group has 8 members. Phil reported that the group was planning another meeting for May 28th when it was hoped it would be in a position to finalise some draft 'skeleton' policies. He anticipated reporting back to the PMG after that meeting and hoped it would provide some useful themes for converting into realistic policies. He said that the group was struggling to come up with policies that are specific to plan making – it needed to be clear which are real planning policies and which are not.

Phil suggested that there should be a meeting between the PMG/Community Infrastructure Group members and the representatives of two local grant funding (charitable) bodies – The Philipson Trust and the Turner-Dumbrell Foundation so as to understand their remits and what potential sources of funds there are.

**Action: Tom** to write to the organisations

**Housing Focus Group:** James reported that the group had met three times and was well underway.

**Conservation Focus Group:** Tom reported on Richard's behalf that the group still only had four members and could do with more. It had met on four occasions but it was limiting the amount they could do. Most of the evidence they required was now available to them but they still needed to undertake some detailed assessments in relation to landscape/views and ecology and biodiversity. They believed this could be achieved without specialist input.

However they had completed their work in relation to local green spaces which has included individual assessment. The group had concluded that there needed to be some refinement to the objectives relevant to their topic and proposed to discuss this with the PMG when they produce their draft policy proposals.