

## **Neighbourhood Plan Project Management Group**

**Wednesday March 19<sup>th</sup> 2014  
Friends (Quaker) Meeting House 7.30pm**

### **Notes of meeting**

#### **Apologies**

Apologies received from Andrew Triggs, who had last minute commitments that prevented him attending, and Mike Burr.

#### **Declaration of Interests**

Members were asked to state any conflicts of interest that may come up during the course of the meeting.

#### **Registers of Interest on the website**

All agreed that, in line with Parish Councils and for reasons of transparency, all interests registered should be put up on the website.

**Action:** Edwina to decide where this should best be placed on the site.

#### **PMG Membership & Resources**

Nicola has resigned from the group. She felt unable to continue for several reasons, including pressure of work, but was deeply concerned about the inaccuracies in the notes taken at several of the meetings regarding her contributions on the environment. She was also concerned that an email sent by Tom, in a private capacity, to friends in the village regarding an application for parking restriction in Lodge Lane compromised his position as chair of the PMG. The majority feeling of the group was that he was expressing a personal opinion as a resident, and was sharing it with a wide and varied group – some of whom coincidentally happened to be members of the PMG. Her resignation was regretted, as she has made a substantial contribution to the work of the group.

**Action:** Tom to ask Nicola if she would be prepared to act as an environmental consultant to the PMG, to submit for a Screening Opinion and to carry out subsequent Environmental Assessments as required.

More people are needed, with particular skills and experience if possible, to assist the group particularly on the environment and sustainability and consultation with local businesses.

**Action:** Tom to approach James Standing.

#### **Emails & communications received**

These have been in the main congratulatory that we are developing a plan. One email has been received from an owner offering a plot of land for potential development. Tom has responded, saying that the PMG is a long way off identifying potential development sites and will consider it when the appropriate time comes. He has pointed out to the owner that if the PMG were to consider

it an appropriate site it would be subject, as would all other aspects of the draft plan, to consultation with the residents and Councils of all three parishes in the neighbourhood area.

The latest update of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), a report made by Lewes District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority, has been made available – with potential new local sites for development.

**Action:** Edwina to forward to PMG

### **Traffic issue update**

Andrew Triggs is in favour of the proposal to get representatives of East and West Sussex County Councils together to discuss traffic. Ditchling, Streat and Westmeston parishes perceive that they suffer from being on the cusp of the two counties. Each County seem to believe, however erroneously, that the arterial roads in their counties carry the predominant commuter through-traffic to and from the south coast. The reality is that the B2112 and Spatham Lane take a significant proportion of it. A draft letter to the two councils has been prepared asking for a joint meeting.

Recent information concerning discussions with ESCC on speed restrictions in Spatham Lane needs to be added to that meeting's agenda.

**Actions:** Andrew and Tom to push forward with setting up the joint meeting.

Tom Jones to be asked to pass on relevant information to the PMG about the ESCC Spatham Lane discussions.

### **Burgess Hill Town and Haywards Heath Town Neighbourhood Plans**

As part of the public consultation on this draft plan, the PMG has read through and discussed their response. The consensus was that as the draft plan only relates to the area within the existing town boundary, none of their draft policies appear to take account of the proposed Mid Sussex development on the eastern side of the town and of the impact it will have not just on their town but on neighbouring parishes, including ours, particularly potential through-traffic routing on the B2112 and Spatham Lane. Nor is there mention of how public transport might be developed to help relieve the traffic burden on neighbouring parishes.

Although it infers that there has been discussion with Ditchling Parish Council, there has been no consultation with it regarding the Plan other than on the subject of the future of the Country Park.

Again, Haywards Heath's draft plan doesn't look at the effects of existing and potential developments for increased traffic on areas beyond it. There is only one mention of the B2112 and that is in terms of improving capacity at the junction with the new relief road which implies a desire to facilitate, and make easier, use of this junction.

In neither plan is there a clear vision regarding tourism and the impact it may have on the transport system and the surrounding area. Again, there has been no consultation with Ditchling Parish Council.

The duty to co-operate with adjacent councils is vital in formulating plans. The PMG agreed on a strategy of, in the first instance, writing to neighbouring parishes and towns outlining the process it will itself pursue to consult and co-operate, and then follow it up with responses to the Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath Draft Plans.

**Action:** It was agreed that Tom would draft a standard letter to all the neighbouring councils informing them of our existence and letting them know of the consultation process we will be following. He would follow this with letters in response to the Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath Draft Plans, with particular reference to the B2111.

### **General Questionnaire & Follow up process**

Richard, Tony and Tom had drafted a questionnaire which was circulated for discussion. Comments included:

- The need to establish a vision – why they are being asked to complete it
- Context should be established, followed by qualitative questions.
- Questions should have a scoring range, for stats., plus space for comments
- Separate questions for businesses
- Establish focus groups from the response to the questionnaire.
- There should be an option for the respondent to preserve anonymity, but post code essential
- To be issued to households, rather than individuals - with numbers and age groups preferably declared
- Street reps to be asked make themselves available to help with distribution and with encouragement of households to complete questionnaires
- Include questions which elicit how important/critical a specific topic is for the respondent

**Actions:** Edwina and Sallie with Craig's help to edit the draft questionnaire to make it more useful for analysing and establishing statistics, using the Aylesbury model.

Edwina to generate slips for street reps to fill in their contact details and post with the questionnaires

### **Special interest groups to be consulted**

Special Interest Groups may be defined from the questionnaire – there could be a slot where respondents were able to request the opportunity to discuss their key concerns with others.

In Street an important special interest group to be consulted is Plumpton College.

The Golf Club and other commercial establishments also to be approached.