

Neighbourhood Plan Project Management Group

Notes of the Meeting: Wednesday July 23rd 2014

Introductions and Apologies:

Apologies received from Don McBeth and Mike Burr.

Declarations of interest:

As ever, it was noted that if any conflicts of interest come up in the course of the meeting, they should be declared.

Correspondence received/pending:

Land Availability :

Brighton & Hove CC:

B&H City Council had been contacted re. traffic issues under the provisions of the 'duty to co-operate'. There has been no response yet, and no new replies from the other adjacent Neighbourhood Plan areas.

Fire & Ambulance:

Enquiries have been made into the effect of congestion in the High Street on service response and their thoughts on the idea of turning the Beacon Rd into a no-through road. No replies have been received as yet.

Traffic:

Submission for screening opinion:

Ray Drabble of the South Downs National Park Authority is consulting lawyers following conflicting responses from English Heritage and Natural England.

English Heritage & Natural England felt that a strategic environmental assessment would be required for the Neighbourhood Plan. The defining factor seemed to be whether or not it was really necessary for a future expansion of 'only' 25 - 30 new dwellings. Much would depend on where they are built, the size of the individual developments and the impact on bio-diversity. They seem to have a precautionary approach, as without a SEA the potential effects are not clear. SDNPA seems to take the view that a SEA probably isn't going to be necessary as the impact will not be proportionate.

Ray Drabble is to attend a meeting with the Environment Agency on Monday. It seems likely that a SEA may just apply to housing – he will advise soon.

Results of Meetings with SDNPA, Wivelsfield PC and Monday Meeting:

Wivelsfield Parish Council meeting

Richard attended and gave feedback.

They now have a huge allocation of 100+ houses and other likely planning. This has impacted on their SEA, and having taken legal advice it seems likely that they will have to conduct one. They have appointed a consultant to oversee this.

They have engaged in a Household Survey and have done the returns on this.

Like us, traffic is a key concern, but they couldn't really identify the problem or quantify the impact. As part of our duty to co-operate, we will let them have a copy of our LATS and the 2007 Traffic Survey as an aid to their representation of the adverse traffic conditions.

They have issued a call for sites, requesting information from landowners etc., and are still awaiting responses, having advertised on their website.

We could do the same, also maybe inviting landowners/developers to give presentations to the whole community.

Presentation to the Monday Meeting

Tom had given a presentation about the Neighbourhood Plan.

When asked what their main concerns were, the audience replied:

- * traffic
- * having to go outside village for weekly shop
- * lack of bus service (to be further cut from April)
- *

Fracking

1. The official plan with its legitimate policies
2. Aspirational – traffic and maybe fracking could come under this heading of “material consideration”
3. A schedule

After some discussion on this topic, it was decided that any further action will depend on interest raised in the Questionnaire responses.

Progress on questionnaire return and analysis methodology

Evaluations and anomalies to be dealt with at the next PMG meeting.

Next steps in the project

Key planning stages