

## Neighbourhood Plan Project Management Group

Meeting: Friends (Quaker) Meeting House 7.30pm, East Gardens, Ditchling

Wednesday January 27th 2016

### Meeting Notes

**Present:** Richard Flack, Craig Mayhew, Mike Burr, Tom Dufty (Chair), Edwina Rowling, Trevor Kirby, Don McBeth, Tom Jones, Phil Smith

**1. Advance Apologies:** Amy Tyler-Jones, Tony Gedge, Paul Farrands

**2. Declarations of interest:** none declared

**3. Correspondence sent/received/pending:**

Tom reported that he and the Ditchling Parish Clerk had completed the end of grant report and would be returning £513 to the government out of the £4,100 originally received. This had been the second grant and total expenditure on the project so far had been £6,526. The figure of £8,000 had been quoted as a maximum but he didn't know whether this related to the project as a whole or in any one grant year – hopefully the latter. He would check and would make an application for a third grant.

**Action: Tom** to check and make application [It was subsequently confirmed that the figure of £8,000 referred only to the grant programme 2015 – 18]

Richard reported that he would be leaving the village for a period of circa six months to go and live in Dorset whilst his Ditchling house was undergoing construction work. Tom said that he would remain a member of the PMG

**4. FG policies: Tom** reported that Mike had done an amazing job 'homogenising' the presentation of the FG policies so that they looked consistent and professional. This had involved a degree of editing. Following this meeting they would cease to be discrete focus group policies and would become the PMG's policies. The next stage would be to submit them to Amy/Sarah (SDNPA) for categorisation as genuine planning policies or aspirational policies. We would also ask them to conduct a general critique of the policies. In the ensuing discussion a few amendments were made.

**Action: Mike** to incorporate the amendments

**Tom** to forward to Amy/Sarah

## **5. Preferred development sites & settlement boundary extensions:**

Tom reported that the focus group leaders had met and decided on a pecking order of the four possible development sites exhibited at the Open Day, based on 'deliverability', public acceptance and scale. It was a criteria that all the owners had agreed to the sites being used for small, low cost affordable (for rent or purchase) houses. On this basis the most preferred site was the land south of Long Park Corner belonging to Park Barn Farm which it is estimated is large enough for circa ten houses. The second most preferred site was the garden land to the east of Walnut Tree Cottage, East End Lane which could accommodate up to three houses.. Both are outside the settlement boundary and the PMG would be recommending an extension to bring them within. Both raise conservation issues which it is felt could be overcome. It was agreed that the SDNPA should be consulted before putting them in the draft plan, to get its views on the conservation issues. It was noted that the requirement to take an allocation of fifteen houses could not be met without housing outside the settlement boundary. It was agreed that the other two sites should remain on the table and not at this stage be put forward.

**Action: Tom** to correspond with the SDNPA via Amy/Sarah

**6. Recent Traffic meeting (Paul);** Paul had reported to Tom that he had had a meeting with Neville Harrison, one of two representatives of parish councils on the SDNPA. They were also colleagues. The meeting had been very productive and Neville had expressed full support for the concept underlying PMG's traffic and transport policies. He had expressed concern at the lack of involvement by ESCC which should be fully signed up to what SDNPA is trying to achieve with highways in the park.. He was keen on the implementation of the shared space and Quiet Lane concepts, and felt that in keeping with these concepts signage should be kept to a minimum, also for landscape conservation reasons. Non-intrusive options such as cattle grids should be considered where possible. Sustainable tourism and sustainable development should be the objective.

Tom said that he was still trying to get a joint meeting of ESCC & SDNPA officials with the project group and hoped that Neville could help in setting this up.

**7. The draft plan:** Tom reported that the FG leaders had agreed that the draft plan should follow the structure recommended by Richard i.e.

## **INTRODUCTION**

**GENERAL BACKGROUND** e.g. reference to Neighbourhood Plan regulations, basic conditions etc. NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

## **CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN AREA.**

## **COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

## **VISION AND OBJECTIVES AND KEY ISSUES**

**THEMATIC SECTIONS** e.g. housing, traffic, conservation, infrastructure, setting out policies, proposals and site allocations.

## **ACHIEVING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.**

**8. Implementing the Plan post approval:** Phil initiated a discussion. It was agreed that a section indicating how the plan would be implemented should be added. He set out three elements to effective plan implementation:

**Planning** – there needed to be some framework which would enable the 3 parishes to continue to work together and agree a common approach to dealing with planning applications

**Actual response to Planning applications** – there needed to be continuous reference back to the plan and why an application did or did not fit with it. Parish Councils needed to be able to provide a narrative to justify their views on an application, not just 'support', 'reject' etc

**Project implementation** – some process would be needed whereby projects could be implemented. This might involve forming partnerships with local organisations such as the Visit Ditchling Consortium and the Parishes acting together with local and public organisations.

However it shouldn't be too bureaucratic. Reviewing progress in implementing the plan is going to be one aspect but it is more than just a monitoring requirement. An Implementation body is needed.

The plan will provide a constant reference point but it is a living document and will be subject to change. Residents will want continual feedback on progress in achieving its content. The best way to engage residents is to present them with options. This infers that there is always some positive project in hand on which their opinion is needed.

**Funding** – Funding is key to the implementation of many parts of the plan, particularly the aspirational policies. The Implementation body should have fund raising responsibility. The Paris council's role would be to pump prime external fund raising and external funding.

Residents could become shareholders but remember the demographic of the area.

**Action: Phil**

**9. Vision Statement;** Tom tabled a revised draft of Vision Statement & Objectives. A few amendments were agreed. **Action: Tom**

**10. 'Achieving Sustainable Development':** Tom tabled a section he had drafted. A few amendments were agreed. **Action: Tom**

**11.** It was agreed that the three weekly scheduled meetings should cease after February and be replaced by ad hoc meetings called when there is specific reason. **Action: Tom**

**12.** It was agreed that thought needed to be given to the requirements for the 6 week consultation period. **Action: Edwina**