

Unconfirmed minutes - to be approved at the next meeting of the Steering Group

**Findon Parish Council**

**Minutes of Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meeting held Wednesday 22 April 2015  
at 7.30pm, The Gun PH**

**Present:** Cllrs Havenhand, Kirk (Chair) & Goldsworthy

**In Attendance:** Richard Bell, Jacqui Greaney (Minutes Secretary), Tarquin Taylor & Ed Wain.

Item No		<u>Action By</u>
15.12	<b><u>Apologies for Absence</u></b>	
	Apologies received from Cllr Mackerell, Maureen Chaffe (Consultant), Steve Flitton, Nick Gore & Ruth Taylor.	
15.13	<b><u>Approval of the Minutes 11 March 2015</u></b>	
	The minutes were unanimously approved.	
15.14	<b><u>Matters Arising</u></b>	
	None.	
15.15	<b><u>Feedback from Saturday's Consultation Event</u></b>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PK thanked everyone for their great support and obviously well run event at last Saturday's Public Consultation day: 282 residents attended. He also thanked the school governors for providing very welcome refreshments (which raised £191 towards school funds.) JH expressed on behalf of the group thanks to PK who, even though absent on the day, had played a major part in keeping the whole NP process on track. PK then invited everyone present to give a brief summary of their thoughts about the day.</li> <li>• JH - A good day overall, apart from: 1. Didn't have complete maps for an overview of the sites; 2. Detected a concern among visitors (RB agreed) that we were presenting a view that was considered worse than the SDNP Wyevale brownfield site. (The questionnaire indicated low density housing was preferred.); 3. The amount of information presented was overwhelming.</li> <li>• TT - An excellent day, not nearly as bad as he had feared! But, 1. The missing master map was inexcusable (a last-minute substitute was thankfully found); 2. The mailing list service/Royal Mail was evidently not dependable. Several roads - as many as 10%? - received no letters of invitation (eg North End and Nepcote). It was agreed an apology to all residents would be published in the next Findon News; 3. TT identified three groups of people at the event. Those who were curious and easily persuaded; those who were fed-up and assumed we had an agenda; and those who were really angry at the proposed sites - one particular person was very argumentative, and critical of not presenting the SDNP's recently proposed alternatives. (There was further discussion about the NP's identified sites - it transpires that at least two (sites 6 &amp; 15) are not actually available for reasons of access and a new planning permission request and that, as site 11 has business/leisure use it should not have been included. Landowners had definitely not been consulted prior to the day and no 'deals' had been done. The appraisals were simply based on site potential.)</li> <li>• EW - In his view the majority of people seemed favourable to the Plan's propositions. Our 'message' needed to be stronger. Some people felt the comments forms were too vague. Also, had touring and caravan sites been missed off the Plan? (It was agreed that it was not necessary to include these.)</li> <li>• RB - Felt he 'got off lightly', with no confrontation at his stall (positioned before housing). The feedback was very positive with approval of the day's professionalism. Some issues arising included, a) Why have we listed Winton's as an important building when it is now being rebuilt?; b) Grass cutting (PG reported that the PC was purchasing its own mower, with a new contract to do the whole village.); c) The footpath between Convent Gardens and Braeside is obstructed. PG confirmed this is a PC issue.</li> <li>• PG - Expressed admiration for TT who had managed to remain calm and considerate all day, in the face of some very unpleasant and unnecessarily aggressive questioning. PG suggested a further consultation day is needed, purely for housing. He felt the majority of comments in the box were favourable. Attendance would probably have been higher had there been more publicity, with perhaps too much reliance placed upon the letters. In hindsight posters around the village (as for the Questionnaire) would have helped. (TT felt there was full attendance from site neighbours - even if only informed by word of mouth.)</li> </ul>	<p>PK</p>
--	--	-----------

<b>15.16</b>	<b><u>Methodology for analysis of comments</u></b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JH had prepared a template for capturing the Housing comments. TT and EW volunteered to help JH trial this system, before going ahead with all responses (including those received by email &amp; collected from Peckhams). The first stage will be logging the Housing comments. The second stage will be collating all other comments. This should be done if possible before 7 May (JH going away).</li> <li>It was agreed that detailed responses to individual comments was neither feasible nor appropriate. This applies also to subsequent email comments (which have gone to the Parish Council email rather than the proposed NP email address). Anything requiring specific action will be passed on to the PC.</li> </ul>	JH, TT, EW
<b>15.17</b>	<b><u>Future strategy re Housing &amp; Design</u></b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussions confirmed we must prove to the Examiner that our results are evidence-based and that the Steering Group must represent the Parish. If the outcome is for zero development how can the SDNP impose 50 houses when their objective is to “enhance and conserve” the National Park?</li> <li>TT felt the Steering Group must now respond to the SDNP SHLAA, show the contrast and acknowledge the difference of opinion. It was agreed to consider seeking clarification of our legal position. PG to contact the SALC &amp; CPRE (via David Johnson, Sussex Branch Chair) and PK to contact Liz Beth of Planning Aid. No reply had yet been received from the SDNP Director of Planning to the Parish Council’s letter regarding the requirement of 50 houses, assumed only possible if the Rogers Farm garden centre site is utilised.</li> <li>A meeting with SDNPA to be arranged urgently to discuss all SHLAA and housing allocation issues.</li> </ul>	PG/PK  PK
<b>15.18</b>	<b><u>Any Other Business</u></b>	
	JH reported that SDNP had added weight to not widening lanes that can be classified as pre-1840 ‘Historic Rural Roads (eg Cross Lane, Nepcote Lane, Stable Lane etc?). Proposal to add this category to the NP to be discussed at next meeting.	
<b>15.19</b>	<b><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></b>	
	<b>Wednesday 13 May, 7.00pm at The Gun</b>	

Meeting closed at 9.10pm