



Clerk: **Mrs.C.M.Tobin**  
Cert.Ed.L.Pol.FILCM.,

## SOUTHWATER PARISH COUNCIL

Beeson House,  
26 Lintot Square,  
Fairbank Road,  
Southwater,  
West Sussex  
RH13 9LA



Telephone No: 01403 733202 Fax: 01403 732420  
Email: [Catherine@southwater.net](mailto:Catherine@southwater.net)  
Community Web Site: [www.southwater-pc.gov.uk](http://www.southwater-pc.gov.uk)

### CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES

**The Confidential Minutes of the NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP meeting held on Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> December 2017 in the Council Chamber, Beeson House, Southwater, West Sussex, RH13 9LA commencing at 7.30pm.**

<b>NP39/17</b>	<b>MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS</b>
	<p>The confidential minutes of the meetings held on the 21<sup>st</sup>/28<sup>th</sup> November were approved.</p> <p>John Mace indicated that in terms of the light touch Barrister's report (Minute 31/17 refers) it was agreed that the brief provided to the Barrister should be issued to the Steering Group in relation to the stress tests on the Policies. Andrew stated that the idea was that the Barrister would look at the basic conditions and whether this would be met.</p> <p>In terms of the 422-460 Housing Needs Assessment to include elderly accommodation and the group deciding to increase it to c.650 to achieve the infrastructure it was stated what those requirements were to be. John Mace asked that this be noted.</p> <p>John also stated that the second sentence in the third paragraph of 33/17 required rewording and that Billingshurst should be added as this had been mentioned in the discussions as another area within the Local Plan.</p>
<b>NP40/17</b>	<b>PROJECT UPDATE</b>
	<p>Andrew Metcalfe referred to his note Ref: 02/730 dated 30<sup>th</sup> November 2017.</p> <p>Andrew referred to the Steering Group meeting held on the 28<sup>th</sup> November at which the Group had selected Option 6 as their preferred option to include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of between 430 and 610 new homes (C3 Use Class)</li> <li>• The development of between 80 and 120 specialist residential care units (C2 Use Class)</li> <li>• Infrastructure ranked in importance as follows:-</li> </ul>

1. Highway improvements to the Hop Oast Roundabout.
2. A new road linking the Hop Oast Roundabout with Cedar Drive.
3. A site for a new through school (including primary and secondary facilities).
4. A new road linking the village of Southwater and the new development with the Christ's Hospital Railway Station.

At the meeting it was stressed that the plans were illustrative and would need more detailed consideration prior to inclusion in the Pre-Submission Plan. For an allocation to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan it must be:-

- Deliverable (suitable), available and achievable.

The National Planning Framework also confirms in Paragraph 177 that it is 'equally important to ensure that there is a reasonable prospect that planned infrastructure is deliverable'. Each of these requirements were then considered.

#### Suitable

The Group are confident that the land is suitable for development, this has been established through the assessment of potential development sites.

#### Available

Berkeley's have confirmed that the land is available for development but not for the option proposed. They are unlikely to resist the allocation for C2/C3 uses but may well choose to make the land not available for the infrastructure requested. In addition, should the land south of the Hop Oast roundabout be required for highway improvements the landowner has not advised whether their land would be available for these works.

#### Achievable

This primarily relates to viability and what a developer can reasonably be required to bring forward through their scheme. At this time we do not know whether Option 6 is achievable. The principal issue is what form of infrastructure could reasonably be required, the cost of such infrastructure, and whether the proposed allocation would be a viable development by requiring it to be provided. Failing to demonstrate the allocation is achievable could lead to heavy criticism at the Pre-Submission stage and an examiner removing key requirements before the plan is 'made'.

Andrew indicated that it was therefore considered following his meeting with the Chairman of the Parish Council, Clerk and his colleagues that further work was required before Development Option 6 can be included in the Neighbourhood Plan document. Andrew then summarised what he considered to be an appropriate level of evidence for the Group to be able to assess whether an allocation in the plan along the lines of Option 6 would be deliverable.

#### High Level Transport Assessment

Such a report would consider the state of the existing highway network, the implications of the current Berkeley scheme and the implications that additional homes would have on the key access point(s) onto the A24. The intention would

be to identify the trigger points (in terms of vehicle improvements) and thereby the quantum of development that would require certain levels of improvements. In addition, this report would seek to assign an indicative cost to junction improvements. It is likely that this report would take 5/9 weeks to prepare (dependent on the availability of highway data). A general discussion took place with those present of the view that both the Hop Oast and Pollards Hill Roundabouts should be assessed. The Clerk stated that this would be an expensive exercise and Andrew stated that he had asked two contractors for estimates for works, however these were not currently like for like, one being for only the Hop Oast whilst the other was for both Roundabouts. Geoff Cole stated that he felt that both should be evaluated due to the potential impact although it was argued that the traffic would be predominately north bound towards Crawley and Gatwick areas.

#### High Level Viability Assessment

Following a report on the viability being prepared and completed a high level viability assessment can be prepared which would consider the viability of the development, taking into account the proposed housing mix, affordable housing, CIL contributions, infrastructure etc. This is largely a number crunching exercise and it is considered that this could be prepared in around 3 weeks.

Through these two reports Andrew hoped that the Plan would be able to demonstrate that the highway improvements works set out in the Plan and required by planning policy are required to make the development acceptable (in planning/highway terms) and secondly, that the proposed allocation is viable. Once this is done, we would require Berkeley Homes to confirm that the land is available for such a development before, it is included in the Pre-Submission Plan.

To prepare the above documents the Group can either engage with Berkeley Homes in the hope that they undertake the work or the Parish Council could commission and prepare independent reports to rely on either through examination or when in discussions with Berkeley Homes.

Graham Watkins referred members to a communique received from a District Councillor, members were astonished by its content. John Mace referred to Page 28 of the Housing Needs Assessment, but generally those present felt they should not be dictated too. Andrew stated that the proposed site(s) were not identified in the Local Plan as Strategic Sites. Chris Care felt that the District Council would be unhappy at the proposals. It was hoped that the discussions to be held in the future would seek clarity on the whole situation. Chris Carey stated that developer generally looked for a 17-20% profit margin. The Chairman indicated that he had asked the Clerk to respond to the District Councillor offering a meeting. A draft response had been prepared.

**Action: The Clerk to write to the District Councillor who had written of their concern regarding the Neighbourhood Plan proposals, although no formal comment had been made; it was all speculation at this point.**

Andrew then indicated the current position with work on the evidence base

	required:
--	-----------

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Position</b>
Assets of Community Value	This document is complete.
Assessment of Potential Development Sites	The assessment work is nearly complete. Other colleagues had been undertaking this work but there was limited capacity. It is envisaged that Andrew's colleague will continue and complete the work by 8 <sup>th</sup> December 2017.
Review of Southwater's Natural and Public Spaces	The assessment work has been prepared by John Mace and Geoff Cole and uploaded onto the box.com site. This needs to be collated into a single document and a member of the landscape team at EnPlan completing this work by the end of 15 <sup>th</sup> December 2017. Once completed Andrew would complete the assessments and check for consistency, this would take no more than 1.5 days. John Mace and Geoff Cole were asked if they could review the maps when completed; both were happy to do so.
Review of the Built Up Area Boundary	This work had not yet commenced as other tasks have taken priority. It would require 3-4 days to complete.
Parish Housing Needs Assessment	This document was completed by AECOM and now published on the Parish Website.
Parish Survey Report	There was no concise report setting out the findings of the 2015 parish survey that was conducted to support the preparation of the Plan. The Clerk indicated that a Draft Document has been sent to Andrew, Geoff Cole, Graham Watkins for review.
Consultation Statement	The consultation statement is a key document that is required when the plan is submitted. It would be beneficial for a draft consultation statement to be prepared for the Regulation 14 consultation. It was confirmed that Moira Hoare, Neighbourhood Plan Officer would complete this.
Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)	Andrew stated that given that the plan must now look to allocate a minimum of 422 homes it would be strongly advantageous for the pre-submission consultation to be accompanied by the SEA. This document sets out the options considered and the logic behind the options chosen and then included within the draft plan, this is arguably more important as the preferred development

	<p>option seeks to allocate more than the minimum quantum of housing. Andrew stated that he would recommend that the Group seek legal advice (Clare Parry of Cornerstone) on whether the pre-submission consultation is accompanied by an SEA) to prepare this document would take 5 days.</p> <p>Andrew confirmed that the Scoping Report had been completed.</p>
<p>Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)</p>	<p>Due to the quantum of proposed development through the Plan this would trigger a requirement for a HRA to be prepared. This is a legal requirement at the submission stage which seeks to identify the potential effects of the neighbourhood plan on the Natura 2000 network and Ramsar sites. The assessment would:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify any aspects of the Local Plan that would cause an adverse effect on the integrity of Natura 2000 sites, otherwise known as European sites (Special Areas of Conservation (SACS)) Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and, as a matter of Government policy, Ramsar Sites 1) either in isolation or in combination with other plans and projects; and</li> <li>• To advise on appropriate policy mechanisms for delivering mitigation where such effects are identified.</li> </ul> <p>Having a draft HRA accompany the pre-submission plan would be beneficial as it removes the possibility of matters arising post submission. I recommend we seek legal advice (Clare Perry) on whether the pre-submission consultation is accompanied by an SEA. If recommended this would need to be prepared by an Ecologist with the relevant experience after the pre-submission plan document is prepared and would take around 3 / 4 weeks.</p> <p><b>Action: Andrew to seek the views of the HDC Neighbourhood Plan Officer to see whether HDC has plans to complete such a plan. Seek the advice of a Barrister. Research whether Locality could provide some technical advice.</b></p>

Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan

In terms of the draft Neighbourhood Plan this was coming together but would need considerable work to finalise the documents, scrutinise the text and policies and produce a finished document. Andrew thought this work would require a further 5 days to complete. In the meantime further meetings should be organised as follows:

		<b>Action By</b>
WSSC Department	Education	CC/AM/CT
WSSC Strategic	Highways	CT to enquire whether there were any current highways reports available to the parish in terms of the Hop Oast Roundabout in particular. AM to obtain quotations for surveys on both roundabouts Pollards Hill/Hop Oast, and enquire whether his directors would be willing to commission the necessary report in the event of the County Council having no further highways information.
Berkeley's		CC/AM/CT Meeting to be requested to enquire as to whether the site(s) would be viable in terms of the infrastructure requirements currently being discussed.

In terms of timelines these had obviously changed. Graham Watkins said, that he believed that the Government may be considering pushing back the proposed changes in the White Paper by another six months. It was confirmed that many local authorities had made representations, and again it was still not clear at this stage whether the changes would affect the parish neighbourhood plans in terms of the new multiples.