

Minutes of Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting 01st July 2014 to review draft Submission Plan

Attendees: Robert Hayes, Bill Ferguson, Sandra James, Bruce Finch, Mike Downer, Roy Seabrook, Graham Hicks, Peter Hicks, Jack Moss, Oona Hickson, Lawrence Tirebuck, Sue Talbot, Geoff Talbot.

Apologies: Alice Smith, Sarah Richardson, Chris Bulbeck, John Southgate, Rowena Tyler (AiRS), Neil Homer (rCOH).

1. Minutes of meetings of 03rd June and 16th June. Approved subject to minor corrections.

ACTION: Sue & Geoff to liaise with Alice.

2. Consideration of draft Submission Neighbourhood Plan. Following the SG meeting of 16th June to consider responses to the Regulation 14 consultation Neil Homer has amended the Pre Submission NP to produce a draft Submission Plan. Copies have been circulated by Alice. In response to a request from Neil both Sarah and Roy, respectively, have provided supporting reports on the Green Ring and drainage at Nutbourne West which have been sent direct to him.

3. Chair invited Sue to comment on the draft Submission Plan. She said that it had been suggested that Alice should send all collated comments from SG members on the draft Submission Plan to Neil on 27th June. Alice had received comments from two members but it was considered best to have further discussions at this meeting to finalise amendments. Sue said that she had been through the Plan and her comments divided into two categories: typographical corrections and consideration of issues, and felt the meeting would wish to concentrate on the second category. She felt that the Plan was fundamentally unchanged. The only notable changes related to the requirements for infrastructure contributions. These had been drafted following debate at the previous meeting but it was important to ensure that the Group was aware of what contributions are now required and why. Sue indicated that she had spoken to Neil that morning to confirm her understanding as to the approach adopted in redrafting the Submission Plan.

4. Infrastructure. There was a lengthy debate about infrastructure provision. The main points made being that there are two ways of providing for infrastructure in the plan 1) the requirement for funding under S106 Agreements until April 2015 when CIL would be implemented, and 2) the safeguarding of land for facilities and providing them as part of planning permissions. It was noted that the Plan housing sites might all be dealt with before CIL is implemented, and therefore it was likely that some of the infrastructure requirements set out in the Pre Sub Plan could be realised under S106 Agreements, which are much more restrictive than CIL. Sue explained that this is why reference to contributions for the pedestrian footbridge had now been omitted from all the housing sites.

5. Funding for transport projects. It was reluctantly accepted that site specific contributions for the footbridge had to be omitted from the Sub Plan, but it was noted that it had never been assumed that funding from the housing sites alone would be sufficient to pay for the footbridge or the new road crossing of the railway. It had been recognised that other much more significant sources would be needed and that these projects were long-term and likely to be beyond the Plan period. Sandra James re-iterated her concerns expressed at the previous meeting, that the Plan would raise expectations that could not be realised. The meeting noted this but felt that sufficient explanation had been given to local residents and it was clear that most understood the long-term nature of these proposals from the comments received on the Pre Sub Plan. However, it was decided that these concerns should be expressed to rCOH but that the consultants should be given clearance to do what is legally and technically correct in drafting the Submission Plan.

6. Nutbourne West. However, the implementation of the Nutbourne drainage works was considered to be so fundamental to the Nutbourne West housing proposals that it was agreed that some way had to be found to retain contributions. It was suggested that the policy could refer to funding from a number of sources as it is hoped that Operation Watershed, among other initiatives, will be activated by the Parish Council to make improvements here.

ACTION : Advise Neil to retain request for financial contribution in line with CDC comments. Parish Council be formally requested to initiate Operation Watershed proposals to alleviate flooding problems in Nutbourne. Lawrence to request application forms from Sandra.

7. **Safeguarding of land** It was noted that the Plan requires the safeguarding of land in both the short term (the Plan period), such as implementation of the Green Ring within the proposed housing sites, and for longer term aspirations (possibly beyond the Plan period) such as the potential implementation of the remainder of the Green Ring north of the railway line and the provision of access across the railway line both east and west of Southbourne. This remains in the Plan and is very important.

8. **Land north of Alfrey Close** It was noted that the requirement for a second access onto the A259 from this site seemed to have been weakened in the draft Submission Plan. It was considered that this second access was important to neighbouring residents and every effort should be made to secure it. **ACTION: Advise Neil to retain approach in Pre-Submission Plan.**

9. **Proposed Footpath from Loveders site to the station** It was noted that WSCC Highways support the provision of this link and that as it seemed to be required to make development of this site acceptable, it would be legitimate to require a S106 contribution to help implement it. **ACTION: Advise Neil to retain request for S106 contribution for provision of footpath link.**

Other matters

10. **Heritage** Bill indicated that the revised Plan did not address the comments raised by English Heritage; his discussion with Urban Edge (SEA consultants) suggests that some additional wording in the relevant section of the Plan document describing the review of information adopted by the Focus Group should resolve this matter. **ACTION: Oona and Sue to liaise to provide appropriate wording to Neil.**

11. **St John's Centre** The plan does not include reference to St John's Centre at St John's Church as a community facility. **ACTION: seek Neil's advice on inclusion.**

12. **Plan Cover** It was agreed that the photo should be changed from that on the Pre Submission Plan to avoid confusion. Similarly the Sites Assessments document should have a different photo to that of the Submission Plan. **ACTION: Robert, Bill (and Ruth Heelan) to provide Neil with a selection of photos from which to choose.**

ACTION: All these points on the Submission Plan to be collated as quickly as possible by Sue, amended as appropriate and finally agreed by those SG members with delegated powers (Robert Hayes, Chris Bulbeck, Mark Everson, and Jonathan Brown), and forwarded to AiRS and rCOH tomorrow (02nd July)

13. **Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)** Bill has been liaising with Nick Pincombe of Urban Edge over a number of matters: Budget – sufficient budget remains to complete the document for submission but none to provide consultant support during the Examination phase should this be required. Bill has contacted Sue Payne (CDC), as the commissioning body, seeking further funding (c£1,200). Agricultural land classification – comments had been made by Natural England about agriculture land quality. Following discussion it was felt that references in documents could be made clearer. The Sussex Wildlife Trust had mentioned that biodiversity assets should be mapped and that the references to mitigation in the Sites Assessment Report needed some further work. **ACTION: Bill to continue discussions with CDC; Bill/Sue to provide appropriate links within SEA and Sites Assessments reports.**

14. **Consultation Report** Rowena (AiRS) has advised Lawrence that 2 hard and 1 electronic copy of the submitted documents are required for the Examiner. Bill reminded the meeting that the submission comprises 4 documents: Submitted Plan (Neil); Basic Conditions Statement (Neil); SEA (Urban Edge/Bill) and the Consultation Statement which Bill is compiling. He is confident that it will be available by 11 July and hopefully by 08 July. Bill is liaising with Rowena but has just been advised that the Statement needs to include reference to responses from statutory consultees and developers. Bill requested that Lawrence provide him with the record of these. It was agreed that no individual

formal responses would be made to the comments from developers but that reference could be made in the Consultation Statement to the Sites Assessments report where the answers to most of the points raised had already been addressed. **ACTION: Lawrence to forward consultation responses to Bill; Bill/Sue to liaise over references between Consultation Statement/Sites Assessments report.**