

**BRAMBER NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP MEETING**  
**Bramber & Beeding Village Hall 7.00pm**  
**Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> December 2019**

**Present:** Cllr Roger Potter, Cllr Mike Croker, Cllr Sarah Greene, Cllr Mick Tilley, Mrs Rachael Rainbow, Mrs Christine Supiot, Mrs Diane Croker and Mrs Brianne Reeve.

**In attendance:** Mrs Alison Eardley (NDP Consultant)

**Members of the public:** 6

**Notes:** Rebecca Luckin (Parish Clerk)

**NOTES**

**1. Apologies for absence**

a) Apologies were received and accepted from Mrs Paddy Robson.

**2. Declarations of interest**

None for this meeting.

**3. Notes of the previous meeting – 13th November 2019**

a) Cllr Croker **proposed** that the minutes of the meeting be accepted as a correct record of the meeting. **Seconded** by Cllr Tilley. **Agreed.** The minutes were duly signed by the Chairman.

**4. Matters arising**

- a) Circulate updated Reg 14 notes to all – actioned
- b) Complete action points by end of November – All
- c) Draft Consultation Statement – RP
- d) Liaise by email regarding revision of the draft plan – All
- e) End of grant report – actioned
- f) Contact locality regarding percentage of grant allocated to Bramber from SWAB NDP – RP

**5. Open Forum**

- a) Cllr Malcolm Eastwood (Chairman Henfield Parish Council) spoke regarding the potential impact of large- scale development in the Adur Valley catchment area. He outlined the Mayfields proposal for 7,000 houses (20,000 residents) and provided a copy of a brochure that had been sent to Henfield residents. The developer will not provide road or infrastructure improvements in the area. Henfield may become a suburb of the proposed Mayfield Market Town. 650 residents attended a public meeting in June. Landowners and the Chairman of Henfield Parish Council report that they have been harassed by the developer. Henfield has a Neighbourhood Plan that allows for development in the area, that has been considered and agreed as appropriate. The Inter Parish Group (17 parishes, 24,000 people) formed an action group to fight potential development. In addition to flooding, air quality, traffic and infrastructure could also present problems. Cllr Eastwood requested that Bramber Parish Councillors join the Inter Parish Group to oppose large scale development and new towns in the area.
- Q – How can private individuals get involved?  
A – Mayfield will be put forward as a site by HDC and will go to public consultation in the spring. We hope that members of the public will send letters of objection. LAMBS action group has a website.
- Q – How much land does the developer currently own?  
A – Currently they own 28 acres and have been refused options on further land by landowners. Compulsory purchase would come into effect if HDC include the proposal in their plan.
- Q - Don't underestimate the developer, they employ the best planning consultants, QC and have connections with the government. They have purchased further land in Albourne.

A – Henfield residents raised £30,000 in one month to commission reports, through LAMBS. A QC has been engaged to validate the reports and correspond with HDC. Henfield PC has raised £7,000 in a month.

A – Peter – Henfield has drafted a NDP and specified a number of houses however, political pressure will be put upon HDC to approve large scale development in the district.

A – Last time HDC refused the proposal due to the unsustainability of the site.

A – Mayfield send a minute taker to all local Parish Council meetings, although Henfield Parish Council recently passed four resolutions regarding the proposal.

### **Cllr Eastwood left the meeting at 7.30pm**

- b) Mr Peter Rainier (DMH Stallard), representing the Clays Field site owner. Thank you for publishing public comments which cover three general topics; 1 – the general public value the open space, due to the visual benefit and public access which they would not like to lose, 2 – Historic England’s view is that development would have a detrimental impact on views into and from the site, 3 – the landscape is sensitive to housing development. We have produced appraisals that disagree with the comments that have been made and have received leading QC opinion that states that the Bramber NDP is in danger of not complying with basic tests, especially regarding local green space. The bar of LGS designation is very high and it should be the exception rather than the rule, it has to be an integral part of the proper planning of the future of the community and should not be used to prevent organic growth in the future. My client has considered the above and met with consultants and experts and has considered the options available, including submission of a planning proposal prior to the making of the plan, and opposing the NDP. If the land cannot be used, it could be fenced off from public use and used for agricultural purposes. However, the landowner would prefer to take a positive approach and would ask Bramber Parish Council to consider a significantly reduced residential allocation in the region of 10 – 12 units, with the parish receiving 90% of the land in perpetuity. Further discussion would be required between the landowner and Steering Group the landowner is open to discussions.
- Q – A member of the public expressed concern that the landowner of Clays Field appeared to be offering land to the Parish Council.
- A – Cllr Potter - it is incidental to the prime purpose (to provide housing) of the group and will not influence our decision.
- A – Mr Peter Rainer – it should have an influence. It is an important green space and could be retained for public access and amenity forever.
- A – Member of the public - We’ve been able to use the land to date without owning the land, which is different to King’s Mead close which has never been open to the public.
- c) The owner of the Kingsmead site referred to the ‘tilted balance test’ – there is a presumption in favour of housing, if the local housing need is not met, development will proceed. Careful development of Kingsmead Close would not impact the SDNP. A recent AONB case proceeded when it was shown that there was a need for housing locally. In light of this outcome, you need to look again at Kingsmead Close. It has good access and is within walking distance of Steyning. I refer you to case number – CO/539/2019 regarding Monkhill Ltd and Secretary of State and Waverley Borough Council.
- A – Cllr Potter - We will discuss it with HDC and SDNPA.
- Q - Would it be helpful to show you some plans?
- A – AE - It would have been helpful prior to this meeting. The call for sites process started in November 2018. Our next step is to consider whether what has been said will change the plan that is up for consideration at this meeting.
- A – Decisions have been based upon evidence which has not changed. Only the proposals have changed. The Regulation 14 consultation period has closed.
- Q - I’ve been requesting to talk to the Parish Council, but have not been able. The evidence you are

referring to is flawed. I have offered 100 % affordable housing, although SDNPA have complained that there is not enough diversity. I would like to work with you. It is very easy to find a reason to say no to development. Kings Mead cannot be seen from the SDNP. If you do include it in the plan, it will still need to go through the planning process. If houses were built properly, they will not be seen from the SDNP.

A – You commented at Regulation 14, you have not been excluded from the process. We have considered long and hard and have not made a quick easy decision regarding either site.

Q – I spoke with the SDNPA who stated that they would get involved if the site is included in the NDP. What harm will it do to include it? At the moment it is a worthless site, I'm in the business of making money. Let the planning officers and/or inspector decide? I can get plans drawn up that refer to existing local design features.

Q – We would be happy to provide other options too, if a steer is provided so that we can work with you to know what the community would prefer.

### **Members of the public left the meeting at 8.00pm**

#### **6. Chairman's announcements**

a) The Chairman confirmed that Mr Nick Stubbs had advised that he was no longer able to be a member of the Steering Group.

#### **7. Agreement of the revised draft Bramber Neighbourhood Plan**

CONFIDENTIAL SESSION - the Chairman proposed, under the Public Bodies (Admissions to Meetings) Act 1960, in accordance with Standing Orders 3 (d), to exclude the press and public on the grounds that the confidential matters to be discussed under item 7 would be prejudicial in the public interest. **Agreed.**

Following Regulation 14 public consultation, Steering Group members considered the revised draft plan, in preparation for recommendation for approval by Bramber Parish Council and for submission to HDC.

Steering Group members were disappointed that developers had waited until after Reg 14 and had not provided detailed plans to back up their current proposals. Public events were held in Nov 2018 and 19, where the level of detail available at the time was discussed.. Members considered proposals made during the public forum for this meeting and agreed that the evidence accumulated had strengthened the arguments not to develop the site. Members discussed the sites:

Clays Field – The developer had done nothing to engage residents and could have provided a lot more detailed information earlier in the process particularly regarding a potentially smaller development. Public consultation had taken place with the level of detail provided by DMH Stallards (representatives of the landowner) at that time. An objective assessment had been carried out by the Housing Group which led to the conclusion that housing would not be appropriate for this site. Members agreed that they had followed the agreed assessment process in response to the original proposal for 40 units. The Steering Group could go back to Reg 14, but would need to think of the impact, mindful of HDC revision of their plan and anticipated uplift in housing numbers. However, the findings of the assessment process were not materially affected by what had been said tonight about a potential reduction in housing numbers.

Kingsmead Close – The site is not in the SDNPA Local Plan. The site did not meet the assessment criteria specified by HDC/SDNP. The Steering Group assessment states that the site is not suitable for any development. Members did not hear anything during the public forum that would challenge current decisions and existing evidence base.

Steering Group members unanimously agreed that nothing had been put forward to change the Steering Group point of view that the sites were not suitable for development.

Steering Group then went on to review the overall proposed changes to the Plan resulting from the Regulation 14 feedback. Agreement was reached and actions were assigned to finalise the few remaining Plan amendments.

**The Clerk left the meeting at 10.00pm**

The Steering Group unanimously approved the amended Neighbourhood Plan be recommended to Full Council for approval on Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> December. **Agreed.**

**8. Publicity / Community Engagement**

No report for this meeting.

**9. Plan Programme**

No report for this meeting.

**10. Neighbourhood Plan Finance update**

a) Neighbourhood Plan grant balance - 65p

b) Due to the fact that Bramber Neighbourhood Plan has an agreed Design Codes Guidance document, Locality has agreed that the group will qualify for additional grant funding up to £8,000.

c) The Clerk had submitted an expression of interest to Locality for further grant funding.

**11. Correspondence**

a) 22.11.19 – HDC confirmation that Warnham Neighbourhood Plan had won the South East Award for Excellence in Plan Making.

**12. Items for the next agenda**

None for this meeting.

**13. Date of next meeting – TBA once the timing of the Horsham Regulation 16 process is clarified.**

The Chairman closed the meeting at 10.10pm

Signed:  
Chairman

Date: