

Notes on a Meeting of Tatsfield Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group held on Tuesday 21st January 2020, commencing at 20:00 at the Parish Room, Aileen McHugo Building, Westmore Green, Tatsfield

Present: Martin Allen (MA), Jim Yeeles (JY), Bob David (RD), Nichola Stokoe (NS), James Garside (JG), Ruth Yeeles (RY), Jill Hancock (JH), Ian Hayman (IH), Jason Syrett (JS), Ashley Clifton (AC), James Barker (JB), Ian Mitchell (IM), Mark Watts (MW), Paul Jackson (PJ)

No parishioners

The meeting commenced at 20:01

	Action
1. Apologies had been received from Sandy Philibert (SP), Jon Allbutt (JA) and Kim Jennings (KJ).	
2. PJ declared his interest in being a near neighbour of one of the Sites but was allowed to remain in the Group.	
3. The Minutes of the Meeting held on 26th November 2019 were presented. By resolution, the Minutes were accepted and adopted as a true record. The Minutes would be passed to the Parish Council (PC) for acceptance at its next meeting. In the meantime, IM would upload these Minutes to the website as a draft copy and RY to Drop Box	PC Clerk / IM RY
4. Dropbox – RY had nothing to report.	
5. Communication Strategy – MA reported in JA's absence. A half page entry was in this month's edition of the parish magazine explaining the current position and stating that papers will be on the website. Any completed ones to IM please. MA said that NS would be taking over input to Tatsfield Talk as quite a few questions were being asked which needed replying to.	Topic Leads/IM NS
6. Admin – The Group accepted the resignation of Gillian Phillips (GP). RY was asked to remove her access to Dropbox. There was now a vacancy which could be filled.	RY
7. Website – IM reported the viewing figures for 2019: 900 to the TNP website compared to 6,000 on the Parish Council website, 23,000 on the Village website and 2,500 on the History Project website. IM reported that from 31 st March 2020 the present hosting of all the websites would finish. A group was involved currently in finding alternative hosts. MA would ensure that papers for the NP website are sent to IM before that date.	MA
8. Finance – MA reported that the grant for £5,910 had been received. A new spreadsheet had been prepared and was in Dropbox. This budget had to be spent by the end of March. MA said that there was money for photocopying, etc – invoices to be presented in the usual way. MA had spent £109.54 on photocopying so far.	All
9. Update of Topic Groups: a. Topic Group 1 – Housing/Planning MA reported that the Housing Group had met on 7 th January. They had looked at the sites up to TNP20. Notes on this meeting had been circulated to the Steering Group and were in Dropbox. NS and KJ had since assessed the TAT sites. Most of the RED sites suggested by AECOM had been agreed but no discussion had taken place regarding extending the village	

settlement boundary. A couple had been changed from RED to AMBER for further investigation.

Nearly all the TAT sites had been assessed as RED.

Two sites had been agreed as GREEN as they were within the settlement boundary.

MW queried a couple of the decisions and these were answered by MA and NS.

It was agreed that most of the sites assessed for further investigation would need to be considered as either rural exception sites or under the moving of the defined village boundary. This would be discussed at the next meeting of the Housing Group on 29th January.

It was suggested that a plan of the village settlement boundary with the AMBER sites identified should be available for the meeting.

JS suggested that visits would need to be made to these sites to assess access and proximity to the settlement boundary, amongst other things.

MA suggested that these sites should be submitted to TDC for their comments.

The Group went through each of the sites for comment as per the results sheets prepared by the Housing Group in January. The only alterations to the list were as follows:

TNP01 – RED – but for further investigation

TNP05 - RED – but for further investigation

TNP06 – AMBER to RED – Basic Error not adjacent to village settlement boundary

JG advised that this site (and some others) had been found 'amber' in the AECOM Report on the basis that it was partly brownfield land and so could potentially (in part) be a suitable site (ie an acceptable form of development in the green belt) even if not adjacent to the settlement boundary. It was agreed that the justification for any decision on this site should clarify this and set out clear justification. JG to advise on wording for this if requested to do so.

TNP08 – AMBER for further investigation

TNP09 – AMBER – SP map doesn't agree with previous HELAA – for further investigation

TNP12 – GREEN – in village settlement boundary

TNP15 – GREEN but part of site AMBER – for further investigation

TNP17 – AMBER – for further investigation

TNP18 – RED – for further investigation

TNP19 – RED – for further investigation

TNP20 – AMBER – for further investigation

TNP21 – AMBER – for further investigation as TDC did not comment

TAT003 – AMBER to RED – Basic Error not adjacent to village settlement boundary

TAT007 – AMBER to RED

TAT015 – AMBER – for further investigation

TAT016 - GREEN – for further investigation

MA

<p>TAT019 – AMBER – to Red - Basic Error not adjacent to village settlement boundary</p> <p>There was also a general discussion about whether AECOM site assessment conclusions should be changed and it was agreed that this should only be done where there is clear and convincing justification for doing so.</p> <p>The members of the Steering Group present all agreed that all sites classified as RED would be dismissed as not part of the Neighbourhood Plan and letters would be sent to them notifying them of this decision.</p> <p>The Housing Group Topic Paper had been sent to all. JG had one clarification on two sentences which appeared to conflict:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identifies a net annual affordable housing of 7 dwellings/annum for Tatsfield - The TDC Local Plan does not set an affordable housing target for Tatsfield <p>JG responded as follows: "It is technically accurate as the Local Plan doesn't set a requirement for either market or affordable housing. The TDC Affordable Housing Needs Assessment identifies a NEED (not target) of 7 dwellings per annum. This could cause confusion and so recommend that "TDC Local Plan does not set an affordable housing target" is removed and the sentence starts with "Policy CSP5....."</p> <p>b. Topic Group 2 – Community Facilities JG had rewritten the Topic Paper for this Group.</p> <p>c. Topic Group 3 - Local Economy JG had sent suggestions to SS on the Topic Paper which had been agreed. This was now ready to go on the website.</p> <p>d. Topic Group 4 – Environment – Built and Natural PJ reported that the Topic Papers still needed to be finished. There were quite a few questions at the end of the paper which needed community consultation and the next meeting with the Parish in the Spring.</p> <p>e. Topic Group 5 - Transport and Infrastructure No changes to the Topic Paper.</p>	
<p>10. Strategic Environmental Assessment Plan JG would approach TDC about the need or necessity in view of the Housing Group proposals and discuss at the next Meeting.</p>	<p>JG</p>
<p>11. What do we do next from here? Topic Reports to be continued to be finalised. Group meetings to continue where applicable. Documents to be sent to IM to put on the website.</p>	<p>Topic Leads</p>
<p>12. Draft Neighbourhood Plan MA thanked JS for producing a draft Neighbourhood Plan. JS said that JG had reviewed the draft and had made comments. He said that the draft was mainly comprised of the Topic Papers with a front and back end. However, there was a great deal of duplication and also variances in composition. JG said that it was not essential that policies are quoted in the plan as they form part of the evidence base (topic</p>	

reports) but essential parts of the policies could be in the Plan also. JG suggested amendments were as per his email to the group of the 19 th January. JS asked for Topic Group Leads to look through their sections of the draft Plan.	Topic Leads
13. Next Meeting would be held on Tuesday 18th February at 8pm in Parish Room.	PC Clerk
14. Future Agenda Items Public meetings – when, where and what to include?	JA
The meeting closed at 9.55pm	

MA/JH/01/20

..... Chair Date