

Notes on a Meeting of Tatsfield Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group held on Wednesday 25th May 2022

Present: Martin Allen (MA), Bob David (RD), Nichola Stokoe (NS), Ian Mitchell (IM), Jason Syrett (JS), Ian Hayman (IH)

There was 1 parishioner present Jim Kenney (JK)

The meeting commenced at 20:04

	Action
Apologies had been received from Ruth Yeeles (RY), Jim Yeeles (JY) Kim Jennings (KJ). Paul Jackson (PJ) Jill Hancock (JH), Sue Smale (SS) and Ashley Clifton (AC)	
2. Declaration of Interests – No interests declared.	
<p>3. The Minutes of the Meeting held on 20th April 2022 were presented and signed by MA.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>2a. Matter arising: and still outstanding:</p> <p>Link to all documents from the Neighbourhood Plan to the Neighbourhood Plan website was still to be completed.</p> <p>Page 30 TDC Local Green Spaces</p> <p>MA to check with TDC Re the criteria re Local Green Spaces</p> <p>Notifying Owners of Local Green Spaces in light of above</p> <p>Page 42 Sects 03.3, 03.4, 03.5 – AECOM exclusion from NP – MA had spoken with Anna/TDC and MA explained the reason why Anna had made her comments and confirmed it was not a “territorial dispute” more of a safeguarding issue regarding the numbers mentioned. Housing comments to be re-read and amended in light of that conversation.</p> <p>JS had included the agreed amendments up to Page 40 and will continue with the remainder.</p> <p>Consider response from SCC Historic Environment Team – lack of mention of archaeological sites in the area.</p> <p>Rest of TDC responses to be discussed at the next meeting.</p>	<p>PC Clerk / IM RY</p> <p>MA</p> <p>MA IM/NS</p> <p>MA</p> <p>JS</p> <p>JS</p>
4. Dropbox – RY had confirmed that Dropbox was still working correctly and she had put in all the latest documents received.	
<p>5. Update and response from the Communication and public consultations of the Neighbourhood Plan Reg 14 Consultation Responses from TDC (circulated to Group)</p> <p>Page 42 It was advised that Anna/TDC thought there was too much detail in “numbers” and that the “Housing “ section should be less specific . It was therefore agreed that we would rewrite this section</p> <p>Page 43 Section 3.5 2nd and 3rd Para’s –</p> <p>TDC comment: Bearing in mind previous comments about the theoretical nature of the AECOM HNA, these paras could be deleted, as your own parish survey shows the need for affordable housing. It was agreed to delete.</p> <p>What is meant by “impose”? Do you mean TDC has no plans to allocate affordable housing in the parish in the emerging Local Plan? Yes Agreed to amend as per statement,</p>	<p>MA</p> <p>JS</p> <p>JS</p>

<p>Page 43, Section 03.6 fifth para. Reword to: Seven sites were identified for further review. Delete all specific details , Agreed</p>	JS
<p>Page 44, Section 03.7 first para: Reword to: Following a further detailed review of the shortlisted sites the Steering Group further rejected 3 sites due their setting size etc.....then delete three, Agreed</p>	JS
<p>Page 45 Option 2 Very Special circumstances. Elaborate on the heading. You could say “Identify Very Special Circumstances which would support development not normally permitted in the Green Belt” or similar. Agreed</p>	JS
<p>Page 45 Option 5 Add “that neighbourhood plans are not obliged to allocate housing sites. Agreed.</p>	JS
<p>Page 46 TNP03A and TNP03B 03A Clarify “the highest possible standards of construction. May be use “a high standard of construction.”</p>	JS
<p>03B compliment better “20 homes” and “small scale” may be use the words “appropriate in scale” . Agreed.</p>	JS
<p>Point to note: The figure of 20 homes as set out in the new Local Plan policy TLP13 Rural Exception Sites was queried by the Local Plan Inspector and as yet we do not have his final views on this number.</p>	
<p>Page 46 Supportive policies ; Add CSP15 – Agreed</p>	JS
<p>Page 51 Section 04.3 first para – Align the disparity between the last para on page 50 above the final para on page 49. Agreed</p>	JS
<p>Page 52 final para; look at whether appropriate placing. Agreed</p>	JS
<p>Page 53 TNP04A , TNP04B Consider how these policies fit with TNP03A and TNP03B in order to remove any overlap e.g. re. Sustainability. TNP04A appears to apply to all buildings, and is headed Layout and Scale, but also refers to materials. TNP04B applies only to residential buildings and also mentions materials (see above). Would this more appropriately be headed “Design of new residential buildings and extensions”? Review</p>	JS
<p>Page 54 TNP04C - Is a redevelopment of an existing residential building already covered by TNP04B? Review</p>	JS
<p>Page 54 TNP04D - What is clause iv seeking to achieve? That new agricultural buildings should be built in a way that is capable of conversion or change of use? If so, the second element of the policy, i.e. should not give rise to excessive disturbance etc., would be better set out as a separate policy identifying considerations to be applied to an application for change of use. May be split to the statements out Review</p>	JS
<p>Page 56 TNP04H – has only one clause so delete the (a) Agreed</p>	JS
<p>Page 58 Sections 05.3 and 05.4 These introductory sections are different in style/approach from preceding chapters and helpful in evidencing the approach of the chapter with local concerns derived from consultation. Consider replicating in brief in other chapters?</p>	JS

<p>It was suggested it was wrongly located and would help to be as in other chapters. This was purely because it could not be fitted , review</p> <p>Page 71 TNP07A The intention of the policy is clear and it is suggested that TDC and the Steering Group meet to discuss how best to achieve their policy aims</p> <p>Page 71 TNP07B It would be preferable to mention in this policy “ in accordance with national and local policy for Green belt and other policies”... Agreed</p> <p>At this point the meeting reached Section 08 Climate Change and Sustainability and the Chairman introduced Jim Kenney who had agreed to “ look at “ this section within the Neighbourhood Plan. Send Word copy of NP and Anna’s comments to Jim to review for the next meeting.</p> <p>Also response from SCC Historic Environment Team – lack of mention of archaeological sites in the area. Review</p>	<p>JS</p> <p>Group/AC</p> <p>JS</p> <p>JK</p> <p>MA</p> <p>JS</p>
<p>6. Website – IM reported that so far this year there've been 787 visitors to the site, compared with 528 for the whole of last year. The year-on-year comparison for January to May is 787 for 2022. The first five months of 2021 produced only 248 visitors. the 2020 figure was 318. So there's been a threefold increase between 2022 and 2021.</p>	
<p>7. What do we do next from here? MA to respond to Mike Pendleton email. Essentially:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) review and consider all the Reg 14 feedback - public, statutory and TDC – we are doing this b) decide what to amend – we are doing this c) write consultation statement (RY & JY has started this) d) write basic conditions statement – we will attempt this after this after the Final Draft of the N.P. has been completed. e) amend and update the plan – we are doing this f) formally submit to TDC for the Regulation 16 consultation – we are working our way toward this. 	<p>MA</p> <p>ALL</p>
<p>8. Next Meeting: Wednesday 29th June 2022 at 8pm in the A.M.B.</p>	
<p>The meeting closed at 10.01pm</p>	

MA/JH/05/22

..... Chair Date