

Minutes

Present:

Councillors: Andy Collins, Marie Gilby, Jane Towers, Philip MacDougall,

Residents: Sandra James, Stephen Johnson, Richard Foot, Keith Dimon, Martin McBride, Andrew Sargent.

Observing: Cliff Archer.

Andy Collins chaired the meeting.

1 Apologies: Tim Guymer (CDC), Cllr Jacky Sheppard, Sandra Davey,

Other Circulation: Cllrs Rachel Perri, Ina Littlefield, Geoffrey Hyde, The Clerk to the Parish Council

Other Group members: Julie Austin, Trevor Redman, Pete Baldwin, Sue Webb, Andrew Kerry-Bedell, Mark Colston, Sally Cobden, Sue and Mike Kirby, Susan Rising

2 Declaration of interests: None

(An interest will be declared by any individual who might expect to make an exceptional financial gain as a result of the NP outcome. Eg A landowner or developer with land that might be put forward for development.)

3 Minutes of the last meeting:

Corrections:

Attendee surnames: 'Sheppard', 'Dimon',

Section 2: SEA = Strategic Environmental Assessment

4 Matters arising:

4.1 Circulation of Minutes. Sandra James said she had completed the minutes on the day after the meeting, but they had not been circulated until much later. Please could the minutes be circulated straightaway?

Conclusion: Andy Collins agreed.

4.2 Call for development sites: Three new sites had been brought forward - off Drift Lane (north of the railway line), Prospect Farm (N of Main Rd, W of Cut Mill), and Pear Tree House (Off Broad Rd)

Martin McBride asked why it was necessary to call for new sites. On the face of it the HELAA study was all the evidence we needed for the list of sites we would consider. It was not clear why we should open this question again when it had already been answered by the CDC HELAA study. Could we have an explanation in writing from Tim Guymer? Andy Collins said we had put out the call because the advice from CDC was that unless we did, our NP could be challenged. Stephen Johnson said that he understood the HELAA study was now quite old. CDC were worried that unless steps were taken to update it, the NP could be challenged, and CDC resources were a problem. He had been promised an explanation in writing from CDC.

Conclusion: The Call for sites has gone out. A CDC explanation in writing has been promised.

4.3 Response to the Local Plan Consultation was discussed. The meeting agreed that the requirement for the NP to approve sites for 500 homes was unjustified. These homes did not meet a local need. It was a drastic change from the previous Local Plan and NP, where the indicative housing number had been put at 25. 500+ homes would transform the parish, it would be very difficult to retain its semi rural nature, the landscapes, views, varied housing designs and green spaces. It would almost inevitably mean large amounts of productive farming land would be lost and converted to large blocks of all too similar houses, a form of development that was alien to the parish. However we were in a bind on two counts.

a The Government sets the rules with its NPPF legislation.

b The objectively assessed housing need had been revised upwards. CDC has no option in this. CDC is forced to revise the Local Plan to meet this need. If it is not revised, development will take place anyway, but without the controls that can be built into the Local Plan. Similarly if the NP, which becomes part of the Local Plan, is not revised to conform to the Local Plan, developers will be able to ignore any constraints that may be included in the NP. If we don't choose the sites for development, the developers will.

Conclusion: The Parish Council will make a submission as part of the Local Plan Consultation, and members were urged to make their own submissions.

5 Timetable of action and meetings.

5.1 The draft Timetable had been circulated with the Agenda.

Andy Collins had proposed a meeting with prospective developers on Feb 4th

The merits of meeting with developers to learn about their plans was discussed. Stephen Johnson suggested the more we learned about possible development plans the better. Some sites would be linked to particular developers, some would not yet have development plans. We should meet developers, ask questions, but venture no opinions, and recognise that proposed plans, particularly amenities, might not materialise. He suggested that without having some idea of development plans it would not be possible to know how many houses would be built on any individual site, even though the HELAA study identified housing numbers for each site.

This suggestion was rejected by Sandra James, Jane Towers, Martin McBride, Philip MacDougall who argued that we should not meet with developers, that this was contrary to the advice from our consultant Richard Eastham, that rather we should make an assessment of the various sites based on objective criteria and prepare a list of preferred sites which would form the basis of a consultation of residents proposed for Feb 16th.

Conclusion: We will not meet with developers on Feb 4th.

The Feb 4 and Feb 11 meetings will be used to select our preferred sites

We will hold a consultation event in the Village Hall on Feb 16th

6 The Development of the Parish:

6.1 Primary School/Medical centre/Convenience store and other infrastructure

Martin McBride said that rather than listening to developers' ideas, we should form a view about how the parish should look in fifteen years time, starting with where we should locate a new school, medical centre, convenience store and other infrastructure. This triggered a debate about the prospects for a new school, where it should be located, and whether it would happen.

The CDC preferred local plan says 'land will be allocated for ... a new two form primary school' and 'Opportunities will be sought to relocate Chidham Primary school'.

It was said that 500 homes would have 60/80 primary school aged children.

It was said that WSCC would not build a new school. It would have to be an Academy or Free School.

There was debate as to how much land would be required. Whether it should be located in Hambrook (HCH0004/0003), or immediately west of the parish (HCH0014/16)

It was agreed that relocation of Chidham School would be popular with residents of Chidham Lane, parents of the children, and residents on the peninsula.

Conclusion: There was no conclusion. Opinions were split on what sort of certainty could be attached to a new school being provided and the existing school closed down

6.2 Medical Centre

Philip MacDougall said that the Clinical Commissioning Group say that an additional GP will be required for the additional 500 houses planned. There was no additional capacity available in the current medical centre at Southbourne. A new Medical centre was being considered, but no location had been chosen. Possible locations within the parish appear to be in Hambrook (HCH0004/0003), or immediately west of the parish (HCH0014/16), or using the buildings on the Chidham School site in Chidham Lane, once they have been vacated.

Conclusion: There was no conclusion. Opinions were split on what sort of certainty could be attached to a new medical centre being provided or where it would be located.

6.3 Convenience Store / Community Land Trusts (CLT): There was a discussion as to whether CLTs could play a part in our NP. CLTs can be set up to develop and manage genuinely affordable homes as well as other assets for the benefit of local people. A CLT is a non-profit community-based organisation run by volunteers for community benefit, but must also be a viable business that is properly managed and governed. Andy Collins said that this could be an attractive option but finding the money for start up, and volunteers to run the business was a significant barrier. Stephen Johnson said that a CLT could be a vehicle for solving concerns that any promised Convenience store might not materialise. If a developer was prepared to build the store and gift the building and site to the community, or the funds raised in some other way, a CLT could be set up to act as landlord. The board of the CLT would then be able to determine the tenant for the building without being dependent on a third party. The meeting was not convinced by this suggestion.

Conclusion: There was no conclusion. CLTs need further study and consideration.

6.4 Consultancy

To assist us in the principle task of the NPRG, selecting the sites which, once developed, will provide 500+ homes for the parish and district, we will need both the advice and help of a Planning Consultant. We would also need to engage a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Consultant. There was a discussion about how that should be achieved.

Planning Consultant There was agreement we should get advice from Richard Eastham, our chosen planning consultant. The Parish Council had agreed preliminary funding for this financial year of 2 days of the consultant's time, and several 'man' days of his team members.

Conclusion: It was agreed that Andy Collins would do his best to get Richard to our next meeting (Jan 31) and for our forthcoming site selection meetings, and secondly to clarify the situation as regards funding for Consultancy support in the period of the new financial year.

SEA Consultant It was not clear at what point it would be necessary to engage a SEA consultant, and what point we would be in a position to prepare a brief, but this was thought to be a matter of some urgency.

Conclusion: It was agreed that Andy Collins would ask our Planning Consultant about these questions and do his best to clarify the situation as regards funding for an SEA Consultancy.

7 Site selection

Site selection The principle task of the NPRG is to select the sites which, once developed, will provide 500+ homes for the parish and district, and also to indicate which sites should not be developed. There was a discussion about how that should be achieved.

It was suggested that we should select the sites for development regardless of developer plans or further expectations of amenities or infrastructure delivery.

Rather that the sites should be selected on objective criteria such as access to local roads and transport facilities, capacity for development, drainage, proximity to local amenities, wildlife corridors, local context, impact on the landscape, etc., with a view to forming a long term overall plan. We would need the advice of the planning consultant, and perhaps the SEA consultant during the process.

Conclusion: This was broadly agreed and would be the principle task for the next 2 or 3 meetings so that our proposals could be put to a community event on Saturday Feb 16th

Site capacity There was discussion about site capacity and the reliability of the CDC indicative numbers in relation to the various sites. CDC assumes 30 houses per hectare to estimate the site yield but uses promoter estimates, where provided.

Conclusion: The likely site yield numbers need to be clarified.

Settlement boundaries Where settlement boundaries are drawn has a significant impact on future development activity. One of the tasks of the NPRG is to redraw our settlement boundaries. Whether settlement boundaries should follow site boundaries was not discussed.

Conclusion: This will be discussed with our planning consultant at a future meeting.

8 Community Drop in Event.

A 'Drop in' event was proposed for Feb 16th at the Village Hall. Jane Towers wondered if this might be structured as a meeting so that all residents got the same key messages, but others felt a drop in meeting would be more convenient for some and would generate more feedback.

Conclusion: A drop in event will be held in the Village Hall on Feb 16th, provisionally from 2pm – 6pm.

9 Minutes taker

Jane Towers proposed the group should have an independent expert minute taker for our meetings.

Conclusion: This was agreed. Andy Collins/Philip MacDougall would try to find someone suitable to do this and request the Parish Council to fund it.

10 CHEMroute

At a meeting this week it had been proposed that parishes on the route should include identical wording support for the project in their NPs. The wording would be drafted by Jonathan Brown (Southbourne)

10 Next meeting

The next meeting is Jan 31st. Village Hall, 7pm

Review Policy AL10 Chidham & Hambrook from the Local Plan, and site selection.