
HORSTED KEYNES NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN



STEERING GROUP MEETING

Date: Thursday 5th March 2015
Time: 8.00pm
Venue: Martindale Centre, Station Road, Horsted Keynes

Members of Steering Group present: Peter Whatling (PW) Terry Higham (TH) David Colville (DC) Angela Newman (AN) Marjorie Fritz (MF)

Members of the public are welcome and encouraged to attend.

42 members of the public present

8.00pm to 8.30pm – Open discussion

Neighbourhood Plan process - An opportunity to make comments and ask questions.

Comments made and Questions asked:

- Do we have to have a Neighbourhood Plan? Is it statutory?
No
- What have we done re: infrastructure?
We have consulted with Highways and conditions will be written in to policies.
- Has zero housing development increase been put to the village?
No. We need development and we must comply with MSDC policies.
- Process is flawed if we start by asking landowners.
*The process did **not** start by asking landowners.*
- What are the numbers / facts?
- It is our opportunity to maintain the character of the village.
- The facilities are declining in HK
- How many houses are in HK?
650
- When Village Plan was written in 2008 it identified need for development. 2nd home ownership must be stopped.
NP objective is to produce smaller houses. If more than 10 houses are built on a site 30% must be affordable housing.
- Has the NP encouraged landowners to put forward land.
The NP process requires a "call for land" from landowners.
- Why are some of the sites acceptable now but rejected previously
The NP process allows sites to be considered which were previously deemed unsuitable by MSDC.
- How do we take this forward? There is a need for justification of numbers with MSDC.
Justification for the MSDC numbers will be sought.
- Can NP control how many houses are built each year?
No. The site specific policy can only state maximum number for site.
- What is the definition of "local people"?

There is a formal definition which will be included in the FAQs.

- We should have another survey now people are more aware of process.
- What are the criteria for deciding the size of houses?
There are MSDC guidelines but the village decides.
- There is a need for smaller houses for older people to downsize.
- What role has the LPA taken in decisions the HKNPSG has made?
The LPA is there for advice if needed but it is the villagers who determine the NP
- But the Localism Act says the LPA must be involved at key stages?
The LPA is involved and provides assistance and advice as requested – see detailed correspondence with Mark Bristow.
- Where does it say the requirement of a 15% increase in housing?
Nowhere. We will be allocated an “OAN housing target” in MSDC’s District Plan which is expected to be in place before the NP. However, the NP will not necessarily meet the OAN figure.
- There is a letter from Mark Bristow (MSDC) saying that no particular development is required in HK (the letter was presented but there wasn’t any such clear statement in it)
- Why aren’t villagers asked if they want a change in the village boundary?
They are – it is one of the policies presented for comment at the 24.01 event.
- There seems to be the suggestion that we can’t rely on the MSDC planners to protect HK.
We are trying to make sure that the village doesn’t get development it doesn’t want (follow up comment - we would rather leave it to the planners - further comment that it is the developers that present the risk, not MSDC)
- Want hard facts and figures on the numbers of houses built in HK
See above.

8.30pm – Meeting commences

The first 10 minutes of the meeting will be available for members of the public to make comments or ask questions on any item on the following agenda.

Minutes

1. Apologies for absence

- a. None
- b. Due to the resignation of Kenton Lawton from the HKNPSG Peter Whatling (PW) has agreed to become Chair. Proposed by TH and agreed unanimously.

2. Declarations of interest

None

3. Minutes of previous meeting 05.02.15

It was agreed they are a true record

4. Matters arising from previous minutes not covered in agenda items

All items covered

5. Sub-group reports:

a. Finance

- TH circulated a print out of up to date expenditure. Copy held on file.
- A
new phase of funding can be applied for. TH to ask CB to prepare application
Action TH
- Update on consultant activities
CB provides general advice when needed. Has given advice on housing needs survey and commented on draft policies.

b. Framework

- Policies - review of draft policies
CB and MF have sent in comments on draft policies. PW to respond to CB's comments then recirculate to NPSG for other members to comment also.
Action PW, AN, TH, DC

c. Community engagement

- Review of feedback to date following 24th January presentation
There has been a large volume of feedback from the consultation event – post-its and letters. They have been collated but now need to be formally recorded. MF to sort and record feedback. **Action MF**
- Review approach to ensure the NP process is fully understood by the Parish in light of recent developments
TH to update and expand Q&A's on website **Action TH**
Another leaflet drop was discussed. It was agreed that CB (Navigus) should be consulted for advice on best way forward. **Action PW**
- Discuss need for general response to letters and emails rather than individual responses
It was decided that emails and letters will be acknowledged but sender to be directed to the Q&A's on website. Q&A's will be regularly updated to address points raised.

d. Housing / Development

- Review feedback from landowners for potentially sustainable sites
There has been no response from landowners re sustainability assessments
- Review feedback from Highways for potentially sustainable sites
An email from Chris Owen for WSCC (Highways) has been received in response for comments on sustainable sites:
 - Police House site – no issues
 - OI
d Rectory – pedestrian access an issue due to narrow lanes. Response from Monson Engineers (consultant for Old Rectory) states extra trips not likely to have impact on traffic. They propose a car park. More definition is needed. PW to follow up. **Action PW**
 - Sugar Lane Sites - Developments acceptable in principle. Issue of pedestrian access to be dealt with.
- Review feedback from community for potentially sustainable sites
MF to collate responses from emails and responses from tonight's meeting

Action MF

- HK017 Covenant

It was confirmed that a covenant exists which states no building but does not state no access road / green spaces . It was felt it would be worth pursuing and meeting owners to discuss covenant. PW to contact CB to ask advice on sustainability of HK017 with a covenant on it. After consulting CB' PW will arrange a meeting with Mr and Mrs Vince if appropriate.

Action PW

e. Communication

- Planning for April Annual Parish Meeting

Policies will be presented to public at the Parish Council April meeting.14/4/2015

- Update and new requirements for FB and P&P

AN to advertise presentation of draft policies in P&P

Action AN

6. Mobile phone masts – the next step

There are 3 possible sites. There is strong support from the village. Landowners should contact mast providers. SEWater have indicated they are happy to have a mobile phone mast on their land but will not market it. The Parish Council would need to pursue this action. MF to approach Beverley to have this as an agenda item on May meeting agenda.

Action MF

7. Agree any items which need to go onto Parish Council agenda

See previous agenda item.

8. Date of next meeting

02/04/2015