

---

# HORSTED KEYNES NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

---



## STEERING GROUP MEETING

Date: Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> May 2015  
Time: 8.00pm  
Venue: Martindale Centre, Station Road, Horsted Keynes

---

Members of the public are welcome and encouraged to attend.

Approx. 35 members of the public present.

NPSG members present:

Peter Whatling (PW) Chair, Terry Higham (TH,) David Colville (DC), Marjorie Fritz (MF).

Angela Newman (AN)

### 8.00pm to 8.30pm – Open discussion

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

PW asked for the following rules to be observed:

- Contributors to
  - Raise hand
  - Stand up whilst making contribution
  - Introduce themselves
  - Make one contribution at a time to allow everyone who wants to speak to do so
  - Please don't interrupt when others are speaking

### 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.*

Questions and comments made by public:

Q. The NP is concentrating on housing. How do we include options for another shop?

A. The NP can only address land use planning matters. The CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) is £210/sq.m. for all new builds. MSDC provides 25% to Parish Council. Therefore we would be provided with money and the NP could identify areas / projects to be funded.

Q. 1) Is the NPSG under a numerical directive in terms of housing numbers?  
2) Is the plan being prepared in accordance with relevant UK and EU laws/directives?  
3) What about infrastructure?

A. The plan is being prepared in compliance with all relevant UK and EU laws/directives. NP must comply with MSDC Local Plan and they are requiring villages to provide a proportion of the assessed housing needs for the district. HK's objectively assessed number (OAN) is 120 but MSDC recognise that constraints will probably result in this number not being achieved. NPSG will rely on WSCC Highways to determine whether roads are suitable.

Q. What legal standing does MSDC document have?

A. MSDC Plan is in consultation at the moment and it is expected that it will be formally adopted early next year.

- Q. Is NPSG aware that Mark Bristow says we do not need to provide 120 houses?
- A Yes. NPSG must identify the constraints which will prevent that number being achieved.
- Q. What number is NPSG putting forward?
- A No number yet. Depends on what the sites will accommodate.
- Q Are they green sites only?
- A No – amber as well. Overall judgement takes all criteria into account.
- Q Is WSCC highways assessment on website?
- A Yes
- Q Has there been further information re the Old Rectory?
- A Yes. They are proposing too many houses (80). Waiting for revised proposals.
- Q Can we learn from West Hoathly and Ardingly NP re lower numbers?
- A Possibly.
- Q There are 14 proposed units to be developed at Westall. Can we adopt them in our quota of number of dwellings?
- A NPSG have no knowledge of this but will make enquiries. If a planning application has been submitted they could probably be included. If not we don't know and will seek advice.
- Q Should we try to keep numbers down to meet HK needs rather than try to meet 120?
- A We must follow the formal process
- Q Our ageing population need Westall.
- Q HK needs smaller homes - no larger ones.
- A. This is allowed for within the NP policies
- Q Is WSCC Highways report based on a site visit or from plans?
- A Not certain but probably from plans.
- Q What appraisals do Highways do before they accept a plan?
- A NPSG will find out.

### **Minutes:**

1. Apologies for absence  
None
2. Declarations of interest  
None
3. Minutes of previous meeting 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2015  
Agreed they were a true record
4. Matters arising from previous minutes not covered in agenda items
  - MF – meeting with MB – arranged and happened . Minutes attached
  - TH – New grant application money not paid in yet.
  - AN/DC – article for P&P – done
  - PW- Issue of Sustainability Assessment and policies to MSDC – outstanding

- PW- Population increase proposed to be submitted to PC. Not done as the meeting with MB needed to precede this.
- MF – updating summary of consultations. On website and ongoing.
- DC – Consultation with businesses. To be done. DC to consult with Westall re development.
- DC/AN FAQ document. Quotes received but not progressed.
- PW.- Proposal for additional survey. Not progressed see 5cv below.

5. Sub-group reports:

a. Finance / Admin

- Budget report appended

b. Communication

i. Publicity and marketing.

Article for next P&P . TH to draft notice for P&P re housing needs and constraints **TH**

ii. Framework

Comments on Policies Some comments have been received. Responses pending.

Old Rectory site will be reconsidered if / when amended proposals received.

Allocations to other sites may be amended accordingly. **PW**

iii. Non-land use issues – still to be done

iv. Comments on / endorsement of current plan draft from new PCC &

v. Inclusion of new PC members on SG and way forward.

NPSG will be a sub-committee of new PC. New PC will be allocated

committees / working parties. Hopefully 4 PC will join SG so that PC

members are in the majority. They should read draft plan and supporting

material before new SG meets to plan way forward. DC to arrange meeting.

**DC**

vi. PW to email CB to obtain available dates for a meeting

**PW**

6. Discussion of FAQ and leaflet drop.

Information on FAQ sheet needs updating.

**TH**

Not appropriate to do a leaflet drop now. When draft plan is circulated people need to have a summary sheet to go with the document and indicate important points.

7. No items for PC agenda until new committee is formed.

8. Date of next meeting

4<sup>th</sup> June 2015

## HORSTED KEYNES NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

### BUDGET REPORT FOR HKNPSG MEETING ON 14 MAY 2015

(Note: All costs are reported net of VAT which is recoverable by HK PC)

BUDGET RESOURCES	month	total	available for navigus	other	invoiced to date
HK Parish Council Special Reserve		5,000.00			
Cost of Posters		-93.00			
Balance available to HKNPSG		4,907.00	1,200.00	3,707.00	
CDF Grant awarded		6,900.00	6,900.00		
		<b>11,807.00</b>	<b>8,100.00</b>	<b>3,707.00</b>	
<b>Adjustments to Resources</b>					
Refund of unspent grant		-726.00	-726.00		
Loss of Grant retained		-690.00	-690.00		
					-
Transfer of HK PC Special Reserve			1,416.00	1,416.00	
<b>Total available to HKNPSG</b>		<b>10,391.00</b>	<b>8,100.00</b>	<b>2,291.00</b>	
Estimate of additional Navigus costs			975.00	-975.00	
<b>Revised Total available to HKNPSG</b>		<b>10,391.00</b>	<b>9,075.00</b>	<b>1,316.00</b>	

(Note: New Grant of £3,885 applied for March 2015)

### EXPENDITURE TO DATE

Martindale hire	June 2014	15.00		15.00	15.00
Martindale hire	July	15.00		15.00	15.00
Navigus fee		250.00	250.00		250.00
Martindale hire	August	15.00		15.00	15.00
Navigus fee		300.00	300.00		300.00
Martindale hire	September	20.00		20.00	20.00
Navigus fee		25.00	25.00		25.00
Martindale hire	October	20.00		20.00	20.00
Navigus fee		900.00	900.00		900.00
Navigus expenses		81.00	81.00		81.00
Martindale hire	November	20.00		20.00	20.00
Navigus fee		900.00	900.00		900.00
Navigus expenses		45.00	45.00		45.00
Land Call Ad in Middy		150.36		150.36	150.36
Martindale hire	December	21.00		21.00	21.00
Navigus fee (part)		2,200.00	2,200.00		2,200.00
Navigus fee (balance)		750.00	750.00		750.00
Navigus expenses		33.75	33.75		33.75
Martindale hire	January 2015	20.00		20.00	
Open Day expenses (M Fritz)		44.74		44.74	44.74
Prismatic Print Solutions (A Newman)		111.40		111.40	111.40
Prismatic Print Solutions (A Newman)		43.80		43.80	43.80
Solo Press (flyers A Newman)		85.00		85.00	
Martindale hire	February	20.00		20.00	
Navigus fee		200.00	200.00		
Martindale hire	March	20.00		20.00	
Navigus fee		400.00	400.00		
Martindale hire	April	20.00		20.00	
Navigus fee		200.00	200.00		

<b>Total to date</b>	<b>6,926.05</b>	<b>6,284.75</b>	<b>641.30</b>	<b>5,961.05</b>
<b>BALANCE OF BUDGET AVAILABLE</b>	<b>3,464.95</b>	<b>2,790.25</b>	<b>674.70</b>	
<b>CDF GRANT SUMMARY</b>				
CDF Grant received (90%)		6,210.00		
		-		
Less total spent (rounded)		5,484.00		
<b>REFUND TO CDF</b>		<b>726.00</b>		
<b>CDF Grant withheld (10%)</b>		<b>690.00</b>		
<b>Total loss of Grant funding</b>		<b>1,416.00</b>		
<b>GROUNDWORK UK GRANT SUMMARY</b>				
Grant awarded	3,885.00	3,335.00	550.00	

## MEETING NOTES

**Date:** 21.04.2015, 14.00

**Location:** MSDC Office, Haywards Heath

**Present:** Mark Bristow                      MSDC  
Andrew Marsh                              MSDC  
Terry Higham                                HKNPSG  
Peter Whatling                               HKNPSG

### Matters Discussed

MSDC representatives advised the following:

1. The basis of the HEDNA document was explained including the distribution of dwellings amongst the villages. It was agreed that Burgess Hill had been allocated a much greater share of dwellings than their OAN, but by itself this did not reduce the OANs for other areas as the OAN is reflective of 'need' rather than a policy decision. However, the OAN for villages like HK is not intended to be a housing target and there were reasons why a smaller number could be accepted from the villages.
2. It was not anticipated that the OAN figure of 120 would be achieved and doubted that there were sufficient sustainable sites in HK which could take that number. However a proposal significantly less than the OAN would be looked at very closely and it was implied that such a proposal would be unlikely to be accepted by the examiner.
3. It was recommended that a document bringing out all the issues leading to the need for growth be prepared but without going into the complexity of the HEDNA figures. The population growth projection presented by Terry at the meeting was considered to be the correct level of detail, but it was stressed that HEDNA was the basis MSDC rely on and that alternative calculations prepared by villages could call into question the reliability of the HEDNA.
4. There were a number of reasons why a number below the OAN could be acceptable. If a community was in a protected area such as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, then this could be grounds for a lower level of development to protect the area. Ensuring sufficient houses to satisfy the current affordable needs register was also a legitimate factor in determination of the total number required. (See addendum below)
5. For development on the western boundary of the village we would need to specify a strong physical barrier, e.g. housing built in such a way as to present an unbreachable boundary and prevent further development beyond.
6. For any development fronting Sugar Lane it was recommended that the highest quality homes be provided close to the road to ensure best outlook for existing dwellings on the other side of the road. "Lower quality" homes could be placed behind which would not be visible from the lane.
7. The highway authorities could require any developer to make improvements to existing highways and footways to ensure adequate widths, sight lines etc.
8. With regard to Site HKNP013 (containing farm buildings) it was recommended that a courtyard arrangement of housing could be acceptable to eliminate the possibility of future development spreading into adjacent fields and to provide an appropriate high quality outlook from the existing farmhouse. Low level dwellings, 2 storey and bungalows could be placed to the west of this to minimise the impact on the views to the west. Such an arrangement has been discussed by MB with Celia Vince. In the absence of a Neighbourhood Plan such a development would probably be approved by MSDC.

9. With regard to the Old Rectory site, in the absence of a Neighbourhood Plan the development currently proposed would probably be approved by MSDC.
10. It is unlikely that development on all the sites offered would be regarded as sustainable, as shown in the Council's Settlement Sustainability Review.
11. In writing policies for site development particular attention should be paid to development close to or within the Conservation Area.
12. A proposal for zero development because we are a rural village within the AONB would not be acceptable to MSDC.
13. It was recommended that we looked at the Woldingham plan submission to see how they have dealt with the requirements for appropriate dwelling layout and screening within an area such as HK.

Addendum to above minute re minute 4:

In reply to a request for a reminder of what was said by Andrew Marsh on the subject, Mark Bristow sent the following reply:

The points that were raised would have been along the lines of noting:

- Conservation area / heritage assets (listed buildings, etc)
- Other constraints – including environmental and infrastructure (such as the narrow lanes, lack of footpaths), backed up by evidence
- Availability of sites – i.e. are there enough developable/suitable sites shown within the SHLAA to meet the full OAN without any problems such as access?
- Sustainability Appraisal – i.e. are there enough sustainable sites to meet the full OAN? If there are, would it be sustainable to develop them all in order to meet OAN (i.e. are there any in-combination effects – all development at once creating an overload on the school for example)?
- Sustainability Hierarchy of Settlements – Horsted Keynes is a Category 3 settlement, would meeting the full OAN reflect this, or be appropriate? Would a lower number be more suitable and not harm the character of the village?
- Demographics – i.e. the discussion we had about an ageing population, and developing some housing would assist in encouraging a younger population. Which has an effect on...
- Community aims/aspirations such as maintaining primary school/increasing roll of pupils from HK rather than from outside, etc.

We are confident you hold evidence on most (if not all) of the above, or have considered it in one way or another.

Andrew's suggestion was to prepare a justification paper (nothing too long or onerous) that took each point above in turn, and then drawing the evidence together to suggest that meeting the full OAN would not be appropriate/possible, should that be the case. The aim of the paper would be to justify why a lower number would be appropriate, at the same time that delivering lower numbers (or nothing) would not be beneficial. The idea is to justify your number in a non-scientific, but pragmatic way which could be easily understood by the community in order to gain support for your approach – or at least see the reasons behind the approach. The findings of this could then be writing into the Neighbourhood Plan for context.

We didn't mention any potential target other than providing an example halfway point of 60 between providing nothing or meeting the full need, as that's your decision to make, we did of course mention that we are not expecting you to meet the 120 OAN figure – although we'd be delighted if you did!