

Full Parish Council – Minutes
Unconfirmed

I have been following the Neighbourhood plan process avidly for the last 2 years. Because I have a conflict of interest I have not spoken out about the plan, but now I feel it is time, before the PC make a decision regarding submitting the plan.

I have great reservations regarding the additions to Policy HK1 to the plan: the Built up area boundary policy. This policy now states that developments of up to 10 houses may be built on land adjacent to the BUAB.

I don't consider all councillors have truly thought through the consequences of this policy - It could just open a larger can of worms.

- I believe such a policy will bring other, new landowners (and developers) into the mix, who have not to this point shown interest in developing land, as it enables them to now develop land adjacent to the BUAB.
- This brings under threat parts of the village that the PC should be doing their utmost to protect – for example the conservation area along Church Lane.
- Here 5 different land owners own land against the BUAB, and all are large enough to put more than 10 houses on. If applications were successful it puts great pressure on a road with poor access and that children walk to school on. This is just one example of multiple landowners in a small area.
- As your consultant suggested, the policy does not stop a ripple effect with subsequent applications adjacent to these new 10 houses. Is this really creating a 'defendable boundary' around the village or opening up the flood gates and making the BUAB permeable on all sides of the village?
- Representations to the council asked for more affordable housing. This is NOT viable with a development of 10 houses, and any developer will be able to circumvent this requirement.
- Councillors should also consider possible personal conflicts of interest brought about by this policy.
- You are naïve if you think that the controls in Policy HK1 are going to stop the ripple effect of multiple 'small' developments. The existing permeability of the BUAB is highlighted by the house built behind the school, that was not supported by the PC, yet was built outside the BUAB. This will only get worse with policy HK1.
- Consultation of the village did not include the new additions to policy HK1 and I believe such a change should be consulted upon as it creates a wider threat to the village.

On the matter of submitting the plan as soon as possible - I believe that the PC is being unduly swayed by a minority of vocal parishioners. Just because other parishioners are not vocal doesn't mean you have to ignore their needs. As councillors, you are elected to represent the community as a whole. Please reflect on whether you truly believe the voice of a few is what the silent majority want and if the plan as it stands encompasses the needs of the next generation. The attendance at the AGM should be a red flag to the council. It seems to me you are NOT taking the parish with you on this journey – you have lost many of them along the way.

Finally, the plan as it stands includes the Ravenswood Hotel, which according to local media is now being run again as a hotel and wedding venue. I request that the PC contact the owners, prior to any submission, to verify that the site is still available, and will be available for the length of the plan, to ensure the plan is not out of date before it is even submitted.

APOLOGIES – John Luckhurst.

Chairman

Date

**Full Parish Council – Minutes
Unconfirmed**

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are invited to make any declaration of personal or prejudicial interests that they may have in relation to items on the agenda and are reminded to make any declarations at any stage during the meeting if it then becomes apparent that this may be required when a particular item or issue is to be considered.

Cllr Hersey's Declaration of Interest:

I wish to advise that with regard to any comment (s) I may make on any planning application on tonight's agenda, I reserve the right to alter my views on any application and submission should it come before Planning Committee B or the District Planning Committee, following reading the Planning Officer's report, considering any verbal update the Planning Officer may provide and taking into account the views expressed by other Members or members of the public at the meeting.

Cllr K O' Regan declared a personal interest with regard to any discussions or decisions concerning the potential coffee shop at the Memorial Pavilion.

MINUTES

- 24. To resolve that the minutes of the Council Meeting held on Tuesday 9 May 2017 be taken as read, confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman- with the following explanation note:

At the meeting on 9 May 2017, the Parish Council Agreed that with regard to the development at Westhall House, the Neighbourhood Plan should be reset to those in the Pre-submission document and that the numbers for Westhall House should be 14 and not 8.

FINANCE

- 25. RESOLVED to authorise the schedule of payments and receipts and year to date expenditure; and
- 26. RESOLVED to agree the bank reconciliation; and
- 27. RESOLVED to approve the accounts to the 31 March 2017; and
- 28. RESOLVED to approve the Governance Statement for 2016/17 and to authorise the Chairman and Clerk to sign the statement; and
- 29. RESOLVED to approve the Annual Return for 2016/17 and to authorise the Chairman to sign the return for the submission to the External Auditor.

Chairman

Date

**Full Parish Council – Minutes
Unconfirmed**

The Parish Council took this opportunity to thank Judith Bowren, the former RFO for all her hard work and dedication to the Parish Council. They wished her well for the future.

REPORTS - TO RECEIVE REPORTS FROM COUNCILLORS

Chris Hersey, local District Councillor updated the Parish Council about the District Council. It was noted that following elections in May there had been some changes – there was a new Chairman and some of the Committee memberships had changed all updates could be found on the District Council website. He reported that the Inspector was due to reconvene on 25/26 July to consider the District Plan. Once finalised the MSDC website would be also be updated.

Cllr.Mike Kirk, Parish Councillor reported that the fingerposts needed some maintenance and he needed some guidance from the TGR & H committee about what was required. It was AGREED that Cllr Kirk would liaise with the Chairman of the TGR & H Committee.

Cllr. Sarah Webster reported that the fun run would be taking place on 16 June.

Cllr. David Colville reported that he had used his Chairman’s allowance to purchase a gift for the retiring RFO.

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

The Chairman updated the Parish Council about the Neighbourhood Plan. It was noted that a letter from St Giles Primary School had been received. The letter is attached to these Minutes as an Appendix.

The Parish Council noted that the school was consulted during Regulation 14 consultations and that this was when the previous Headteacher was in post. The Parish Council noted that the Plan had been written over a year ago and of course numbers moving in and out of the village would have changed. The Parish Council discussed whether they could be more generalised with the language used in the Plan concerning the school numbers, but it was agreed that the numbers used in the Plan were from a point in time and should remain in the document.

The Chairman also read out the following:

Chairman Date

Full Parish Council – Minutes
Unconfirmed

The previous Head of St. Giles School was approached in May/June 2016 and asked to review the section of our Plan relating to Local Infrastructure, which contained a few paragraphs about the school. I will read one paragraph which she amended – the sentence in the email used "we" as Joanna had indicated that she had discussed this with the Chair of Governors:

The school currently has around 120 pupils aged between 5 and 11 spread across 5 classes. The West Sussex County Council designated capacity of the school is 140 although the Headteacher has advised that a total of 150 pupils could be accommodated in the current school building provided a suitable age distribution could be maintained.

The key words are "spread across 5 classes" and "provided a suitable age distribution could be maintained".

30. RESOLVED that no changes would be made to the Housing Justification document as had been requested.

The Parish Council had also received a formal request from several Parishioners to submit the Neighbourhood Plan. The Chairman reminded those present that the Parish Council always sought advice from MSDC and that MSDC had provided a statement about submission of the Parish Council Plan which is attached as an appendix to these Minutes.

It was noted that the Parish Council Plan had to be compliant with the District Plan. Until such time the District Plan was finalised it was difficult to formally submit the Parish Council's Plan.

After some debate, it was suggested that once a few minor changes had been made to the Plan, i.e. the numbers for Westhall, the Plan was ready for submission. It was further suggested that the Parish Council agree that their Neighbourhood Plan was ready for submission, place on the Parish Council website and inform MSDC that the Plan on the Horsted Keynes Parish Council website was the plan that would be submitted. Once the District Plan was finalised, the Parish Council would then be able to formally submit. It was noted that the District Council Inspector was not reconvening until 25/16 July so the results would not be known until then.

31. RESOLVED to (1) agree that all documents should be updated and placed on website;

Chairman

Date

**Full Parish Council – Minutes
Unconfirmed**

(2) agree to inform MSDC that the Plan on the Parish Council’s website is the plan that will be submitted.

(3) agree that the Parish Council’s Neighbourhood Plan was ready for submission, but could not be formally submitted until the results of the District Plan and other outstanding issues were known; and

(4) if necessary, the Parish Council would hold an Extraordinary meeting in August to formally submit the Plan.

TGR & H COMMITTEE

The Vice- Chairman of the TGR & H Committee updated the Parish Council about the work of the TGR & H Committee since the last meeting. Amongst other matters included in the Minutes, it was noted that the TGR & H Committee did not agree that sponsorship on the fingerposts was in keeping with the village. The TGR & H Committee had asked that the Finance and Governance Committee to undertake a review of the Tennis Club licence. It was also noted that the TGR & H Committee had agreed in principle to the construction of a Boules Pitch on the Village Green. Peter Vince, would be drafting an agreement and would be underwriting all costs and providing insurance.

- 31. RESOLVED to request the Finance and Governance Committee to undertake a review of the Tennis Club License; and
- 32. RESOLVED to note the update regarding the construction of a Boules pitch; and
- 33. RESOLVED to agree that the delegated authority for the TGR & H Committee to be increased from £300 to £500; and
- 34. RESOLVED to request the Finance & Governance Committee to consider the next steps with regard to a possible coffee shop at the Pavilion.
- 35. RESOLVED to agree the timetable for the next steps regarding the play area refurbishment/replacement.

VISION EXERCISE/PLAN

The Parish Council discussed the next steps in developing the Parish Council’s vision and business plan. It was agreed that a further article would be placed in the P & P magazine about developing the vision to encourage residents to come forward with ideas.

- 36. RESOLVED that each Cllr responsible for an area under the vision would bring a report to the next meeting of the Parish Council.

Chairman

Date

**Full Parish Council – Minutes
Unconfirmed**

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

11 July 2017 at 7:30 pm.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Peter Willis commended the Parish Council on their forward planning – there was a need to encourage the local community to become involved as many felt dejected after the Neighbourhood Plan process.

Helena Griffiths encouraged the Parish Council to use other means of communication other than the P& P magazine. Social media was a great way of reaching people in a community.

Julia Wykeham-Martin informed the Council that there had been a mistake in the consultation process with regard to the planning application for Westhall house. The Clerk would circulate the email sent in by Julia Wykeham-Martin to the Parish Council.

Colin Sainter suggested that most parishioners are happy with the work being undertaken by the Parish Council.

The Meeting ended at 09:50 pm

Chairman

Date

**Full Parish Council – Minutes
Unconfirmed**

ST GILES CHURCH of ENGLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL

Church Lane
Horsted Keynes
Haywards Heath
West Sussex
RH17 7AY

Telephone: 01825 790240

Headteacher: Mrs H. Douch B.Ed.(Hons)

E-mail: office@stgilesprimary.co.uk

Website: www.st-giles.w-sussex.sch.uk

Fundraising site: <https://www.spendandraise.com/stgilesschoolhk/>

Horsted Keynes Parish Council,
Parish Office,
Village Hall,
The Green,
Horsted Keynes

30th May 2017

Dear Sirs,

I write on behalf of the Governors and Headteacher of St. Giles CE Primary School (“the school”) in response to the Neighbourhood Plan Housing Justification Paper (“Housing paper”) dated February 2017 and which was drawn to our attention at our Full Board of Governors Meeting on 17.05.17.

Within your Housing paper there are a number of significant and material inaccuracies which misrepresent the school. It is deeply disappointing that none of your number confirmed the “facts” upon which you relied before publication. Had you spoken or written to the Headteacher or Chair of Governors you should have been aware that the need for additional children attending the village school is acute.

The matters with which we take particular issue are as follows, and are addressed using the same numbering as appears in your Housing paper.

4.3 *In respect of the primary school, the current number on roll is approximately 120 compared with a capacity of 150. Given that all schools are recommended to retain a small*

Chairman

Date

**Full Parish Council – Minutes
Unconfirmed**

buffer then this would mean potential capacity for an additional 20 pupils, or 3 per year group. Meeting the OAHN in full would be likely to result in growth in the number of additional primary school-age children living in the village exceeding the capacity of the school. This would give it little potential to adapt to changing circumstances.

- a. The current number on roll is 111 pupils. The projected figure for September 2017 is estimated to be 104 and the projection for future years thereafter is of a similar figure.
- b. The maximum number of pupils St Giles is approved by WSCC to have on roll is 22 pupils x 7 year groups = 154 children.
- c. There is no Government and /or WSCC requirement that, “*all schools retain a small buffer*”, of which the Headteacher or Governors are aware.
- d. The school has a potential capacity for an additional 40 children, spread across all year groups.
- e. There is no expectation now, or in the foreseeable future, that the school will exceed or come close to capacity.
- f. There is always potential for the school, “*to adapt to changing circumstances*”, should the population in the village and surrounding areas increase and a sustained demand for school places arise.

6.5 *The approach in the HKNP also helps ensure that the primary school is not flooded with new pupils in a very short space of time. A large development of 30 -40 dwellings would reasonably be expected to be built and occupied within 2 years. As such, the additional children that such development would create, would be looking to occupy new school places over the same 2 year period. This would represent a major change for a small rural school and may result in children being unable to access school places at the primary school if a particular year group is full.*

- a. The addition of 30-40 dwellings and the families who may occupy them would make a substantial – and **positive** – difference to St Giles School. The decreasing population of village children has had a significant impact upon numbers in the school. The school loses up to 10% of pupils each year to the private sector, especially in the older year groups. The school is funded by pupil numbers, if the numbers fall the funding received from WSCC also falls. Maintaining pupil numbers is key to the survival of the primary school.

Chairman

Date

**Full Parish Council – Minutes
Unconfirmed**

The Governors and Headteacher invite you to correct your Housing Proposal Paper forthwith. We should be grateful if a corrected copy is sent to the planning authorities, with confirmation and evidence that this has been done provided to the school within 28 days, namely 27th June 2017.

In the event we do not receive this within 28 days, the School will make its own approach to the Planning and other local authority departments to correct these misrepresentations.

If, in future, the Parish Council wishes to rely upon facts and statistics relating to St. Giles CE Primary School, or has any queries or questions about our school, we should be grateful if you will revert to either the Headteacher or Chair of Governors.

Yours sincerely,

Marion Lott

Chair of Governors

On behalf of the Full Board of Governors and Headteacher of St. Giles CE School

Chairman

Date

Full Parish Council – Minutes
Unconfirmed

Note to Horsted Keynes Parish Council regarding next steps For Neighbourhood Plan

Below is an explanation of the position of the Council and Parish in relation to plan making as at the 12th of June 2017.

Introduction

The draft Submission Neighbourhood Plan and supporting evidence, including a Sustainability Appraisal have been given to the District Council for its informal comments. The District Council officers have confirmed that the Plan is satisfactory subject to two outstanding issues:

- the implications of the District Plan Examination; and
- the impact of the ‘Wealden decision’ on the Habitats Regulation Assessment of the Neighbourhood Plan.

District Plan

The District Plan is currently at Examination. Further hearing sessions are programmed for the 25th/26th July. These hearing sessions will consider the overall housing number for the District and the potential distribution of this number amongst settlements. This outstanding issue will have implications for the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. In particular, in assessing if Neighbourhood Plans are allocating sufficient housing to meet needs. The District Plan Inspector will report his view on this approach in due course.

Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA)

A Habitat Regulation Assessment needs to be prepared for the Neighbourhood Plan and forms part of the package of submission documents that are examined by the independent examiner. The District Council has prepared the HRA and sought Natural England’s comments.

The recent High Court judgment on the Wealden District Council challenge to the Lewes Core Strategy has implications on how the assessment of the impact of development on the air quality of the Ashdown Forest is considered.

In light of this judgment, Natural England are unable to conclude whether the current HRA for the Neighbourhood Plan is correct in how the issue of air quality is considered. Until Natural England are in a position to support the HRA, this document cannot be finalised. Without an HRA to accompany the Neighbourhood Plan it cannot be submitted for Examination.

Chairman

Date

Full Parish Council – Minutes
Unconfirmed

MSDC has prepared a paper which sets out a short term solution to address this issue which has been submitted to the District Plan Examination. The issue will be discussed further at the hearings in July and the District Plan Inspector will report his view on this approach in due course. At the current time it is unclear across all our neighbouring planning authorities how this issue will be considered by the Planning Inspectorate so it is difficult for the Council to advise on this matter. This is a national issue.

Horsted Keynes Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) and Required Housing Provision

At the District Plan Inspectors request Mid Sussex District Council have submitted evidence to the District Plan examination showing how the housing needs (OAN) of individual towns and parishes (document reference MSDC 8c, submission to the District Plan) is distributed. The approach taken by the District Council has been to distribute the district’s total housing need to settlements on a proportionate basis, based on the size of settlement and its position within the settlement hierarchy set out in policy DP6: Settlement Hierarchy. Horsted Keynes is within settlement Category 3.

The first step to establishing the parish OAN is ‘policy-off’, i.e. it is a straightforward calculation that doesn’t account for constraints or other policy decisions. For Horsted Keynes, this gives a ‘need’ figure of 181 dwellings for the period 2014-2031.

However, when other ‘policy-on’ factors are accounted for, such as over-supply in other Parishes (notably Burgess Hill) and the Parish location within the AONB, the final figure for Horsted Keynes reduces to 64 dwellings for the period 2014-2031. Taking completions and commitments (that is allocations and sites that already have planning permission) into account means that there is a residual of **52** dwellings (minimum) still to find in the remaining years of the plan period – any allocations in the forthcoming Neighbourhood Plan will count against this figure.

Attention is also drawn to paragraphs 14 - 16 of MSDC 8c (page 12) which explains that the figure of 52 dwellings quoted in the table is not to be treated as an exact requirement figure, but as a guide. Further factors such as under/over delivery in settlements and other constraints (particularly the proximity to Ashdown Forest SPA/SAC in Horsted Keynes’ case) will also need to be considered.

It should also be noted that the figures quoted in MSDC 8c are still in provisional form as they have yet to be agreed by the Inspector through the District Plan examination process.

Once the figures have been agreed by the Inspector emerging Neighbourhood Plans will need to demonstrate how they have taken into account the hierarchy settlement requirements.

Conclusions

Chairman

Date

**Full Parish Council – Minutes
Unconfirmed**

Until there is a resolution of the implications of the habitats issues and the Inspector has concluded on the District Plan, the advice for those making Neighbourhood Plans is that they should not conclude their work and submit their Plan for Examination

Chairman

Date