

## **Minutes: Barcombe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting; 17 April 2018; Sports Pavilion**

**In attendance:** C. Arbenz, A. MacGillivray (AMa), A. Marler (AM), M. Heather (MH), T. Parsons, B. Kimpton (BK), B. Bosence (BB), N. Gant (NG)

**1. Apologies:** M. Marwick, P. Denison-Pender, A. Ralph

**2. Declarations of Interest:** None

**3. Minutes of meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> March:** circulated and agreed that they are a fair reflection of matters dealt with.

### **4. Matters Arising:**

a. Recreational space - AM reports LDC are reluctant to change their view – because lack of development since 2003 so predications are that the status will not change / be reinstated. LDC also need to agree the degree of playspace.

Informal conversations with landowner suggest building is planned for the site – but perhaps some negotiations for possible recreation. Having seen initial plans it is outside the current boundary.

b. NG, LB (Loretta Bosence) and BB to propose further design related policies and circulate combined with BK's proposed policies to go to MH and add in density policies and then return to the group for edit.

BK presented 7 proposed policies that address issues of ecology, landscape and some design.

- Discussions suggested that green roofs should provide a visual amenity to the front of the site that helps replicate the 'Hillside' and surround for 'Willows' house that is exposed. Cost should be offset through PV panels and insulation. This is coherent with some of the feedback from consultation. Wording and references in policies are reflective of other authorities. There may be some burden on maintenance that could affect sale-ability.
- Native planting – generally follows local plan with the addition of 'all' planting being of wildlife value (not necessarily 'native').
- Retention of current 'woodland' that abuts 'Bridgelands' and this should be continued providing screen, SUDS function and wildlife amenity. It does not form part of the development sites. A tree screen that surrounds 'Willows' house may be useful. 'Available' space that is not designated building or gardens, to be given over to wildlife amenity planting. BK to amend to register this. Concerns

about 'ownership' and accountability to maintenance – perhaps have a path that connects to the 'alternate route to recreation etc'. The 'High St hedge' is seen as valuable as part of the boundary as there is unlikely to be an additional entrance / exit onto 'High St'.

- Surface water flooding policy needs further development but is a necessary concern to highlight in the policies. Pond being retained is likely to be necessary (as well as desirable) – but perhaps we need to redress the necessity for it to be made 'public' but could still be retain as public visual amenity and wildlife value.
- SUDS policy needs consideration – but is this our role to write? Is there a flooding problem aside from being very 'wet'. With the gradient being towards the pond. Mitigation against flooding will need to be provided by development in accordance to regulations. We might want to ensure soft vs hard.
- Integration of bird-boxes into buildings are not a cost burden of any real significance. Perhaps add detail target swifts and / or house martins.
- Lighting – LB working on the proposal and 'dark skies' approach sought. Can reference Plumpton. Some examples have been provided that answer some of the issues related to health and safety as well as retaining darkness where possible.

Colleagues thanked BK for hard work.

Members will relay the ongoing new policies document in turn.

c. Affordable Housing/Housing for Elderly

AMa and MH have developed aspects that have been subsumed into 'General Housing' policies. MH suggested our 40% proposal is perhaps too ambitious – but the habitable room density is to remain as an advantages means to promote more small dwellings. We may want to say more about older people's housing but the key aspects are embedded in the current texts whilst leaving flexibility for individual needs and aspirations despite being older and for developer to gauge what is sale-able. Has the 'Code for Sustainable Homes' reference (in policy 2) been superseded.

d. Design statement – as above

e. Mini roundabout

Dropped as deemed not appropriate.

f. Neighbourhood plan intro:

AMa circulated a version for reflection and consideration.

Need to check whether Vision Statement is up to date.

Map needs be added.

Should the intro explain the structure? Anna C (consultant) has offered advice that AMa suggests he has reflected in his draft. Preface should introduce the format.

g. Pollution/flooding covered above

h. NG has approached BBM Architects

i. Using current digi-map plans LB is looking into copyright use of what we have developed so far. Perhaps LDC NP officer might help advise on use of other plans.

### **5. Other matters raised by members**

a. Mandy has had to resign – so we are to formally thank her for her work to date.

b. The plan draft - is coming together – suggestion for October to be complete for the entire process, which may be ambitious. Discussion on next steps and process.

c. Discussion of how the NP recognizes the relationship to Barcombe Mills and 'Old Barcombe'. AMa suggests the proposed new NPPF includes some concern that district councils could overrule neighbourhood plans during 5 yearly reviews of their local plan and if insufficient housebuilding occurs. New voices within a community could come forward during the 5 year reviews. *[Note: BNPSG remit allows future reviews of the NP to take place.]* Our document and engagements have stated that the NP is for the whole of Barcombe. It may therefore need reinforcement that policies apply to whole of the Parish. We are minded to ensure people are engaged with the NP and its relationship to all parts of the village and to reflect on the fact that other locations are catered for sufficiently in light of the fact they would not be able to undertake separate plans.

d. New National Planning Policy Framework.

Paragraph 12 - suggests neighbourhood plans have validity.

### **6. Correspondence: Letter from resident.**

Barcombe resident has contacted the group with evidence of a sewage issue and suggests that this is not an isolated incident and is not fit for purpose. BNPSG is asked to consider this in light of future development. AM says BPC has engaged with the topic and it is considered the work of the developer to find solutions to these issues. BB has noticed worker tending to the specific sewage aspect. There are concerns about impact on the Bevern Stream and water-courses – but BNPSG is not able to resolve this issue.

**7. Date of next meeting:** A date to be found in one month.

**Meeting ends** - 21.00hrs