

Notes of additional meeting of the BATTLE CIVIL PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (BCPNP) STEERING GROUP held on THURSDAY 4th April 2019 at The Almonry, High Street, Battle at 7 p.m.

In attendance: Cllr Andrew Brown (ABr), Cllr Margaret Howell (MH), Sue Best (SB), Cllr Dale Wheeler (DW), Jane de Garston (JDG, minutes), Cllr Allan Russell (ARu), Paul Whymark (PW)

Apologies: Russell Hidden

Minutes from the meeting of 19th March will be approved at the next full meeting on 17th April 2019

Discuss new sites

ARu reported the only change from original AECOM report is the number of properties at Tollgates with 4 added.

Recently submitted planning applications to Rother District Council are:

Beech Estate

The Meads

Watch Oak House

Any new properties which are built during the duration of the Neighbourhood Plan process are considered 'windfall' to the numbers required in the plan.

The scoring of the sites was based on potential and will include sites which are not desirable from a holistic approach. ARu commented that the scores were very close for several of the top scoring sites.

The group discussed the need to ensure the developments are balanced across the town. Consideration will be required for commuters crossing town from NTR and for school traffic moving from Blackfriars/east of the town.

BM reported the 'travel study to 2028' was compiled from a desk exercise but was a serious academic review which returned a neutral impact result.

MH reported at the meeting with the Housing Minister it was reported that AONB can be taken into account when looking at the number of properties required.

It was proposed and agreed the preferred sites would be Glengorse (20 properties); North Trade Road (14 properties) & Loose Farm (8 properties). With 3 properties at land South West of Cedarwood this creates the required total of 45 properties – including contingency.

For Netherfield it was agreed the poultry farm site meets the requirements as a brown field site and can accommodate the whole 23 properties required.

ARu asked PW to prepare an updated site list, including the rationale for the decision.

Bingham report

The regulations for NPs changes in September 2019.

It is believed that, on the whole, the Battle Plan just needs some amendments to meet the new criteria.

One expanse of work will be to update the references to the 2018 framework.

DM will be asked if the assessments have been completed using the 2018 framework. If not, DM will need to be paid to undertake this work.

With regard to the basic conditions the BCP examiner will not be known until the plan is submitted. MH advised the Housing Minister has directed examiners to be more sympathetic but it is not known if this is a request or definitive policy. CS agreed to email and enquire.

Discuss paying Donna extra

It was agreed to request quotes for the additional work to be undertaken by Donna. ABr enquired how many references to the old framework need to be changed? SB advised DM may have used the framework for the Robertsbridge plan so may have an easy answer to this.

DM to be reminded that all documents are available on the Cloud.

MH advised that all questions for Donna should be submitted next week so she has time to collate responses by the next meeting, which Donna is attending, on 17th April.

ARu requested DM be advised that AECOM are drawing up the design codes. The application for the funding for this has been approved and ARu is expecting to hear within the next 2 weeks when and who will be completing this work.

Offer from Jeremy Field

MH reported Jeremy had emailed to offer support for the plan. The group agreed at this point in the process this was not required.

Additional discussions

Details for the public presentation need to be considered. BM advised it would be better to keep this as a presentation event of the results and to avoid being drawn into long discussions about individual matters.

It was agreed the information should be available on line on the day of the presentation.

A questionnaire/comment form will be available in paper and online format (on the website) to include a question regarding support for the plan. If not in support, reasons why.

PW agreed to prepare a proposal for what information should be available at the presentation.

BM reported that there without the Town Council being aware of the NP details some planning applications have not met with the desired outcomes of the plan. It was discussed whether RDC should be approached by the BCPNPSG and comments noted on planning applications. ARu did not feel this was appropriate as members of the BCPNPSG who are also BTC councillors could be conflicted.