

NOTES OF MEETING

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| <i>Meeting of / between:</i> | LEWES NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP (LNPSG) | |
| <i>Venue:</i> | Lecture Room, Town Hall | |
| <i>Date:</i> | 5.15pm Thursday 14 th September 2017 | |
| <i>Attending:</i> | Cllr S Catlin Lewes Town Council/Clevedown Residents Cllr R O'Keeffe Lewes Town Council Amy Tyler-Jones South Downs National Park Authority (Planning Officer) Alma Howell South Downs National Park Authority (Planning Officer) Richard Eastham FERIA Urbanism (Principal) Steve Brigden Town Clerk Emma Tingley Admin Support (Lewes Town Council) <i>Community organization representatives:</i> Houndean Residents Ass'n. Ian Linton (<i>Chairman</i>) Lewes Phoenix Rising Jennifer Chibnall RAID Rita Ellis Seniors Forum Richard Partridge Friends of Lewes Robert Cheesman Diversity Lewes Tony Kalume Cycle Lewes Simon Giddey Nevill Residents Ass'n. Sarah Neels Transition Town Lewes Kirsten Firth South Downs Society Liz Thomas Egrets Way Susan Thompson | |
| <i>Apologies:</i> | Neville Harrison South Downs National Park Authority (Member) Cllr I Makepeace Lewes Town Council/Lewes Living Wage | |
| NOTES: | | |
| 1. | Minutes of the meeting held on 5 th July 2017 were accepted as an accurate record. | |
| 2. | <u>Site Assessments & site visits report</u> Liz Thomas reported that the site assessments had been completed. The E-Group had gone through the sites that had and had not been selected. There were good reasons for the sites that had not been selected. SDNPA had asked for Spring Barn to be included but this site had scored badly on the Environment Assessment so it was felt that this site should be deleted. Ian felt that a statement should be in the Plan "if planning consent expires or is considered for renewal then the LNPSG recommendation is that consent should not be renewed". The group had visited all the sites individually and also as a group, taking photographs of each site. These photos could be accessed on Dropbox – the link being provided by Ian Linton. The group had also looked at comments that members of the public had made in relation to the sites. | |
| 3. | <u>Meeting with Lewes District Council</u> Ian had circulated the Minutes of this meeting to the group. | |
| 4. | <u>Update by SDNPA of Joint Core Strategy re. recent court ruling</u> There had been a legal challenge on the Lewes Joint Core Strategy by Wealden District Council. They challenged the methodology used to assess the likely impact on Ashdown Forest. The habitat was at risk of detriment to air quality with the amount of traffic potentially passing near/through the forest. The methodology to calculate the amount of potential increases in traffic had been brought into question. The High Court had ruled that the assessment was unsound; therefore parts of the Joint Core Strategy that referred to housing numbers in the District were quashed. The SDNPA had now made a new assessment taking a new approach to all potential housing across the National Park and in neighbouring districts. The results of this would be published shortly as part of the SDNPA local plan consultation. Their assessment did recognise an increase in traffic, but not to an extent that would cause significant harm to Ashdown Forest. Their Local Plan evidence would be taken to examination and tested at enquiry. SDNPA were confident that the | |

Continues..

| | |
|----|--|
| | methodology was robust so they were carrying forward the current house-building target figure for Lewes town. |
| 5. | <p><u>Advice from SDNPA on outstanding reports</u></p> <p>The SDNPA had a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment prepared for their Local Plan which considered all flood risks. There had also been an assessment completed on all the LNP sites in the same detail. All the sites had been screened and updated regarding surface water and ground water issues and this provided policy recommendations that the LNPSG could look at, and respond to. The Environment Agency had made some comments re the LNP that the ‘sequential test’ in the National Planning Policy Framework should be applied. Sites with the least risk of flooding (flood zone 1) should be looked at first and if housing needs could not be addressed within those sites, or other factors prevailed, then flood zones 2 & 3 could be considered. The Environment Agency were modelling for climate change, which would be produced at the end of this year, so the recommendation will be that any site specific flood risk assessment should take into account that modelling formula; which could be a recommendation in the LNP Policies.</p> |
| 6. | <p><u>Progress report on Regulation 15 stage</u></p> <p>The E-Team had been working through both the responses from Survey Monkey (2,281) in batches that had been allocated to them. Ian had started a master Word document that will incorporate all the changes being made, tracking changes and recording comments for each change. Each alteration will show where that change emanated from <i>i.e.</i> if there is a comment from the Environment Agency. When this document is handed over to Richard Eastham to put into the main text all the tracked changes and comments will disappear. There will, however, still be a permanent record of what was changed and why. The E-Team were also doing the same work on the responses from statutory consultees. Most of those appeared to be a standard response for Neighbourhood Plans. Statutory consultees would have a further chance to comment during the Regulation 16 stage.</p> |
| 7. | <p><u>Review and Summary of Regulation 16 Procedure</u></p> <p>Richard Eastham detailed that in May/June 2017 LNPSG had held the Regulation 14 consultation, then comments were looked at and the Group was deciding which ones they would act upon and make changes in response. This would lead the LNPSG to a revised Plan, which is the ‘submission version’ which would be submitted by the Town Council to the SDNPA and would be accompanied by two other documents; a Submission Plan with a Consultation Statement supporting it and a Condition Statement. The Condition Statement will show how the LNP has conformed to the National Planning Policy Framework and the most relevant policies in the Joint Core Strategy and the Local Plan. The Examiner will look at the Submission Plan to see how it has changed from the pre-submission version by looking at the Consultation Statement and they will also look at the Condition Statement and check that it meets national and local planning policy. There would then follow a six week consultation period and if the Submission Plan does meet the national and local Planning Policies the Examiner’s report will recommend that it moves forward to a referendum.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal that was completed at Regulation 14 would be updated to reflect the submission version of the Plan and any other background papers that had been prepared will also go to the Examiner to help them understand how Policies in the submission version were arrived-at. When the appointment of the Examiner was imminent the Local Planning Authority would provide CV’s for three available Examiners, and jointly the Town Council and the Planning Authority will select and appoint (costs were the responsibility of the Planning Authority). The SDNPA were keen to have the submission of the revised Plan by Christmas 2017.</p> <p>Richard had recently discovered that it was technically allowable for an Examiner to be appointed in advance of the formal submission, and that this had become established practice in Cornwall. The advantage over the appointment of any other consultant who might be engaged to ‘polish’ the final version was that the particular Examiner who would ultimately rule on the plan was unlikely to find fault with a Plan which had been finalized with the benefit of their own advice.</p> |
| 8. | <p><u>Case Study</u></p> <p>Kirsten Firth then talked about the Eco-Systems approach in the LNP. Dr Colin Tingle had been very much involved in pressing for this approach to be taken in the NP. In Dr Tingle’s memory and by taking forward this work Kirsten would like to do a Case Study of the LNP for the benefit of other Parish/Towns around the Country who were preparing Neighbourhood Plans <i>i.e.</i> “How to</p> |

| | |
|-----|--|
| | <p>get Eco-systems into their NP". What Kirsten was hoping for was support from the SDNPA and Natural England and to have a small working party to look at this subject over the next couple of months. Kirsten would do an out-line Case Study and share with those interested and then the SDNPA would take it forward as they have specialists in this field. TC also said it could be shared with the National Association of Local Council's (NALC).</p> |
| 9. | <p><u>Any Other Business</u> <i>Leves Low Cost Housing – LLCH – pre-meeting with Ian Linton, TC, SDNPA and FERLA</i></p> <p>One of the discussions at this meeting had been on LLCH. Comments had come in during the consultation period from various groups and others indicating that as LLCH stands it would be difficult to show it as being in conformity with national and local planning policy. There had also been concerns expressed by the Housing Authority as to how it could be operated. The NP would need the Examiner to support LLCH if it were to 'survive' as a policy in the final Plan. Richard Eastham suggested that a desk study using the local knowledge of a suitable chartered surveyor to construct an economic model to establish the financial viability of the LLCH concept. This could be expected to show permutations of land value versus building/resale cost and indicate the viability or otherwise of the LLCH proposals. If there was a value at which such development could be seen as viable, this could then show it was deliverable and give an incentive to build genuinely-affordable housing. Richard would write a brief for a consultant to work with.</p> <p>It was resolved that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agreed to carry out a desk study using a local surveyor to construct an economic model to establish the financial viability (or otherwise) of the LLCH concept. 2. Agreed to look into the prospect of engaging the eventual Examiner of the LNP in advance of formal submission to enhance likelihood of the document passing Examination. 3. Continue work to establish deliverability of the LLCH concept with relevant local landowners, starting with LDC. |
| 10. | <p>The next meeting of the Steering Group would be scheduled for around a month's time.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>The Meeting ended at 6.45pm</i></p> |