

AGENDA

GOUDHURST PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN GROUP

Steering Committee (SC) Meeting # 25

Monday August 6th, 7.30 pm, Jessel Room

Present: Colin Willis (CW), Craig Broom (CB), Paul Griffin (PG), Linda Griffin (LG), Richard Hillier (RH), Barbara Stafford (BS), Jim Boot (JB), Peter Woods (PW), Anthony Harris (AH), Guy Sutton (GS), Linda Hall (LH), Stephen Wickham (SW)

1. Apologies & Obligations wrt Confidentiality

Apologies: Michael Thornton (MT), Ed Bates (EB), John Leavens (JL), Shiona Gardiner (SG), Adrian Smith (AS), Anthony Harris (AH)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

CW reminded the group that from time to time they may (as members of Steering) be in the possession of confidential information which is not in the public domain and which may also have elements that are commercially sensitive. Such information is, in those circumstances, strictly confidential for eyes-only unless it is already been formally released into the public domain. It may or may not be marked as confidential but if anyone has any doubts of the status of an individual document then the status should be checked with the chair of Steering, Secretary or the Parish Clerk before discussing or sharing any information.

2. Sites Assessment

CW led the discussion on sites allocation identifying the three documents contained in the papers provided namely: Pros/Cons of allocation, the Position paper and example sites policies for a no-allocation, sites discussion, and full allocation scenarios.

CB commented that the discussion on sites had at times been heated and that given the small number of sites under consideration and their yield the overall benefit of including sites in our lan had not been established. The inclusion of sites would be unlikely to deliver more houses and their omission would be unlikely to deliver fewer houses. Given the level of division in the group, and with GPC, then the argument for inclusion needed to be stronger to overcome the potential negative impact.

BS noted that there was a raised a level of risk in publishing our sites assessments and there could be unknown knock-on consequences of such an action.

BS, questioned our authority to allocate sites in our plan as we are not a regulated body. LH agreed and stated that no other NDP group in the Parish had chosen to allocate sites despite the pressures. RH noted that in the guidance allocation of sites

was possible in an NDP and CB noted that Ticehurst have included sites within their plan as Rother, unlike TWBC had an approved plan and Ticehurst had to find their own sites. Other Parishes benefit from developing their plans in parallel with TWBC.

JB commented that we can include sites in our plan and all reasonable alternatives. Our criteria were consistently applied and the strong framework makes it robust. Our criteria delivered the same outcome as TWBC's assessment with no real differences. These assessments are key parts of our evidence base. TWBC have shared a level of detail and JB commented that they should share more of the SHEELAH.

JB noted we could publish the sites assessment, it was our assessment and would not breach any confidentiality understandings with the borough. We can also consider that as our view aligns with the borough there is less pressure to allocate and we could easily rely on borough. CB noted that the sites assessment were factual objective documents and drew no conclusions – those were limited to the traffic light document which should be considered an internal discussion document and should not be for publication.

RH remarked that people in the Parish were expecting a statement on sites particularly following our consultation in May. LH noted that Cranbrook had also consulted on their plan with a series of exhibitions (7) but were not planning to allocate sites in their plan although they were considering farmstead development.

JB noted that by choosing to allocate sites it would limit the likely success of speculative applications as the borough would not refuse applications if our plan had identified sites. LH noted that the Gladman development in Sissinghurst had not led to the predicted tsunami of speculative developments and further development on sites in Hawkhurst are not being built out as sales are not reaching expectations.

RH observed that changes to the NPPF planning rules for 2018 have moved the emphasis from larger to small and medium sites. CW commented that the position paper set a positive and proactive approach and including sites in the plan demonstrated leadership and gave clear direction. We would have site specific policies for each site we allocate. PG noted the 'Man in the street' was expecting some level of development and recognise the need for development on smaller sites and the level of development we are proposing would be in line with most people's expectation.

JB noted that the publication of sites in a draft was not the final decision as each one would need to be assessed against our sustainability analysis/SEA and the SA could rule out both the sites we are considering.

CB If we are to deliver affordable housing as part of our plan then we should consider setting up an NDP project to seek willing landowners/sites to deliver a Rural Exception site (RES). This would not encroach on the TWBC activity as RES sites are not part of the TWBC activity and they do not count these houses in their targets. The group agreed this should be included in our plan as a project (CB to update)

BS agreed it was the only way to provide housing as we have struggled to find such sites in the past the challenge being that landowners receive more than the agricultural value of the land but not the level when the land was designated for development. It was suggested the sites team might take on this task and Hastoe could prove useful in the process but RH commented that although we could talk to them or any other housing association any formal involvement would need to be commissioned by GPC.

CW commented that with allocation we would be able to include sites specific policies defining our objectives for these sites. These would be over and above the policies already included in the plan which dictate basic requirements of the site that allow us to meet the wishes of the community.

CW noted the need for a site specific policy covering Bedgebury Manor given its size and potential to deliver a community almost the same size as Curtisden Green or Kilndown. This was agreed as was that other sites considered previously developed land should **not** be included.

The level of detail required for site allocation was discussed. CW held the view that we would need to publish our allocated sites along with the list of site criteria and the methodology used. The need to publish assessments of all sites were also considered to be needed.

RH referred to the Locality advice on presentation of sites, preferred options and preferred consultation process. JB: In any consultation residents might raise objections on public release of the draft plan or at the formal regulation 14 assessment. We might also receive objections for those sites dismissed by our assessment process.

An overall show of hands demonstrated that 6 were against allocation and 4 were in favour. CW will write a paper for the meeting with GPC.

3. Draft Plan

The draft plan was distributed with the agenda. Written comments on the document, and specifically the policies, should be provided before the meeting on the 21st August. The meeting will review the comments against the draft.

4. Finalise the List of Local Green Spaces

PW: The list of Green Spaces has been agreed with GPC and the Borough and the sites listed at the previous meeting will be included in the Goudhurst NDP as well as the TWBC local plan. RH asked about the rights of landowners and PW stated that TWBC would be contacting landowners who could raise any issues with the NDP team or with the inspector when the plan was reviewed under regulation 14.

There is one outstanding space – The Old Cricket pitch. It was felt this should be included in the list of green spaces. PW noted the interest of local players and the owner in re-instating the cricket square.

5. Feedback/Progress Reports:-

5.1. Minutes of Meeting with TWBC 12/7/18

The minutes of the meeting have been drafted but as yet not agreed with TWBC

5.2. AECOM Technical Support (Design Codes)

The work to create a design code has been initiated with AECOM and we are awaiting a decision on funding.

5.3. Forthcoming Meetings/Workshops:

The meeting with GPC on Tuesday Aug 21 – Kilndown Village Hall (6.30) was confirmed

6. Date of Next Meeting:

The next meeting will be on September 3rd 2018 at 7:30 Jessel Room

7. AOB

RH commented that GH was still in hospital and may be there for some time. He was asked to convey the best wishes of the meeting.

Outstanding Actions from meeting #25

#	Date Raised	Description	Owner(s)	Target Date
154	6/8/18	CB to run an test SA against our selected sites	CB	4/9/18
155	6/8/18	CB to update plan to reflect a project on RES	CB	22/8/18
156	6/8/18	CW will write a paper for the meeting with GPC	CW	22/8/18