

Alfold Neighbourhood Plan

Notes of the meeting held on 9.4.18

Present: Alasdair Denton-Miller; Betty Ames; Penni Mayne; Nik Pidgeon; Chris Britton;
Cilla Britton; Mary Brown; Wayne Mouring

Apologies: Adrian Erricker; Hayley Ringrose; Beverley Weddell.

In Attendance: Ian Motuel (WBC); Maggie Williams (Colin Smith Planning);
Francesca Stern (Bramley PC)

Election of Officers

The following officer election was confirmed (with minor change to role description):

Secretary Chris Britton

Minutes

Notes of the meeting held on 5.3.18 had been circulated and were approved by those present.

Updates

Alasdair showed the meeting the updated APC web site, Neighbourhood Plan (NP) pages, live on screen. Maggie suggested the flooding map be added. Also links to information such as Rights of Way.

Ian pointed out that the planning relevant regulations had been updated, and the NPSG should make sure they use a consolidated version available online. Maggie noted that there was a review of NPPF currently underway.

It was noted that the 2012 Housing Survey was still valid.

Ian Motuel (WBC) – information and Q & A

Implications of Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) – adopted 28/2/18

- Increased housing allocation for Alfold = 125 (compared to 84 currently with permission)
- Noted there are 3 legal challenges to LPP1, but WBC's position is that these have no effect in practice until resolved in the court. Ian read out a statement by Borough Solicitor Daniel Bainbridge, explaining the 2-stage process.

- There is now no ‘tilted balance’ in force, each planning application to be judged on harm vs benefit in context of LPP1 policies
- LPP1 provides more certainty and will help the NP process. Key tests for the NP will be consistency with LPP1, and with national policies.
- Ian offered to review any draft NP policies that we send him.
- Local Plan Part 2 (preferred options) will go to consultation in late May (delayed due to election purdah) and will be considered by the Exec on 10.4.18
- Ian confirmed that eventually weight would be given to preferred sites that are in the NP, but timing is important (less weight during NP early stages)
- ‘Windfall sites’ will be dealt with on merits at the time. Ian pointed out that 188 ‘village windfalls’ was the global figure in LPP1 but because it was not allocated to parishes, there may be an issue with deciding whether an Alfold site being proposed later is classed as a windfall or not?
- Nik asked if ‘reserve sites’ would be advisable to have in the NP to ensure future need could be met , and Ian agreed
- Impact of Dunsfold Park (DP) permission being granted;
 - There will be further Reserved Matters applications going on as a parallel process, and subject to the normal consultation
 - Given that the NP has no jurisdiction over DP, even though it is in the Parish, Alasdair asked about the possibility of a ‘buffer zone’ around DP to prevent urban sprawl and the risk of making a continuous built-up zone joining DP, Alfold and Cranleigh. Ian did not rule it out but asked for a more detailed proposal. There was general support at the meeting for such a policy.
 - Cilla pointed out that just such a buffer zone (following the same principle as the Farnham Strategic Gap) had been suggested to WBC during the LPP1 consultation, but had not been accepted at the time.
 - Cilla asked what the future plans the Borough had for Parish boundaries, i.e. would DP remain within Alfold? Ian said this has not been mentioned or considered to date. Nik agreed that this would be an important consideration in the future, especially when new residents started moving into DP and the question arose of their democratic representation.
- Settlement Boundary; there was a minor change circulated (in map form) to take account of the Sweeters Copse development. Otherwise the 2002 boundary still stood.
- It was noted that an updated Land Availability Assessment (LAA) would be published for 2017/18, in about 3 mths time. Ian reminded the meeting that the LAA was simply a list, and not an allocation. The meeting was made aware of two sites in the Parish being added to the LAA.
- **Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)**; Ian confirmed that far from being too early to consider this, he would advise the Parish to progress a request for screening opinion as soon as possible. The Elstead example was agreed to be a good model to work from.

Action; Alasdair/Maggie

Maggie Williams (appointed consultant) Q & A

Alasdair drew Maggie's attention to the Parish Survey which went to all households. The 25% response rate was considered to be very good. Maggie will review the document.

Action; Maggie

Update on call for sites; 12 new sites now received, making 20 in total for evaluation.

Scope of work for the consultant; Maggie will now start looking at the structure of the NP, and the criteria for how we evaluate sites for potential allocation.

Maggie suggested a good model for the NP was to have 'Aims' as well as 'Policies'. The history of the Parish and planning context would also be needed. There are many good examples that will be sent to the NPSG by the consultant.

Action; Maggie

It will be important to gather a full evidence base before determining policies. There were many sources including the Office for National Statistics (ONS).

SEA is key evidence (see above), and it is a statutory requirement to either have an SEA or have a letter of dispensation from WBC.

Grants towards costs of the NP included; £9k ste-up, additional elements (up to £8k) and additional technical support. Alasdair to liaise with Parish Clerk to make applications.

Action; Alasdair/Beverley

Ian confirmed that WBC does not have its own local guidance on NPs, so the consultant will schedule 2 x half-day sessions for the NPSG.

Action; Maggie

Mary raised concerns about traffic safety and road condition; it was noted this could be the subject of a policy.

Chris asked specifically about construction traffic (particularly from DP), noting that Waverley does not have a binding code of practice? Ian acknowledged that construction traffic would affect the wider Parish, and suggested that if a draft NP policy is drawn up, WBC would comment.

Betty raised the question of other infrastructure needed to support new developments. There is no single 'fix' for this. Ian mentioned the pending introduction of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), but members of the NPSG reacted pointing out that WBC were proposing to exempt DP from CIL. There seemed a consensus that there is no clarity/certainty that the funding required for the necessary level of infrastructure for the quantum of development in the Parish was in place.

Cilla questioned what happens in respect of any speculative applications made before adoption of the NP? Ian confirmed that LPP1 would carry strong weight.

Maggie pointed out that the NPSG would need to be constantly reviewing and updating the situation as consents were granted, and because land supply is constantly changing.

Mary raised the question of public health issues (e.g. air quality). This might also be the subject of an NP policy.

The NP Aims and potential policies, and the site assessment approach/criteria would initially be looked at by a sub-group including the Chair and the consultant. Maggie pointed out that the government's consultant AECOM could be commissioned to independently review the site assessments if the NPSG wished to employ them. Other consultants were available to carry out a 'health check' if desired.

Action; Alasdair/Maggie

Other Matters

It was agreed that a single map showing all site locations from the CFS would be helpful, but no-one on the NPSG had the combination of the data and software to achieve that. Ian to investigate whether WBC had a resource to assist.

Action; Ian

It was noted that an overall timetable for the production of the NP should be drawn up.

Action; Alasdair

Outstanding action; Baseline Environmental Statement

Action; Alasdair

Next Meeting

The next meeting would be held on May 14th, 7pm to 9pm in the Green Room.

The meeting ended at 8.00pm.