

Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee Meeting 20th June 2016 7.30 p.m. Montessori Room, Village Institute

Present: Claerwyn Hughes (CH), Steve Barrass (SB), Stephen Burley (SBu), David Goodale (DG), Michael Wendt (MW), Teresa Killeen (TK), Ann Cook (AC), John Poole (JP), Robin Tait (RT), Peter Sewell (PS), James Robson (JR), Anthony Lloyd (AL) and Sheena Carmichael (SC) with Frankie Nowne (Clerk)

Apologies were received from Adrian Tofts, John Pilcher, Glynis Tucker and Judith Whiteman.

Constitution of the Group: It was agreed that the current Steering Group (SG) should replace the Parish Council (PC) Neighbourhood Plan Committee and report back regularly to the PC. It was agreed that there was no need, at this stage for a formal constitution.

Communication methods: Whilst it was felt that the SG did not want to discourage comments from the public, they should be channelled through the parish clerk's email address or through the email address on the NP web site (i.e. participate@ticehurstnp.org). Responding to comments, for example in News & Views, was not felt to be good way of promoting consensus.

Communication should be encouraged. SC commented that Etchingham have a very large email address list of residents. People could be encouraged via the web site to leave an email address so that TNP can accumulate a direct means of contact with residents.

It was agreed to raise the profile of the S Group, listing names and photographs together with roles within the group.

The Comms Group agreed to revise the communications strategy.

Design Forum Report/ Future Policy Mix:

All members had received a copy of the draft 'Future Policy Mix' and SB had circulated a copy of the various comments made to date. He would revise his paper following the discussion.

Consultant Support:

Feria have delivered a draft report which all Council and S Group members have seen and commented upon. There was some discussion about detailed additions, photographs that could be included or removed. Clerk to check with Feria that the two attachments were identical papers and that another background paper had not been missed. FN

- It was agreed that some policies should cover the whole parish and others would be particular to each of the three wards.
- Interconnectivity of pedestrian routes within the villages and to any new developments was felt to be important.
- It was felt that more detail should be included on rivers and wetlands in the policy.
- Transport links – buses and trains need to be considered and it was agreed that Wadhurst was the main commuter station for Ticehurst residents. Stonegate attracts many commuters from the area to the south e.g. from Heathfield.
- AONB status should have a higher profile (use the Woodland Enterprise Centre resources).
- A list of historic buildings and sites should be accumulated by the Planning Group – resources being Woodland Enterprise Centre, High Weald, Listed buildings from RDC, Lewes archives and F Drewe’s book. It was felt that other people might be interested in getting involved in this project.
- It was agreed that each S Group specialist group should go over their particular interest and report back to the Chairman SB.

Managing Public Expectations:

MW expressed concerns about how the SG can manage peoples’ expectations as whilst the SG is asking people for their opinions, it might not be possible to include them in the emerging plan – for example, more parking areas being one of the requirements.

The Vision:

It was felt that the Vision Statement should be revisited and made more punchy and shorter. It was agreed that members should forward suggestions to DG to collate into a draft statement for circulation.

Design Code:

JR suggested that it was too early to consider this and that he would seek independent advice to start working on a draft. Feria’s statement that all experts should work together, rather than in isolation was felt to be important for any development that Ticehurst Parish approves.

Unique Selling Proposition:

The Vision statement could note specific special features which the residents of this parish are privileged to enjoy.

Use of consultants Feria Urbanism for Phase II:

It was unanimously agreed to recommend to the PC for the July 5th meeting, to continue using their services. Clerk was asked to ascertain their best price for Stage II. SBu requested a short paper to be prepared for the next PC meeting. SB

Links with other parishes:

SC agreed to liaise with Hawkhurst and Robertsbridge. SBu to link with Etchingham and Burwash.

It was resolved that the Clerk should write to all seven neighbouring parishes informing them that Ticehurst is doing a N Plan and if they have any issues arising from plans that they might be working on, we would be interested in sharing information (e.g. transport issues).

It is important that we are seen to have collaborated with our immediate neighbours.

Environment Group:

The Application for a Screening Opinion as to whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment will be completed when the Vision has been revised.

Finance Group:

TK reported that she and the clerk were ready to complete the expression of interest form to gain an application form through Locality for a grant of £9000. When the form arrives it needs to be completed within 30 days and the monies need to be spent within 6 months of a grant being awarded. Delegated authority was given to TK and the clerk to continue with the application.

Planning Group:

JP was asked for a summary of the 'six a site' policy discussed by this group.

More work needs to be done on this to ascertain whether RDC's policy can be challenged - TK has a contact – to liaise with clerk to investigate further.

JP commented on a piece of land on the southern side of the one way system at Dale Hill which he felt was suitable for self-build properties. SB noted that we are producing a strategy document and that we will have to issue a 'call for sites' as part of the process.

SB will revise the TNP project 'Plan of a Plan' and asked SG members to supply lists of tasks which they felt should be included. All

Archiving:

SB reported that it is difficult to keep records of all correspondence – especially email correspondence and looked for ideas about how best to store information. Clerk has all formal documents.

Next meeting:

Monday 5th September 2016 7.30 pm Montessori School.