



North  
Mundham  
Neighbourhood  
Plan

## Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

Minutes of the meeting of the North Mundham Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Extra Ordinary Meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> August 2020 which due to the Coronavirus restrictions commenced online at 18.30.

**PRESENT:** Mr John Ashley (Chairman), Cllr. Peter Stephens (Vice Chairman), Cllr. Tim Russell, Cllr. Annie Maclean, Mrs Sally Rodwell and Mr Dave Waldren.

**In attendance:** Louise Chater (Parish Clerk) and District Councillor Chris Page.

### 79.2020 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

None.

### 80.2020 APOLOGIES AND REASON FOR ABSENCE

Ms Katie Stuart - absent

Ms Hannah Jenkins - absent

### 81.2020 CODE OF CONDUCT

1. Declarations of Interest of items included on the Agenda - none.
2. Dispensation Request -none.

### 82.2020 MINUTES

1. On a proposal by Cllr. Russell, it was RESOLVED to agree and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2020
2. On a proposal by Cllr. Maclean, it was RESOLVED to agree and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> July 2020.

### 83.2020 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

### 84.2020 BRIEFING DISTRICT & COUNTY COUNCILLORS ON PROGRESS & ISSUES

Although County Councillor Jamie Fitzjohn had confirmed that he would be attending this meeting following an invitation issued by the Chairman he was absent.

Due to the issues with the expiration of the Local Plan a number of developers have indicated that they are in the process of submitting their sites under the Interim Housing Policy. The potential development would amount to approximately a doubling in size of North Mundham and Runcton. Almost all the developments would be built with direct access onto the B2166. The Parish had been advised by Chichester District Council that they were expected to accommodate a minimum of 50 dwellings during the life of the plan. The additional issue is that if permitted all these developments will be built in the next three years which is a requirement of the Interim Housing Policy. The Steering Group are aware that the District Council are proposing to issue new guidance on the number of dwelling that the parish is required to provide in September.

District Cllr. Page stated that it is clearly not a practical or viable solution to put in 540 additional houses in the parish within or adjacent to the settlement boundaries due to the lack of infrastructure. However, a further area of concern is that the members had received a briefing on the new Government White Paper which has the potential to increase the current number of dwellings to be provided per year from 628 to 995.

The Chairman asked District Cllr. Page if he was able to provide any guidance on what he would consider a reasonable number of housing for North Mundham or if he was able to advise on a feel for the new numbers.

18.47 District Cllr. Oakley arrived in and offered his apologies for being late.

The Chairman repeated his question and District Cllr. Oakley responded that the overall constraints for the parish will have to be considered which include:

- Pagham foul water treatment works capacity capability
- Natural England have yet to advise if Pagham harbour is as vulnerable as Chichester Harbour to nitrates.
- Highways England modelling for the Bognor Road Roundabout
- Scale of increase of size of settlement District Cllr. Oakley advised that Westhampnett, Tangmere and Madgewick Park have all doubled in size, so the Parish Council and the Steering Group will need to consider what makes the scale of expansion unacceptable other than changing the character of the parish. For example, where are the children going to go to school and how are they going to get there - capacity at Free School/North Mundham Primary School is already very limited. It was noted there is space in schools in Chichester but this will exacerbate the existing traffic issues
- Due to the high-water table, ground water flooding is a serious consideration for any new developments. The question to ask is are the SUDS arrangements achievable; how much land raising will have to take place to enable the attenuation ponds to work correctly.

District Cllr. Oakley stated that the main problem caused by the expiry of the Local Plan is that the District Council cannot prove that it has reached its 5-year housing supply. Therefore, the applications are going to come in well ahead Neighbourhood Plan being in place and until it reaches Regulation 14 it will have very little weight.

Cllr. Russell stated that the Lowlands proposal does include a significant amount of ground raising on the site and Southern Water has already confirmed that they can accommodate this development. However, the residents of North Mundham can vouch that the North Mundham pumping station is working at or near capacity particularly during poor weather. Because each application is dealt with in isolation neither WSCC or CDC or any other statutory consultee consider are taking into consideration the whole picture. District Cllr. Oakley responded that the Local Plan is supposed to provide the guidance for the statutory providers to enable them to make their decisions on investments in their assets. The current situation is outside of what the statutory consultees had envisaged especially if the number increases to those currently being considered by the Government.

Cllr. Peter Stephens stated that his understanding of the NPPF is that the lack of infrastructure is not a reason to reject a site. District Cllr. Oakley agreed with this statement.

19.10 Dave Waldren left the meeting due to a power cut

Q. How are all the developers going to comply with the governments new aspirations to promote no car travel? In each case the developers have stated that they can't provide anything outside their site development.

A. District Cllr. Oakley advised that in his role as a County Councillor he has asked the WSCC planning officer "What is the material weight for new cycling/walking provision". He is waiting for a response to his question. The Chairman stated that the two developers that have put their sites forward via the Interim Housing Policy have included provision for cycle routes, however they have both stated that the infrastructure outside of developments is outside their control therefore these routes may never connect up the network.

Q. How can we ensure that the drainage proposals put forward are acceptable and would work?

A. District Cllr. Oakley responded that it is very easy to put in a condition to request the winter ground monitoring. Then following the results of this monitoring, the developer has to make

significant changes to the layout of the site, but they may not necessarily be able to accommodate the changes within the permitted development.

Q. Potentially there could be an additional 500 dwellings how can we control the number of sites coming forward at the same time?

A. District Cllr Oakley stated that the degree of scale of change is subjective. From the clinical planning viewpoint the question the planning officer will ask is can the issues be mitigated..

The Chairman stated that Policy 2 of Interim Hosing Policy stated "The scale of development proposed is appropriate having regard to the settlements location in the settlement hierarchy." It was noted that the Parish is a service village. District Cllr. Oakley advised that the Parish Council and Steering Group need to argue the impact of the developments and demand that the developers provide planning gain to meet the daily needs of the residents.

The Clerk asked what is the current housing supply and how near are the District Council to being able to meet the requirement? District Cllr. Oakley stated the District Council currently have 4.3 years housing supply. A further 400/450 new permissions would be required to enable the District Council to comply with the 5 year housing supply requirement.

On a proposal by the Chairman, it was agreed that the Chairman of North Mundham Parish Council and the Clerk would email the Director of Planning & Environment and the Divisional Manager of Planning Policy cc District and County Councillors. Cllr. Russell would use the briefing note as basis to highlight the issues of the number of applications potentially coming forward in a very short period of time and requesting advise on how to deal with the number of applications which will significantly exceed the number of houses that Chichester District Council had advised that the parish were required to provide.

The Chairman thanked Simon and Chris for their attendance and requested that the District Councillors keep the Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan committee updated on any further developments.

District Cllr. Chris Page left the meeting.

#### **85.2020 PROJECT PLAN REVIEW**

No further update.

#### **86.2020 WORKING GROUPS** - It was noted that the reports have been submitted to AIRS

1. Housing (TR)
2. Natural Environment (KS) - no further update.
3. Community Services (SR/HJ)

#### **87.2020 DRAFT SCOPE**

AIRS have produced the first draft of the report it was agreed that any details of change would be sent to the Chairman.

Concern was expressed that the document was very light weight and general and could have been produced from a conversation or the meetings that were held a year ago. However, it was noted that this document is only the scope to present to Chichester District Council and is not the plan. It was noted that the evidence from the working party reports will be contained in the Neighbourhood Plan as appendices.

#### **88.2020 PUBLICITY & COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

An article has been submitted for the inclusion in the next issue of Connect reporting on the submission of the working party reports and the next stage.

**89.2020 FINANCE**

Nothing further.

**90.2020 REVIEW SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS AND START TIME**

It was agreed that meetings will continue to be held on the first Wednesday of the month and will commence at 7pm.

**91.2020 ITEMS FOR REPORTING AND INCLUSION OF FUTURE AGENDAS**

None.

**92.2020 EXTERNAL MEETINGS**

A presentation was given by Sunley Estates Ltd to the Steering Group on 17<sup>th</sup> August. In general the members that attended were very impressed with their presentation and the response to issues raised. This site was proposing to provide an additional 61 dwellings, a community hub and a significant amount of public open space, in addition to the potential for the safe cycle route from Hunston to North Mundham..

There are some concerns regarding the management of the potential community hub and the green spaces. Consideration to be given to requesting allotments within the site.

District Cllr. Oakley highlighted the issue of planning gain when a developer puts forward a proposal for a community hub/village hall etc. If is not viable then they potentially will place additional housing in that space.

Agenda item - feasibility study of planning gain including the Community Hub and formation of working party.

**93.2020 EXTERNAL CORRESPONDENCE**

None.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 20.07

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ Chairman of North Mundham Neighbourhood Development Plan  
Steering Group

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_