

## Discussion of Communications between SDNPA and CDC SOUTH DOWNS CENTRE

Note of meeting held on Tuesday, 3 October 2017

Present:

Members		Officers	
SDNPA	Margaret Paren (MP) [Co-Chair]	SDNPA	Trevor Beattie (TRB)
CDC	Susan Taylor (ST) [Co-Chair]	SDNPA	Tim Slaney (TS)
SDNPA	Alun Alesbury (AA)	SDNPA	Mike Hughes (MH)
SDNPA	Tim Burr (TB)	SDNPA	Chris Patterson (CP)
CDC	Clare Apel (CA)	SDNPA	Nat Belderson (NB)
CDC	Andrew Shaxson (AS)	CDC	Andrew Frost (AF)
CDC	Henry Potter (HP)	CDC	Tony Whitty (TW)
CDC	Norma Graves (NG)		
CDC	Gordon McAra (GM)		
CDC	Peter Wilding (PW)		
CDC	Caroline Neville (CN)		
CDC	Janet Duncton (JN)		
CDC	Bob Hayes (BH)		

### Introductions

Meeting opened by MP – asked the group to note that ST was co-chairing the meeting

Those present at the meeting introduced themselves

MP suggested that item (g) on the agenda be brought forward and discussed first *[Item related to issues that Councillors wished to raise regarding relationship with SDNPA]*

### g) Issues raised by CDC officers with regard to CDC/SDNPA relationship

Concern expressed by CDC Members that Parish Councils (PCs) were often better informed and had access to more up to date information than District Councillors

- MP responded by setting out that a concerted effort had been made to engage and improve communication with PCs. It was acknowledged that it was also needed to similarly improve communications with CDC Members of the host authorities (HAs)
- CDC Members suggested that the relevant District Councillor should be copied into any communication with a Parish Council.
- SDNPA officers commented that this seemed reasonable but that where SDNPA advise CDC as a District Council it is for CDC to distribute as appropriate.

SDNPA officers suggested that a currently produced newsletter on SDNPA current issues could be circulated to HA Members.

- CDC Members welcomed such a proposal. SDNPA explained that this newsletter has to be signed up to electronically; SDNPA officers can assist if required with this.

	<p>CDC Members asked whether this was the first time HAs had raised concern with the SDNPA about communication issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MP responded that there had not been a great deal of concern raised previously. Some HAs ask for more communication, some for less</li> </ul> <p>The potential for a six monthly meeting was suggested by SDNPA members (<i>this was not commented on further by the group</i>)</p> <p>CN asked if the SDNPA had an enforcement service separate to that operated by the HAs on their behalf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TS confirmed that the SDNPA enforcement team only handled issues in those parts of the park where the planning function had been fully recovered and not the CDC area</li> <li>• AS suggested that this resulted in a 'gap' which issues fell into.</li> <li>• MP explained that she did not consider that there was a gap as a result, the definitions between where the SDNPA took enforcement action were clear. It was commented that minerals and waste enforcement issues would be handled by the SDNPA as they were part of the service recovered from WSCC.</li> </ul>
b)	<p><b>SDNP Local Plan (LP) Updates</b></p> <p>TS advised that the SDNPA LP was now out for consultation – SDNPA hosting meeting for PC's and HA members on 4 October</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AF set out that CDC Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel will consider the Council's proposed response to the consultation document in due course – CDC Members able to comment and feed in to this process.</li> </ul> <p>HP asked if issues in relation to light-spill from temporary events such as glamping at Chilgrove been addressed within the draft LP?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TS responded that as many such events were undertaken in accordance with Permitted Development Rights there was limited influence the LP could have on the impact from these events.</li> </ul> <p>CDC Members raised the concern expressed by some PCs regarding the provision of affordable housing, the tenure and what affordable is defined as.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TS responded that the draft LP is seeking 50% affordable housing on sites of 10+ dwellings and a sliding scale on smaller sites. Whilst shared equity would be considered there would be an emphasis on social rented.</li> </ul> <p>Some concern was raised by CDC Members that existing local (young) people did not meet criteria to be on housing register and that the affordable housing may not benefit them. Questions were raised regarding the viability of seeking 50% when the viability of providing 30% currently sought by CDC was continually challenged by developers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TS responded that the threshold of 50% had been robustly reached in consultation with expert advisers. The SDNPA's view was that this would eventually reduce residual land values to compensate for the higher requirement.</li> </ul> <p>CN queried whether the draft LP would place an emphasis on the use of local materials in proposed development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MP &amp; AA stated that this would be an important policy consideration within the</li> </ul>

	<p>draft LP</p> <p>The group had a general discussion regarding the interplay between SDNPA and CDC housing numbers</p>
c)	<p><b>. Involvement of CDC members in called-in applications</b></p> <p>CDC Members questioned on what basis were applications ‘called-in’ and how District Councillors could get access to SDNPA officers when this occurred.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NB &amp; TS set out that the decision is based upon strategic significance, taking account of local context which means it could range across developments of all scales.</li> <li>• TS made it clear that access to SDNPA officers and involvement in ‘called-in’ planning applications should be the same as for applications dealt with by CDC on behalf of the SDNPA. Officers were available to contact and District Councillors could attend the SDNPA Planning Committee to make representations.</li> <li>• GM stated that he had not had any issues communicating with the SDNPA on ‘called-in’ applications.</li> </ul>
d)	<p><b>Member/PC involvement and access to case officers</b></p> <p>No members of the group raised any issues beyond those noted in the previous agenda item</p>
e)	<p><b>Use of SDNPA CIL funds</b></p> <p>GM questioned the involvement CDC (and its Members) can have in determining what CIL receipts within the national park are spent on.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SDNPA officers commented that CIL funds can be spent across the SDNP but that as they were ‘new’ to CIL there was currently only approximately £55,000 collected so far.</li> <li>• Spending would be informed by SDNPA corporate projects and an annual consultation exercise. This is currently being undertaken (consultation started July and was being extended to 27<sup>th</sup> October). All consultees on the Local Plan database including the Chairs and/or the parish clerk of all parish councils in the Park were directly notified of this, as were all District and Borough Councils. PW and CN noted that they had not received this notification in their parishes and MH undertook to send the email to them direct. Final spending plans for CIL will be determined by the SDNPA Planning Committee</li> </ul>
f)	<p><b>Involvement of CDC Members in Whole Estate Plans (WEP)</b></p> <p>TS commented that WEPs were not planning policy documents but are more appropriately termed countryside management plans. They are not considered by the SDNPA Planning Committee but by the SDNPA Policy &amp; Resources Committee. They had proved very successful but any consultation during their conception was left to the estate in question to decide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JD commented that District Councillors could attend the P&amp;R Committee and make comments.</li> <li>• NG questioned whether or not there was consultation or notification on these</li> </ul>

	<p>plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TS stated that the SDNPA would notify PCs and relevant District Councillors when WEPs go before the P&amp;R Committee (to date no WEP has been endorsed in CDC area)</li> </ul>
h)	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>HP asked whether the SDNPA would issue a public statement as to its views on the potential for a northern bypass of the A27 around Chichester.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MP commented that the SDNPA had issued a holding objection to Highways England with regard to the proposals</li> </ul>