

Mid Sussex District Council

District Plan Review

Hearings Action Points – AP-013

Duty to CoOperate

Appendix A6:

Agendas/Minutes/Notes

– Individual Authorities

November 2024



Notes of the Duty to Co-operate Meeting – Horsham District Council and Mid Sussex District Council

13th April 2021 - MS Teams (3pm-5pm)

Agenda

Attendees

Present at the meeting:

- Matthew Bates – Planning Policy Team Leader, HDC [MB]
- Tal Kleiman – Senior Planning Policy Officer, HDC [TK]
- Andrew Marsh – Business Unit Leader – Planning Policy, MSDC [AM]
- Estelle Maisonnial – Senior Planning Policy Officer, MSDC [EM]

1. Horsham District Council Local Plan Update

MB/TK provided an update on progress of the Horsham District Local Plan. Highlighted that in January, a draft version of the Regulation 19 Local Plan had been subject to an Advisory Visit ('healthcheck') by PINS. PINS advised further work with Statutory Consultees (particularly Highways England) in respect of the Duty to Cooperate.

It was explained that Local Plan was likely to go to Cabinet on 20th May and full Council on 9th June to agree to publish Regulation 19 Local Plan for representations, and that this was identified in a recently adopted LDS. It is anticipated that consultation will start towards the end of June for 6 or 7 weeks.

It was explained that the majority of development will be on strategic sites and an explanation of potential site yields on such sites were provided. It was explained that a new settlement would be allocated in the centre or south of the district, but if officers' recommendations are accepted this will not be at Mayfield.

2. Mid Sussex Local Plan/Site Allocations of Land Update

AM provided an update on the progress of DPDs at Mid Sussex. The Site Allocations DPD seeks to provide for the remaining apportionment of the District Plan's housing requirement. It proposes allocations for around 1,800 homes, as well as a Science and Technology Park and smaller employment allocations.

The Plan was submitted for Examination and MSDC has responded to first round of Inspector's questions, with the second set of questions expected imminently. Hearings expected in June and hopeful of being able to adopt in September.

The District Plan review has also commenced and have undertaken a call for sites to supplement existing list of sites. Likely to undertake Regulation 18 later this year and aiming for submission in 2023 to reflect existing adopted policy.

3. Strategic planning issues for cross-boundary consideration

- a. Dealing with unmet housing needs, including housing numbers across authorities in West Sussex; Strategic Sites; Local Strategic Statement 3; changes to the standard method calculation and London/Surrey considerations

The relationship with meeting the needs of both our own respective authorities and Crawley BC's unmet needs were discussed given that both the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Mid Sussex District Plan (2018) housing targets' are raised above local need to help address unmet needs in Crawley.

MB explained that, in principle, the Horsham District Local Plan would likely meet half of CBC's unmet need which reflects the agreement between the Northern West Sussex Authorities when preparing the previous sets of plans. AM explained that MSDC are unable to commit to meet any of CBC's need at this point in time as further work was necessary to understand if MSDC has capacity to do so. This included undertaking a SHMA; HRA work in relation to the Ashdown Forest SAC/SPA; and an assessment of potential development sites, of which there were 5 large (1,000+ home sites). MSDC's position had been explained to CBC in the MSDC's response to their Regulation 19 Local Plan. It was agreed that further work was necessary to progress an agreed NW Sussex Statement and that this was already progressing.

There was separate consensus that both authorities were in a similar position in respect of unmet needs of Crawley, coastal Sussex authorities and Surrey authorities being referenced, with current and historic requests to meet unmet needs noted. There was agreement that given the housing market geographies that both authorities would seek to prioritise meeting unmet need in NW Sussex over meeting the needs of coastal authorities.

HDC provided confirmation that it was planning to meet its own need and would not request assistance from MSDC. MSDC also did not foresee that it would request assistance from other authorities.

AM indicated that he was aware that HDC had done work on market absorption as part of the Local Plan and wondered whether this was available. MB explained that this would be published when Regulation 19 publication period commences but was happy to share, confidentially, in advance.

Action: MB to share Housing Deliverability Study

- b. Employment Needs

MB/TK confirmed that it was likely to fully address its own employment needs as well as providing additional land in strategic development sites to ensure good placemaking. MB highlighted implications may arise in respect of in-commuting patterns, from HDC providing a supply of employment land above their assessed need, however no particular concern was raised.

Similarly, MSDC confirmed that it was meeting its own needs by proposing seven employment allocations in its Site Allocations DPD. It was further explained that the Science and Tech Park was proposed to be an allocation of around 50 hectares, that could supply 2,500 jobs. This

allocation was carried from an aspiration contained in the District Plan to go beyond meeting local need and meet a wider, regional need.

c. Gypsy & Traveller Needs

HDC explained that it will seek to meet its G&T need in its Local Plan, predominantly by requiring Strategic Sites to make an allowance of between 5 and 15 pitches, depending on size.

AM explained that ORS had been appointed to undertake their GTAA, which would inform the review of its District Plan.

d. Infrastructure Needs

AM explained that MSDC had done modelling at the A2300 and A23 junction at Hickstead which shows that their Site Allocations DPD would have a severe impact. SoCG with Highways England (HiE) agreed in past month to identify mitigation options and more detailed work continues to identify the design and cost of such work, which would also be documented. MB asked that MSDC share the updated work when produced, given the same junction may be significantly affected by the Horsham LP and HDC may also need to look at mitigation of the junction.

Action: MSDC to send over further HiE work when produced.

MB also identified that HDC were also working with HiE to agree a SoCG. It was explained that although transport modelling suggests very limited impact on strategic road network for Local Plan, HiE has asked for any impacts on the SRN to be mitigated.

AM explained that further infrastructure in Mid Sussex would be needed. This could include additional Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) capacity to mitigate impacts on the Ashdown Forest. Reinforcement of the Waste Water Treatment Network may be needed should particular strategic sites come forward as part of the District Plan review.

e. Statements of Common Ground

MB confirmed the intention that SoCGs will be produced with most neighbouring authorities. MB explained that to avoid repetition within reports, there will be a Part A to all SoCGs, covering issues relevant to all authorities. Part B SoGs will cover issues specific to particular authorities.

MB advised that the signature of the SOCGs at Cabinet level was preferred.

Action: TK to draft and circulate SoCG Parts A and B.

4. Agreed Actions

Action: MB to share Housing Deliverability Study

Action: MSDC to send over further HiE work when produced.

Action: TK to draft and circulate SoCG Parts A and B.

5. AOB

No other items were discussed.

Mid Sussex District Plan District Review

Meeting with Brighton and Hove CC: 15.06.22

Attendance:

Andrew Marsh (MSDC)
Alice Henstock (MSDC)
Liz Hobden (BHCC)
Sandra Rogers (BHCC)
Steve Tremlett (BHCC)
Robert Davidson (BHCC)

Meeting Objective:

The purpose of this meeting was for MSDC to:

1. Explain the background to the preparation of the District Plan Review.
2. To ensure that Brighton and Hove CC is fully briefed on the Plan preparation process and the evidence base that has been prepared to support the Plan.
3. To provide an opportunity to question and understand the work of MSDC prior to considering more detailed responses to it.

Notes:

Background

- Work on DPR commenced in 2020/21 – evidence base update (SHMA, GTAA, EGA, Retail)
- Scope of review – 11 policies require major review, 16 policies minor review and new policies
- Scrutiny Meeting 19th January deferred discussion of the Plan and requested Officers to carry out further work.

Housing Requirement/Delivery

- SM housing requirement for MSDC has increased from 1,093 Jan 22 to 1,119 April 22
- HMA unmet need has increased by at least 1,800
- MSDC has 5 year supply; HDT 124%; 2019/20 first year of completions over 1,000

Discussion – BHCC raised question about why unmet housing need for BHCC had not been identified on the slide given that there are overlapping housing market areas and LPAs are part of the same functional economic area. **MSDC** responded that in NWS are applying a 3 step priority 1) meeting own needs 2) meeting need within NWS area 3) other areas. **BHCC** confirmed that they had raised objections to this type of approach through a SoCG with Horsham. BHCC did not agree to such a hierarchical approach. **MSDCs** view is that evidence had consistently confirmed the NWS HMA as the primary HMA whilst noting there is a small overlap in the southern part of the district with the coast, albeit separated by the South Downs National Park.

Site Selection Process

- District has significant environmental constraints e.g. 50% AONB
- Explanation of the Site Selection Methodology (previously circulated for comment)

- 3 stage process of assessment:
 - Stage 1 – SHELAA – 268 sites (31k dwellings)
 - Stage 2a – Sustainable Location – rejected sites that do not contribute to sustainable pattern of development – 97 sites rejected (examples given)
 - Stage 2b – Selection criteria – excludes sites that are NPPF Showstoppers – 46 sites rejected (examples given)
 - Stage 2c – Selection criteria - excludes site where a combination of impacts is expected – 83 sites rejected (examples given)
 - Explanation of the Significant Sites
 - Stage 3 - Further Testing – 42 sites – reasonable alternatives in the SA. Subject to in-combination transport, HRA and Air Quality. Some site not suitable in combination with other sites

Conclusion

- Residual requirement 7,062
 4 'Significant Sites': 5,580
 21 Housing sites: 1,562
 Windfall: 1,008
 Brownfield: 200
 Total: 8,620
- Spatial Strategy - Effective use of land; sustainable growth at settlements; making unsustainable settlements sustainable; protect AONB

Discussion BHCC questioned how much engagement MSDC had had with Mayfield and that the 1000 threshold chosen for determining sustainability of providing services might seem somewhat arbitrary with regard to the proportion of homes Mayfield proposing which fall within Mid Sussex (approx..900). **MSDC** explained lack of up to date information/evidence from Mayfield to demonstrate site is deliverable coupled with need to bring site forward with Horsham (site not in draft Reg19 plan). The whole site could accommodate approx 8,000 units 6,000 within Horsham and 2,000 within Mid Sussex, but only 900 within the Plan period. Aside from land ownership and sustainability considerations, there was still little detail on issues consistently raised (flood risk, transport connectivity, sustainable transport). MSDC questioned whether this was the most suitable option, when looking at all potential sites within the sub-region to assist with unmet need This work would need to be explored in more detail within the ongoing LSS3 work.

MSDC are working with Mayfield on the significant site allocation at Sayers Common.

Discussion BHCC challenged MSDC on the potential need to look beyond existing spatial strategy re. small extensions and toward whole new settlements to be able to meet housing needs. MSDC, using Sayers Common as an example, explained that this Plan represents a significant change in strategy to the previous adopted plan and is now looking at large scale extension to smaller settlements to make them sustainable communities. Given the change in approach this was going to need brave decisions from Council Members and will likely cause objections from rural communities.

Further work

- Troy Planning commissioned to review brownfield site potential – evidence to support windfall/brownfield allowance increase by approximately 200 units

- Transport – testing sustainable mitigation interventions; Reference case 34 junctions ‘significant’ 23 junctions ‘serve’ impacts. Areas of concern – Ansty, A23/A2300, National Highways

Discussion BHCC challenged MSDC on the density being sought on allocated sites and should MSDC perhaps be doing more. MSDC pointed towards the recently adopted design guide which is pushing higher density in the right locations. Need to be considered in the context that MSDC is a rural district and not the same as planning in a city. Work undertaken by Troy is looking at this in more detail.

Discussion BHCC queried if better transport solutions could be sought on large sites/ whole new settlements. **MSDC** is trying to do this with the significant sites through sustainable transport modes/mitigation but there are still significant and severe impacts on local and national highways networks. Limited options for a whole new settlement in Mid Sussex, draft Plan included 4 out of the 5 significant sites promoted to us.

Discussion around the work of the LSS3 and the need to progress this to inform Plan making. This work is the opportunity to explore the position holistically, understand environmental and infrastructure constraints and how these could be mitigated/unlocked and assess all options against each other, rather than trying to seek a solution to a sub-regional problem through individual plans.

MSDC officers hope to publish a Reg18 Plan in the Autumn, subject to Member approval.

BHCC are currently working on Article 4 Direction and will then be commencing work on evidence base gathering for the City Plan Part One review.

Next Steps

- MSDC circulate note of meeting
- MSDC to share links to evidence base
- BHCC to consider presentation given by MSDC and note the evidence base prepared to support the Plan to date.
- BHCC to share any further comments/views/queries with MSDC either in writing and/or at a future meeting

Mid Sussex District Plan District Review

Meeting with Brighton and Hove CC: 08.12.22

Attendance:

Andrew Marsh (MSDC)
Alice Henstock (MSDC)
Natalie Sharp (MSDC)
Sandra Rogers (BHCC)
Steve Tremlett (BHCC)
Robert Davidson (BHCC)

Meeting Objective:

The purpose of this meeting was for :

1. MSDC to present Draft District Plan published for Reg 18.
2. To provide an opportunity for Brighton and Hove CC to question and understand the Plan.
3. BHCC to provide update on Plan making.

Notes:

MSDC update

- MSDC explained the work undertaken since last met in June.
- MSDC gave short presentation that explains Plan strategy.



08 12 22 Reg18
Update.pdf

- MSDC have held 7 public exhibitions. These were well attended and showed strong public feelings about the Plan.
- BHCC have been reviewing the evidence base and considered it to be extensive, but no specific questions arising to date.

Discussion: around the local elections in May and about local and national politics and the potential impact for plan making

BHCC update

- City plan adopted end Oct - supported by Green/Labour. Not supported by Conservatives due to allocating sites on urban fringe.
- Now moving onto review of part 1 plan. SMHA commissioned. I+O next autumn.
- Article 4 - new class E to resi. Previous lapsed in July 2022. Undertaken more survey work and reduced the area by 2/3rds. Now waiting to hear from DLUHC. Into force 1st Feb. SoS may use powers to intervene

Discussion: around progress to date on LSS. Sandra to discuss with Liz, to contact James Appleton (WBC) re progress.

Next Steps

- MSDC circulate note of meeting
- MSDC to share presentation
- BHCC to prepare formal response to Reg 18 Consultation
- BHCC to contact James Appleton re LSS3 progress

Duty to Co-operate Meeting – Horsham District Council and Mid Sussex District Council

30 August 2023 10-11.30pm

MS Teams

Meeting Notes

Attendees

Catherine Howe, Head of Strategic Planning HDC

Tal Kleiman, Senior Planning Policy Officer HDC

Andrew Marsh, Head of Planning Policy and Housing Enabling MSDC

Alice Henstock, Principal Planner MSDC

NB. The following notes record the content of the meeting above by theme. They are not necessarily a chronological account of the meeting.

1. Horsham District Local Plan Update/ Housing position

An update was provided about the progress of the Horsham District Local Plan. It was explained that (subject to the precise wording of the constitution) an LDS would be considered by Cabinet in late September before seeking adoption at full Council in October. Should it be approved, it would likely identify that a Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan would be taken to Cabinet and Council in December with the intent of publication period commencing soon after.

Though not finalised, it was likely that housing numbers would be lower than identified in the draft July 2021 version of the Local Plan that was considered by Cabinet but did not progress further. The housing target would be less than the 911 annual need figure generated by the standard method. This was due to 2 years of minimal approvals, caused by the need for new development to demonstrate water neutrality and the ongoing effect of the water neutrality issue. Currently, the Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply and the position has worsened since the CG Fry case.

As a result, the housing target will be stepped with a relatively low figure for the plan's first five years (circa 500), with a greater target beyond this. It was likely that the overall annualised figure would be between 700 and 750 per year. From a position of assisting other authorities with housing supply, HDC will likely be in a shortfall against standard methodology figure going forward. HDC is likely to formally request assistance from other authorities to meet unmet need but through previous discussions with other authorities, the likelihood of assistance is considered low.

Similar to MSDC (see below), Officers are engaging with the Parish Councils throughout September regarding the Local Plan, following a period of member engagement/training that was triggered by the Local Elections. There is currently a speculative large scale, planning application for around 800 homes (Horsham Golf and Fitness), which has underlined the importance to members of getting a Local Plan in place.

2. Mid Sussex Local Plan Update/Housing Position

Regulation 18 Local Plan consulted upon in November and December 2022. Since then, change in Council administration (no overall control but lead by Liberal Democrats with assistance from Independents) has meant need to undertake work with members.

Cross Party Members Working Group established by the Scrutiny Committee is undertaking review of Regulation 18 Local Plan including the omission sites presented to the Council during Regulation 18. Identified a need to better reflect local infrastructure needs necessary to accommodate development. A Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan may be considered by the Scrutiny Committee in October. Likely to still be able to meet housing needs and buffer likely to increase as result of standard methodology update, showing a lower need figure for Mid Sussex, however this is subject to the findings of the Working Group and Scrutiny Committee. As per the NWS SoCG, any over supply of housing would be prioritised in the NWS Housing Market Area.

MSDC are undertaking engagement with Town and Parish Councils throughout September on the Local Plan. A live inquiry on a planning appeal was focusing on five year housing land supply, the first of its kind in Mid Sussex since adoption of the District Plan in 2018. This has highlighted the importance of progressing the Local Plan, even though MSDC's future housing land supply position is looking healthy.

3. Mayfield Market Town

HDC informed MSDC that they were written to by the new promoter of MMT, Berkeley Homes, stating that they were no longer promoting the site through the current Horsham District Local Plan. MSDC explained that Berkeley's were promoting a site in Sayers Common but this is separate and distinct from landholdings relating to MMT.

Noting their previous interest in MMT, HDC explained to MSDC that they would be informing BHCC of Berkeley's position on MMT.

4. Gypsies and Travellers

HDC explained that an updated GTAA had been undertaken. Though need figures were emerging, it appeared that a need of around 100 pitches would be identified in Horsham (taking into account both definitional and non-definitional components of the population, following the Smith case). The Local Plan would likely identify allocations that could accommodate around 60 pitches and therefore HDC would likely be seeking assistance from others to help address unmet needs. The exact figure would depend on the outcomes of appeals on some G&T applications.

MSDC noted that their identified need is 4 pitches for those who still travel and 12 for those who no longer travel, established by a 2022 study and that this need is likely to be met in the upcoming Local Plan. They noted that an appeal for a Transit site in Slaugham was in progress.

HDC explained that they are likely to seek allocations in strategic sites for G&T pitches. MSDC explained that they had previously used this approach as part of the Northern Arc allocation, and in Regulation 18 Plan on Sustainable Community Allocations.

5. Transport

Noted that A23/A2300 capacity issues were evident at the southbound slip road during work on the Site Allocations DPD. To support the allocation of the Science and Technology Park in this location in the DPD, MSDC were able to identify three options (varying in cost and complexity) that could mitigate effects of development and that PINS were comfortable with this. Such options were the result of work with partners – including National Highways, WSCC and the site promoters.

Additional development within the draft District Plan may increase pressure at this junction and therefore MSDC will need to consider how a cohesive solution can be found and delivered at this junction. This will require working with National Highways and this can be challenging.

HDC recognise the importance of the junction though note that, particularly due to the reduction of development identified in the forthcoming Horsham District Local Plan, it is unlikely that future growth in Horsham would impact on this junction in any meaningful way. It would nonetheless continue to support MSDC in efforts to attract funding and/or raise the need for improvements to this junction.

6. Employment

Both authorities identified that they were likely to fully address needs for employment uses in their Local Plans and therefore assistance from others were not required.

Both authorities noted, following the alteration to the Use Classes Order, that leisure/commercial uses were coming forward on sites allocated/approved for employment uses.

7. Coastal West Sussex & Greater Brighton

Both authorities expressed frustration at the lack of progress on LSS3. HDC, through undertaking DtC meetings in September, would express this to other CWSGB members and seek to understand the respective positions of others.

As HDC/MSDC were aligned in thinking, it may be that joint communication in relation to CWSGB from both authorities would stimulate progress. A separate discussion will be arranged on this point.

8. Crawley Local Plan

Both authorities had identified concern of the 'shadow policy' in the Crawley Local Plan, which seeks to exert influence on potential allocations (Crabbet Park and West of Ifield) located in other authorities. Both will await MIQs from Inspector before determining any future steps that may be taken however both have continually raised this point formally at Regulation 18/Regulation 19 stages.

9. Joint Statement of Common Ground

Collective recognition that draft, unsigned SoCG does not reflect current situation and that significant revisions would be required. Agreed that it would be preferable to wait to produce SoCG as Plans are still emerging, but that it would be desirable for a signed SoCG to be achieved prior to submission of Local Plans for examination to reflect accurately cross-boundary and strategic matters.

10. Other Statements of Common Ground

Recognise that both authorities have recently signed up to an updated NWS SoCG (two parts) to coincide with CBC's Local Plan submission. Both are also signatories to the Water Neutrality SoCG. It is considered that they both reflect the up-to-date position on such issues and that any bilateral SoCG would be best to cross refer to ensure consistency with other parties.

Gatwick Diamond Local Planning Authorities' Meeting
Monday 16 October 2023 @ 12:30pm
Held Virtually: Teams Links sent in Meeting Request
Draft Notes

1. Attendance and Apologies

Elizabeth Brigden	Crawley Borough Council
Ian Mawer	Epsom & Ewell Borough Council
Mark McLaughlin	Horsham District Council
Duncan Clarke	Mole Valley District Council
Natalie Sharp	Mid Sussex District Council
Ian Dunsford	Reigate & Banstead Borough Council
Sue Janota	Surrey County Council
Caroline West	West Sussex County Council

Apologies

Victoria Potts	Epsom & Ewell Borough Council
Julia Hayes	Horsham District Council
Alice Henstock	Mid Sussex District Council
Katya Fox	Tandridge District Council
Robert Cotter	Tandridge District Council
Justin Turvey	Epsom & Ewell Borough Council

Robert Cotter no longer works for Tandridge District Council.

2. Gatwick Diamond

a. Notes and Actions from the Last Meeting (17 April 2023)

Actions Arising (17 April 2023):			
Action No.	Action	Lead Officer	Done
Agenda Item: 2 Gatwick Diamond; a. Notes and Actions from Last Meeting (10 October 2022)			
1.	All to consider the notes of the previous meeting (10 October 2022) and provide any amendments to EB.	All	
2.	EB to recirculate any amended notes from the meeting if any comments are received.	EB	
Agenda Item: 2. Gatwick Diamond b. Review of Gatwick Diamond Local Authority Planning Policy Group i. Members' Group: Chair; Meetings			
3.	All to talk to their Portfolio Holders to seek a steer for what they consider appropriate and would want from the Group.	All	Roll forward
Agenda Item: 2. Gatwick Diamond b. Review of Gatwick Diamond Local Authority Planning Policy Group iii. SoCG/Review of LSS			
4.	EB to pull out priorities from the LSS to circulate and discuss at the next meeting.	EB	Roll forward
Agenda Item: 3. London Plan & Wider South East			
5.	JH (HDC) to check with MM if had heard anything.	JH	Item 3

Action: All to consider the notes of the previous meeting (17 April 2023) and provide any amendments to EB.

Action: EB to recirculate any amended notes from the meeting if any comments are received.

b. Review of Gatwick Diamond Local Authority Planning Policy Group:

- i. Members Group: Chair; Meetings
- ii. MoU
- iii. SoCG/Review of LSS

Not yet mentioned. Focus has been on DCO.

Maybe after May pick up – as Members could change again following local elections.

DCO:

Skills and Business: Economic Strategy Implementation Plan – might want to target in future.

Housing numbers to support workers.

Lots of things coming out of it.

Surface Access Strategy – parking.

Community.

All agreed that this is perhaps all worth thinking about going forward, but will be clearer in the future.

c. Infrastructure Improvements Updates

A22 Study – WSCC J6 south Mid Sussex. Looking at what issues are. With Tandridge.

3. London Plan & Wider South East

MM to find out where this is up to:

Action: MM to provide update on London Plan next meeting.

Some SPDs etc. internally in London.

After Mayoral Elections likely.

Mole Valley, Reigate and Banstead and Epsom & Ewell councils might be members of the Wider South East.

4. Other Duty to Cooperate Work

a. Coastal West Sussex

b. NW Sussex HMA/Water Neutrality

HDC appeal decisions on water neutrality. Storrington – a Local Plan allocation for 35 dwellings, application is for 78 dwellings. Not signed up to a strategic solution.

Additional quantum above the allocation number was taken as part of the windfall allowance in the housing trajectory.

Along with another appeal inquiry.

c. Surrey Place Ambition

SPA has been signed off.

5. Statements of Common Ground

Nothing raised.

6. Local Plan Update

CBC: Local Plan submitted 31 July 2023. Two Inspectors appointed. Issued Matters, Issues and Questions. Hearings to be held in two parts: week commencing 20 November 2023 and weeks commencing 8th and 15th January 2024.

E&E: consulted Reg. 18 Feb/March 2023. Council decision – paused. Working towards ‘unpausing’. Licencing Committee recommendation to Full Council – 24 October. Published decision to pause or unpausa. Only two options. No caveats allowed as would prejudice Local Plan later down the line. Will pick up DtC comments. Timetable to meet 2025 deadlines. Reg. 18 evidenced based.

HDC: aiming for a Jan/Feb 2024 Reg. 19 consultation. 11 December 2023 Cabinet, document will be public on 1 December. Also, will include GTTS/Housing Delivery Market Study/SA/Viability study. Target housing number 911 dwellings per annum – will be nearer 700-800 dwellings per annum. Housing number 5-year supply is below 2.5. HDT gone from 140% to 70%.

MVDC: paused for 10 months. NPPF should come out soon? Last day of LURB – Parliament tomorrow. Flood of speculative applications on sites not allocated, whilst sites allocated being refused as Green Belt. Appeal at end of month – will depend on outcome, whether Members will move to adopt Plan.

MSDC – Member work since elections. Commenced cross-party working group. Bringing new Members up to speed. Positive to keep going. Aiming for Reg. 19 to Scrutiny Committee 22 November, Council on 13 December 2023. Publication in the new year.

RBBC: Overview and Scrutiny considered LDS. Schedule to submit 2026. To be in the new style Local Plan. Will have 9 months without an up-to-date Local Plan in place. Shrunken timescale – building evidence base. Icenl – housing needs DtC; Lichfields – retail; SHELAA – in house (costs higher than anticipated); Transport – SCC. Environmental Outcomes Reporting – what does it mean? Experts. Habitats Consultants – no applications as everyone doing BNG. Traveller work commissioning. Residents Panel – several across the borough. Formally requested to be a front-runner. Also DCO and AONB Boundary Review. Will be doing 5 year review on adopted Core Strategy.

SCC: Mins and Waste Preferred Options: summer 2025. Another call for sites.

WSSC: Five Year Assessment of review of Minerals Plan has taken place – it remains relevant and effective. Waste Plan Five Year Assessment of review will take place next year. Both likely to be updated under the new system now. Local Transport Plan – annual monitoring taking place. Active Travel England – didn’t feel level 0 was reflective of position and working with ATE to review.

7. Future Agendas/Dates of Next Meetings:

- Monday 8 April 2024 at 2pm
- Monday 14 October 2024 at 2pm

8. AOB

Nothing raised.

Actions Arising (16 October 2023):			
Action No.	Action	Lead Officer	Done
Agenda Item: 2 Gatwick Diamond; a. Notes and Actions from Last Meeting (17 April 2023)			
1.	All to consider the notes of the previous meeting (17 April 2023) and provide any amendments to EB.	All	
2.	EB to recirculate any amended notes from the meeting if any comments are received.	EB	
Agenda Item: 2. Gatwick Diamond b. Review of Gatwick Diamond Local Authority Planning Policy Group i. Members' Group: Chair; Meetings			
3.	All to talk to their Portfolio Holders to seek a steer for what they consider appropriate and would want from the Group.	All	
Agenda Item: 2. Gatwick Diamond b. Review of Gatwick Diamond Local Authority Planning Policy Group iii. SoCG/Review of LSS			
4.	EB to pull out priorities from the LSS to circulate and discuss at the next meeting.	EB	
Agenda Item: 3. London Plan & Wider South East			
5.	MM to provide update on London Plan next meeting.	MM	

Meeting Note

Mid Sussex District Council and Wealden District Council

14.12.23

Attendance

Nichola Watters (Wealden District Council)

Kelly Sharpe (Wealden District Council)

Andrew Marsh (Mid Sussex District Council)

Alice Henstock (Mid Sussex District Council)

Natalie Sharp (Mid Sussex District Council)

Discussion

- **MSDC** explained work undertaken since the publication of Reg18 Plan in November 2022.
- Significant engagement with Town and Parish Councils and Member Working Groups
- Plan updated to reflect this engagement work and comments made at Reg 18
- No change in strategy or sites since Reg18
- Housing allocations deliver an oversupply of 996+ against standard method – an increase since Regulation 18
- In North West Sussex HMA – unmet need is now over 9,000
- Once met own need priority will be to assist in meeting unmet need in NWS HMA in accordance with the agreed SoCG on this issue with the NWS HMA authorities (based on evidence base collated by the Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton authorities)
- Council approved Reg19 Plan for consultation on 13.12

Q In relation to transport WDC sought clarification on the 3 junctions that need improvement and the base date of the transport modelling work (as follow up to transport meeting on 12.11.23)

- **WDC** explained working to published Reg 18 draft Plan in March 2024.
 - Plan will be full draft with policies and options for housing delivery
 - Unlikely to meet housing need in full, between 2,500 and 4,000 shortfall
 - Most evidence base is complete including SHMA, which shows main relationship with Tunbridge Wells and Eastbourne but also links with MSDC to west of Wealden.
 - Evidence available on web site
-
- **Strategic issues** – general discussion about strategic issues between MSDC and WDC.
 - Previously matters included housing including G+T provision and Ashdown Forest.

Outcome

- **WDC** to revisit draft SoCG and to share with MSDC in early Feb

- **MSDC** to share slides

Meeting Note

Mid Sussex District Council and Brighton and Hove City Council

04.01.24

Attendance

Sandra Rogers (Brighton and Hove City Council)
Steve Tremlett (Brighton and Hove City Council)
Robert Davidson (Brighton and Hove City Council)
Andrew Marsh (Mid Sussex District Council)
Alice Henstock (Mid Sussex District Council)
Natalie Sharp (Mid Sussex District Council)

Discussion

- **MSDC** explained work undertaken since the publication of Reg18 Plan in November 2022.
- Significant engagement with Town and Parish Councils and Member Working Groups
- Plan updated to reflect this engagement work and comments made at Reg 18
- No change in strategy or sites since Reg18
- Housing allocations deliver an oversupply of 996+ against standard method – an increase since Regulation 18
- In Northern West Sussex HMA – unmet need is now over 9,000
- Once met own need priority will be to assist in meeting unmet need in NWS HMA in accordance with the agreed SoCG on this issue with the NWS HMA authorities (based on evidence base collated by the Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton authorities)
- Regulation 19 Consultation begins on 12th January for 6 weeks

- **BHCC** explained have started to commission evidence base for Local Plan Review.
- Anticipate publication of early issues for Plan in Summer 2024
- New Plan likely to be submitted in 2025 under new plan making system

- **Strategic issues** – general discussion about strategic issues between MSDC and BHCC.
- Previous SoCG for MSDC SA DPD (2020) and District Plan MOU (2016) identified matters as housing, Gypsy and Traveller provision, transport and employment.
- BHCC potentially further SoCG relating to G+T provision as part of their part 2 Plan.
- LSS meeting took place in December which discussed future work/direction of group

Outcome

- **BHCC** to check if any other SoCG's were signed to support Part 2 Plan
- **MSDC** to share note of meeting
- **MSDC** to follow up and update BHCC on outcomes from LSS meeting
- **MSDC** to prepare a SocG to support submission of District Plan

Meeting Note

Mid Sussex District Council and Lewes District Council

29.01.24

Attendance

Nadeem Din (Lewes and Eastbourne Council)

Anna Clare (Lewes and Eastbourne Council)

Andrew Marsh (Mid Sussex District Council)

Natalie Sharp (Mid Sussex District Council)

Discussion

- **MSDC** explained work undertaken since the publication of Reg18 Plan in November 2022.
- Significant engagement with Town and Parish Councils and Member Working Groups
- Plan updated to reflect this engagement work and comments made at Reg 18
- No change in strategy or sites since Reg18
- Housing allocations deliver an oversupply of 996+ against standard method – an increase since Regulation 18
- In Northern West Sussex HMA – unmet need is now over 9,000 (Crawley's increased during examination as Plan period extended)
- Once met own need priority will be to assist in meeting unmet need in NWS HMA in accordance with the agreed SoCG on this issue with the NWS HMA authorities (based on evidence base collated by the Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton authorities)
- Regulation 19 Consultation began on 12th January

Qs In relation to:

- SDNP coverage of Mid Sussex district.
- MSDC's search for housing sites
- Education provision on significant sites
- Engagement with Towns and Parishes
- **LDC** provided an overview of Regulation 18 Plan content and work down to date. Explored different options for housing numbers and meeting need. Next iteration of plan to contain target and proposed allocations.
- Consultation period extended to 19th February.
- DtC workshop to take place before end of consultation period (DAC Planning leading). MSDC will attend.
- Evidence available on web site, except SFRA – awaiting formal sign off
- MSDC provided an overview of draft response to Lewes' Reg 18 consultation; housing on boundary and infrastructure implications. Noted that previous 2021 rep noted significant engagement required re options for development at Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath however this had not been forthcoming until now.
- Highlighted that officers are keen to have ongoing discussions on cross boundary issues as the Lewes plan progresses.

Outcome

- MSDC to share slides
- MSDC to review draft response to LDC Regulation 18 consultation in light of discussions.

Gatwick Diamond Local Planning Authorities' Meeting
Monday 8 April 2024 @ 2pm
Held Virtually: Teams Links sent in Meeting Request
Draft Notes

1. Attendance and Apologies

Elizabeth Brigden	Crawley Borough Council
Harry Burchill	Epsom & Ewell Borough Council
Mark McLaughlin	Horsham District Council
Duncan Clarke	Mole Valley District Council
Natalie Sharpe	Mid Sussex District Council
Ian Dunsford	Reigate & Banstead Borough Council
Nikki Nicholson	Surrey County Council
	Tandridge District Council
	West Sussex County Council
Tracey Flitcroft	

Apologies

Ian Mawer	Epsom & Ewell Borough Council
Caroline West	West Sussex County Council
Alice Henstock	Mid Sussex District Council
Sue Janota	Surrey County Council

EB highlighted still no representative from Tandridge and asked if anyone has a contact name she can use before the next meeting?

ID confirmed he did have a name which he would send through after the meeting.

Action: ID to send through a contact name for TDC to approach to invite to this group.

Action: EB to follow up contact at Tandridge to introduce the Gatwick Diamond group and invite to next meeting.

2. Gatwick Diamond

a. Notes and Actions from the Last Meeting (16 October 2023)

Actions Arising (16 October 2023):			
Action No.	Action	Lead Officer	Done
Agenda Item: 2 Gatwick Diamond; a. Notes and Actions from Last Meeting (17 April 2023)			
1.	All to consider the notes of the previous meeting (17 April 2023) and provide any amendments to EB.	All	
2.	EB to recirculate any amended notes from the meeting if any comments are received.	EB	
Agenda Item: 2. Gatwick Diamond b. Review of Gatwick Diamond Local Authority Planning Policy Group i. Members' Group: Chair; Meetings			
3.	All to talk to their Portfolio Holders to seek a steer for what they consider appropriate and would want from the Group.	All	Roll Forward – item 2b.

Actions Arising (16 October 2023):			
Action No.	Action	Lead Officer	Done
Agenda Item: 2. Gatwick Diamond b. Review of Gatwick Diamond Local Authority Planning Policy Group iii. SoCG/Review of LSS			
4.	EB to pull out priorities from the LSS to circulate and discuss at the next meeting.	EB	Roll Forward
Agenda Item: 3. London Plan & Wider South East			
5.	MM to provide update on London Plan next meeting.	MM	Done – item 3

No changes raised from April 2023 notes. Agreed to let EB know if there are any amendments or corrections from the October 2023 notes and EB to recirculate.

MM provided an update on the London Plan – under item 3.

b. Review of Gatwick Diamond Local Authority Planning Policy Group:

- i. Members Group: Chair; Meetings
- ii. MoU
- iii. SoCG/Review of LSS

DCO – hearings underway. Currently negotiating the S106. Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) have pushed back on matters including Biodiversity and Ecology and Economic, Skills and Businesses. A smaller group has been set up to discuss further.

Other matters being discussed of critical interest to the Gatwick Diamond Authorities include Air Quality and Noise.

National Highways, the Highways Authorities and the Railway companies have all expressed concerns.

c. Infrastructure Improvements Updates

WSCC/SCC nothing to report.

DC questioned whether it would be possible to bring together housing numbers for the area around Gatwick Airport. This could then be considered in relation to discussions with strategic developers and infrastructure providers particularly regarding cumulative impacts (and timings) on schools/health/sewage.

The scope of this work was discussed – whether a specified distance, the whole Gatwick Diamond Local Authority areas, or particular towns/developments based on connections. 15 (5?) miles around Gatwick Airport to see how much housing is to be delivered, now plans are published and more advanced.

The capacity of Horley wastewater treatment works was discussed as it is overflowing. Thames Water suggest they have proposals to address this.

NN confirmed that SCC school place planning are working closely with WSCC, and there are no major issues in the area. TF agreed that WSCC and SCC work closely across the boundaries. EB welcomed this, and suggested it would be helpful to have those conversations with the districts and boroughs jointly as part of this work, so the information can be disseminated to relevant Council Members, members of the public and/or developers, and taken into account when progressing the schemes through planning (plan-making and decision-taking).

TF confirmed that WSCC hold all of the planning data for the West Sussex Districts and Boroughs and could help pull the housing development information for the relevant areas.

DC agreed to take on the initial work as a task – particularly looking at Hookwood/Horley/Ifield/Crawley.

Action: DC to look at the scope of emerging housing development around Gatwick Airport and to share with the Group.

ID suggested the Cycling and Walking Plans agreed/being prepared across the districts and boroughs. This could helpfully be mapped to show the interconnectivity. Also bus lane priority schemes.

Action: for the group to consider the mapping of active and public transport linkages across the Gatwick Diamond area (particularly around Gatwick Airport).

This work should be progressed as far as possible electronically through the Group ahead of the next meeting.

3. London Plan & Wider South East

MM provided the group with a recap and update in relation to the progress on the London Plan since the group submitted a joint response to the consultation in 2018.

- The Gatwick Diamond Authorities jointly commented on the draft London Plan collaboration policies. However, the Inspectors' didn't appear to have taken this matter further: with nothing picked up in relation to cross-boundary working outside the London boundaries.
- The Inspectors deleted the Aviation Policy, which the group had objected to in relation to the unqualified support for Gatwick Airport expansion without reference to ensuring it would not result in additional environmental harm as it does for Heathrow. However, the Mayor retained the policy.
- The Authorities also raised concerns about London meeting its housing needs, confirming the Gatwick Diamond area of Sussex and Surrey has its own housing needs and significant constraints. Following this, the government wrote to the London Mayor and set up a panel to investigate London not delivering the housing targets. The panel published a report in January and the government undertook the wider consultation on the presumption on Brownfield Land. This has included the removal of the small sites uplift and increase of housing need figures for central London. The government raised concerns that the London Plan industrial policy is too restrictive and requires a response by the end of the year.

ID highlighted that the scale of growth for the London borough's to accommodate is significant – with housing targets above what can be delivered. In addition, the cost of decontaminating brownfield land to bring it into residential use is high.

ID confirmed that the Silvertown Tunnel under the Thames, linking to the Greenwich Peninsula is due to be completed next year (2025). This is the first new crossing, east of Tower Bridge, since the Dartford Bridge.

It was noted that with the elections coming, it is unlikely there will be much to consider before October. It was agreed to wait until the next meeting before considering if there should be any further actions under this item.

4. Other Duty to Cooperate Work

a. Coastal West Sussex

Not currently being driven forward. A meeting was held at the end of last year and it was agreed to continue the group until it is clearer what would replace DtC, and for those authorities still progressing under the current system. The draft SoCG is being updated by HDC/MSDC.

Chichester District Council – looking to submit their Local Plan imminently, but have issues relating to transport and water.

Arun District Council – published Reg. 18.

The other authorities are looking to progress under the new system (Adur, South Downs National Park, and Brighton and Hove). Worthing recently adopted their Local Plan.

b. NW Sussex HMA/Water Neutrality

NWS SoCG are being updated to support the HDC and MSDC Local Plan submissions (July 2023 versions currently published alongside CBC's Local Plan submission).

Water Neutrality – policy appears reasonably accepted, through the CBC Local Plan Examination. Issue now is the implementation. Securing sufficient water credits in the “bank” and prioritisation of the water credits will be key. Have a Project Manager working full time jointly across the authorities on this, and have secured funding for a supporting post, yet to be appointed.

HDC appeal decisions – these have been inconsistent. A meeting was held with the Chief Planning Inspector and this secured an agreement for consistent decisions. Since then further decisions have been issued which contradict each other. But not erred in law, so can't challenge. Difficulty with securing Natural England clear advice on use of Grampian conditions. This puts pressure on the councils' implementation scheme (Sussex North Offsetting Water Scheme – SNOWS) with speculative development rather than the planned development proposed through the Local Plans.

Crest Nicholson – Kilnwood Vale Appeal Inquiry: suggesting water neutrality should be dealt with by the water companies not through the development industry/planning system. Potential to take it through the High Court if lose the appeal.

c. Surrey Place Ambition

It was agreed to expand this item for the future to cover Duty to Cooperate across Surrey.

Action: EB to update standing agenda item to Surrey Duty to Cooperate.

NN confirmed that the Place Ambition v2 was published in autumn 2023, covering the spatial priorities to deliver growth and infrastructure, and the investment needed to do that.

5. Statements of Common Ground

Nothing Raised.

6. Local Plan Update

CBC: Examination Hearing Sessions held November and January – formally closed hearings part of the Examination on the last day of the Hearings. Inspectors issues their post-hearing letter on 31 January, suggesting the Main Modifications they wanted the council to consult on. Main Modifications Consultation took place over 6 weeks

between 12 February and 25 March (to be completed by pre-election period). Received 22 responses to the consultation (some not on MM, but predominately on Gatwick Airport safeguarding/strategic employment site and affordable care requirement). All have been submitted to the Inspectors. Anticipate the fact check report after the elections and the final report by the end May/early June. Hoping to take the Plan to Full Council for adoption in July but, if not, it will be autumn (assuming a favourable Inspectors' report).

E&E: The Local Plan work is un-paused now. Working towards Reg.19 in January 2025, following approval to do so by Committee in November 2024. Currently gathering the evidence base – transport/flood risk etc.

Questioned whether any of the other Surrey districts/boroughs received the email from Surrey County Council regarding Affordable Extra Care – C2/C3?

HDC: Reg.19 finished – 1,700 comments received – West of Ifield and the other large sites, water neutrality and omission sites. Aiming for a mid-June deadline to submit – to get something in before the outcome of the Kilnwood Vale decision. Housing target of 480 dwellings per annum (dpa) for the first five years, and then 900+ dpa over the rest of the Plan period. 780 dpa average over the whole Plan period.

MVDC: Local Plan un-paused. 2023 waited for a response from the government. Received response at the end of the year which confirmed MV Local Plan should be considered under the previous NPPF. Main Modifications currently commenced, ends on 23 April 2024. So far 28 responses have been received.

In relation to C2/C3 – MVDC also received the email from SCC and responded that authorities should require affordable housing from C2.

Had been asked by the Inspector to prepare a topic paper on planning updates in the last 12 months. Lots of things have come up – not just NPPF changes : self-build/BNG etc. Future Mole Valley Council Note 35.

MSDC: Reg.19 finished 23 February 2024. 1,300 responses. Team is currently making its way through these and preparing summaries. So far, not received anything unexpected which would require further work before the Examination. Responses received mostly on the allocations – the three significant sites. Submission is anticipated after the elections, mid-May 2024.

RBBC: due to the new planning system the adopted LDS needed to be changed. Now anticipating submission 2026. Have produced an indicative timetable.

Undertook a five-year review of the Core Strategy to retain its weight in Development Management decisions. This was signed off before Easter, subject to legal challenge.

Currently progressing evidence – housing needs, retail, leisure. Call for sites: economy and housing. Comments received on the methodology for the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). Commencing work on transport evidence.

ID also mentioned SCC work on carbon/energy consumption in buildings – taking into account the Energy Ministerial Statement. Currently building up the evidence base, with three consultancies working on this. At current government levels, wont reach zero by 2050 – need to accelerate. Attending workshops. Suggesting needs to be 90% not 80%. The economics/viability do work out positively, as well, even with Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).

Action: ID to keep group updated on the SCC carbon/energy consumption in buildings work at the next meeting.

TDC: no one from Tandridge attended. EB to secure a contact from ID and follow up to invite to next meeting (see action 1).

ID confirmed he understood there were new members of the team starting and the authority was commencing work on a new Local Plan.

SCC: Minerals and Waste – little to update on. Work has commenced. Working towards a preferred options consultation in June 2025.

WSSC: still looking at assessment on the Waste Local Plan Review. If there is to be anything done, it will be under the new system.

TF questioned the reference to Active Travel England in the last meeting's notes. EB confirmed any clarification would be helpful.

Action: TF to check the reference to Active Travel England and provide an update.

Action: EB to amend notes of last meeting accordingly and re-circulate when receive updated clarification information from TF.

7. Future Agendas/Dates of Next Meetings:

- Monday 14 October 2024 at 2pm
- Monday 14 April 2025 at 2pm

Dates of next meetings noted.

EB to check next year's Easter dates (to make sure no clash with April meeting).

Action: EB to check Easter 2025 dates.

8. AOB

Nothing Raised.

Actions Arising (8 April 2024):			
Action No.	Action	Lead Officer	Done
Agenda Item: 1 Attendance and Apologies			
1.	ID to send through a contact name for TDC to approach to invite to this group.	ID	Done
2.	EB to follow up contact at Tandridge to introduce the Gatwick Diamond group and invite to next meeting.	EB	Done
Agenda Item: 2 Gatwick Diamond; a. Notes and Actions from Last Meeting (17 April 2023)			
3.	All to consider the notes of the previous meeting (16 October 2023) and provide any amendments to EB.	All	
4.	EB to recirculate any amended notes from the meeting if any comments are received.	EB	
Agenda Item: 2. Gatwick Diamond b. Review of Gatwick Diamond Local Authority Planning Policy Group i. Members' Group: Chair; Meetings			
5.	All to talk to their Portfolio Holders to seek a steer for what they consider appropriate and would want from the Group.	All	Roll Forward
Agenda Item: 2. Gatwick Diamond b. Review of Gatwick Diamond Local Authority Planning Policy Group iii. SoCG/Review of LSS			
6.	EB to pull out priorities from the LSS to circulate and discuss at the next meeting.	EB	Roll Forward
Agenda Item: 2. Gatwick Diamond c. Infrastructure Improvement Updates			
7.	DC to look at the scope of emerging housing development around Gatwick Airport and to share with the Group.	DC	
8.	For the group to consider the mapping of active and public transport linkages across the Gatwick Diamond area (particularly around Gatwick Airport).	All	
Agenda Item: 3. Other Duty to Cooperate Work c. Surrey Place Ambition			
9.	EB to update standing agenda item to Surrey Duty to Cooperate.	EB	
Agenda Item: 6. Local Plan Update			
10.	ID to keep group updated on the SCC carbon/energy consumption in buildings work at the next meeting.	ID	
11.	TF to check the reference to Active Travel England and provide an update.	TF	Done
12.	EB to amend notes of last meeting accordingly and re-circulate when receive updated clarification information from TF.	EB	Done
13.	EB to check Easter 2025 dates.	EB	