

**East Grinstead Strategic Location**  
**2:00pm 8<sup>th</sup> December 2004**  
**Mid Sussex District Council, Council Chamber**

Present: Paul McCreery (Barton Willmore)  
David Bradley (Barton Willmore)  
Keith Oliver (Taylor Woodrow)  
David Banfield (David Wilson Homes)  
Rod Bull (Eversheds)  
Simon Elliott (WSCC)  
Neil Border (WSCC))  
Lyndsey Beveridge (WSCC)  
Judith Hewitt (MSDC)  
Dick Lankester (MSDC)  
Kate Buchanan (MSDC)

Apologies: Peter Court (Persimmon Homes)  
Ian Bull (Linden Homes)  
Ian Dix (Savell, Bird & Axon)  
Tim Townsend (WSCC)

---

**1. Update on West Sussex Structure Plan**

NB explained that Structure Plan is currently in the 4<sup>th</sup> week of a 6-week legal challenge period. No appeals have been lodged as yet. There have been two approaches to the Ombudsman, both from the East Grinstead area; one concerning consultation procedures.

**2. Update on the First Draft of the South East Plan**

NB explained that the SE Plan has gone back to SEERA; the first motion will be to amend housing figures.

Paper has gone to the plenary regional planning committee (which should narrow the range of housing figures). Whatever result comes from the regional planning committee will be put into the draft SE Plan. It is hoped it will be published for consultation on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2005. The plan will be available to view for 12 weeks from this date. SEERA will produce a pre-consultation document to explain the process and will be sending a letter to every house in the southeast. WSCC and MSDC will be asked to look at the housing at a sub regional level, which will go out for consultation during July.

**3. Update on Local Development Framework for Mid Sussex**

JH outlined the current progress with the LDF. There have been ongoing discussions with GOSE regarding the LDS process, with regard to the order in which the LDS should take place. GOSE had wanted only the Core Strategies to be submitted and go through the examination in public process before the other documents could be submitted. But they have now agreed that Mid Sussex is an exception and that the Core Strategies and Small Scale Housing Allocations can go through together. It is intended that these documents will be submitted by Christmas.

The Core Strategy and Policy and Small Scale Housing Allocations will be separate documents but part of one process running concurrently. Now hoped that adoption of the Area Action Plan for East Grinstead will be by August 2007.

**4. Review of SPG**

DL explained that the current SPG on infrastructure (adopted early last year) is being revised. There has been pressure from Members to broaden the scope of the SPG. MSDC are looking for views/comments from developers on how the guidance might be revised and improved. The initial report will be taken to the Better Environment sub-committee on 9<sup>th</sup> February with ideas and

suggestions. After this the document will be re-drafted and sent out for consultation (March / April 2005) and then published as SPD with a sustainability appraisal.

There is the idea of a 'Community Pot'; how developments taking place across a town can be used to improve the town as a whole. There is pressure for small scale local improvements so the proposal is for a modest amount for the local fund from developers (very similar to the current situation).

Another issue is where to set the threshold; should it be on every house / development or only above a certain level.

## **5. Update on the Progress of the Multi Modal Transport Model**

SE outlined the revised programme of the model. It is hoped that the base year will be completed by January and that the 2016 data will be completed by late January / early February. Slightly behind original programme, but timings will be tied into the Area Action Plan.

ID and SE have been discussing growth rates and possible future scenarios in order to get further details for a combination package. There is a draft list of proposed tests, which may need some slight alterations, which will be tested in January / February. These tests will provide an idea of the different strategies and impacts.

SE and ID met with ESCC, SCC and HA; presentation on the model outline, approach to data collection and methodology. There was a very good response with the outcome that these agencies will be working together. They will meet again at the end of January 2005.

### Finance

The draft agreement has come back from Eversheds. Aiming to pay final bill for initial build by February.

### Junction 10

A number of ideas have been put forward, which the HA have been very receptive to. Only vague ideas so far so HA will wait to see modelling. The major concern is the capacity of slip lanes particularly where the M23 joins the A264, southbound.

### Line testing

Initial testing is on an indicative line and these test results will be produced by end of February. More testing of other routes will follow on from this. At present the indicative route is only in West Sussex, but options with implications for East Sussex and Surrey will be looked at, at a later stage.

## **6. The use of Compulsory Purchase Powers**

RB explained that there had been a very constructive meeting between the consortium and WSCC. They agreed that there would be a resolution on CPO powers once the LDF is published. It is hoped that WSCC can take it to their members.

The road modelling funding needs to be signed off separately from the CPO powers.

KO noted that in the Haywards Heath Local Plan there is talk of CPO to purchase land. He suggested this should be in the LDF Core Strategy and Policy document; based upon the principle of partnership working towards a common solution. Both authorities have the power but as yet it is undecided as to which authority will do this.

If a detailed road application is submitted, it is hoped that if WSCC use their CPO powers then WSCC would become joint partners / owners of the road; the consortium would be the promoters of the road.

There was talk about the timings of applications. KO explained that the consortium is thinking of submitting an early application following straight on from submission of the Area Action Plan.

Hoping for a co-joined inquiry but if this is not possible they would stop one and start another. Appeals are Inspector led; Inspector's report is binding so difficult for application not to be accepted. JH will raise the point of deliverability of houses with GOSE.

#### **7. Update on Environmental Survey Work**

KO stated that Capita Symons' Infrastructure Report had not yet been received.

JH raised concerns over the Archaeological report. An attendee of the Stakeholders' meeting (Jeremy Clarke), who is a local archaeological volunteer, noted that a desktop survey would not record all of the relevant data because this is not actually recorded. Volunteers are the only people who really know what archaeological remains are there. KO noted that a geophysical survey might be necessary. Further ecological work is ongoing but it depends upon land ownership and a lot of the land is unregistered which is causing a number of problems.

It is hoped that the fieldwork will be carried out from January to December 2005 so that all four seasons are covered.

#### **8. Joint Members' Advisory Group**

JH explained that nothing has happened since the last meeting. The next JMAG meeting has been arranged for 14<sup>th</sup> December, where Urban Practitioners will provide feedback about their report. It is hoped that the report will be in circulation soon after Christmas.

#### **9. Stakeholder and Public Consultation Work Update**

JH discussed the successful stakeholder event and a possible follow-up event, raising how it could be linked in with the multi-modal transport study. More information / facts could perhaps be provided at the next stakeholder meeting so that decisions about routes they want to test could be made.

KO explained the approach that had been taken in Ashford – tiles were produced illustrating the number of units for a certain area in order to give people a better idea of how much space a certain number of houses would take.

#### **AOB**

JH and DL visited Imberhorne School. The school would like to be located on one site; currently split by a five minute car journey. They have looked to see if they can extend the school but they consider this is not possible, so they would like to build a new school and keep the existing sports facilities. Imberhorne School would like this put into the AAP. This would release the Windmill Lane site, an area of approximately 7-9ha. Currently the school has a catchment that stretches into Surrey and Kent. New school places would not be required if Surrey and Kent were excluded from this catchment. KO commented that this was a good idea because the site provides good access to Imberhorne Lane, by the side of the running track.

There was discussion about affordable housing. The SE plan states that developments should have a minimum of 40% affordable housing and there is talk of this figure being carried forward to the LDF. KO commented that the relief road is already a big expenditure and the possibility of extra affordable housing may be too much.

#### **10. Date of Next Meeting**

Further meeting arranged for Tuesday 1<sup>st</sup> February at 14:00.