



**To All Councillors,**

You are summoned to an **ONLINE** meeting of Billingshurst Parish Council (in adherence to The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 No.392) on **Wednesday 2 September 2020 at 7.30pm**. A link will be sent to you explaining how to join this meeting.

**To Members of the Public,**

This meeting will be streamed on the internet. Follow link from website or Facebook page. This will enable you to see and hear Councillors.

If you would like to ask a question,

- a. you can either submit it to the Clerk at least 24 hours prior, who will then read it out, or
- b. you can ask it directly, but you must still notify the Clerk at least 24 hours prior, so you can be sent a link that you will enable you to join the meeting for the duration of public questions.

G.C. Burt   
Clerk to the Council

26 August 2020

## AGENDA

1. Chairman's Announcements.
2. Apologies for Absence.
3. To Receive Declarations of Interest and consider any requests for a dispensation.  
*Adjournment for*
4. Public Session (Members of the Public may speak for up to 3 minutes at the discretion of the Chairman).
5. To receive written reports given in advance from District and County Cllrs, and for them to take resulting questions.
6. To receive reports from Council representatives on outside organisations, **plus on any training recently attended.**  
*Resume Meeting*
7. Approval of the Minutes of the Meetings held on 4 and 23 March, 17 June and 15 July 2020. (Previously sent)
8. Matters Arising – that are not separate agenda items

9. To note receipt of response from HDC regarding Cedar's Orchard (previously circulated to all Cllrs) and consider invitation to attend meeting to discuss further, including attendees.
10. To consider requesting that Land opposite 22-52 Broomfield Drive be designated as an *Asset of Community Value (ACV)*. <https://mycommunity.org.uk/what-are-assets-of-community-value-acv>
11. To review appointments to committees etc.– Appendix A.
12. To consider making a response to the Government White Paper: *Planning for the Future*, details previously circulated. Suggested response for discussion attached - Appendix B.
13. To consider proposal from Cllr Jon Perks that when physical meetings are held again in the future, that they be broadcast online in the same way that virtual meetings have been.
14. To consider proposal from Cllr Paul Berry: To arrange a meeting between the Clerk, Chairman and Neighbourhood Wardens with senior police officers to discuss anti social behaviour in Billingshurst and to encourage the police to have a more regular presence in the area.
15. To receive Wardens' Reports for March-August, previously circulated.
16. Any other matters for information only.
17. **Date of Next Meeting** – 4 November 2020

**Members of the public should be aware that being present at a meeting of the Council or one of its Committees or Sub-Committees will be deemed as the person having given consent to being recorded (photograph, film or audio recording) at the meeting, by any person present.**

**BILLINGSHURST PARISH COUNCIL****COMMITTEES, WORKING PARTIES AND REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE BODIES****2020-21**

(The Council has set the max. membership for Committees to 10 members.)

| <b>COMMITTEES</b>          |                                                    |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| Planning & Environment     | GA, EB, <b>GC</b> , <b>DH</b> , JP, SR, SW         |
| Property                   | <b>BB</b> , PB, GC, SD, DH, RM                     |
| Finance & General Purposes | GA, BB, EB, PB, <b>AG</b> , DH, RM, <b>KP</b> , CG |
| Working Practices          | PB, <b>AG</b> , DH, RM, MW                         |
| Billingshurst Centre       | GA, <b>AG</b> , <b>KP</b> , SR, SW, SD, CG, RM     |
| Flooding                   |                                                    |
| Complaints (5 members Max) | PB, SD, RM                                         |
| Complaints Chairman        | <b>SD</b>                                          |
| <b>WORKING PARTIES</b>     |                                                    |
| Neighbourhood Plan         | SD, <b>JP</b> , SR, MW                             |
| Emergency Planning         | GA, EB, <b>AG</b>                                  |
| Internal Audit             | GA, DH, RM                                         |
| East St Traffic Calming    | PB, <b>AG</b> , <b>JP</b>                          |
| Youth Liaison              | RM, MW, SW                                         |
| Jubilee Skatepark WP       | BB, PB, DH, CG                                     |
| CCTV                       | PB, GC, RM, GA                                     |
| Local Plan                 | DH, BB, <b>JP</b> , GA                             |

***Bold** indicates Chairman/Vice Chairman*

| <b>REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE BODIES</b>                 |                           |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Allotments Society                                       | EB                        |
| Adversane Traffic WP                                     | AG, JP                    |
| B'hurst Sports & Recn. Assn. (BSRA)<br>x4                | GC, SD                    |
| Fireworks                                                | BB                        |
| Friends of Station Road Gardens x1                       | BB                        |
| HALC (H'ham Assn Local Ccls)                             | AG, GA (+ SD if possible) |
| N'hood Warden Steering Group x2                          | GA, SD, AG + Clerk        |
| Public Art Steering Group                                | SR + Clerk                |
| SPD Working Group                                        | SD + Clerk                |
| Trustee of Adversane Hall x1                             | AG                        |
| Trustee of Dauxwood Pre-School x1                        | MW                        |
| West Sussex Association Local<br>Councils (WSALC) AGM x2 | SD, AG                    |
| Youth Council                                            | MW                        |
| B'hurst Flood Action Group                               | GA                        |

## Planning for the Future - MHCLG White Paper consultation

This consultation will close at 23.45 Thursday 29th October 2020.

### Pillar One – Planning for Development

Q1. What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England?

- A.
- B.
- C.

Q2. Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area?

**YES**

Q3. Our proposals will make it much easier to access plans and contribute your views to planning decisions. How would you like to find out about plans and planning proposals in the future?

- A. Social Media
- B. Online News
- C. Newspaper
- D. By post
- E. Other (please specify):

Q4. What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area? (Please select only three answers)

- A. Building homes for young people
- B. Building homes for the homeless
- C. Protection of green spaces
- D. The environment, biodiversity and action on climate change
- E. Increasing the affordability of housing
- F. The design of new homes and places
- G. Supporting the high street
- H. Supporting the local economy
- I. More or better local infrastructure
- J. Protection of existing heritage buildings / areas
- K. Other (please specify):

Q5. Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals?

Yes

No

**Not Sure**

Please provide supporting statement

Not enough detail is provided in the proposal - the language is nebulous, e.g. 'we envisage' and 'could include'. Further, in phrasing the question as '... in line with our proposals' leaves open the possibility that the eventual decision could be somewhat different from this proposal. It is a theme throughout Planning for the Future that it is light on detail and certainty.

With Growth, Renewal and Protected areas to be defined as part of a future Local Plan, it is unclear what boundaries are being set for local planning authorities, particularly that there are no stated criteria as to what/ when Local Plans will be 'called in' for review by the Minister.

The aim to have a simplified process is welcomed in principle; however, this must not be at the expense of Government imposition of development on unwilling communities. In seeking to strengthen the role of the NPPF, this subverts a Local Plan and is more easy to be subject to political change, both reducing the say of local communities.

6. Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

Reducing the size of Local Plans by omitting repeat of national policy would reduce the size of documents but could result in some loss of understanding and context for those not fully understanding of the planning process, meaning there could be local misunderstanding, which would not be efficient.

Recognising the value of Neighbourhood Plans to develop, amongst other, design codes and guides will support communities seeing value in producing these Plans. In suggesting there could be a 'twin track' with the Local Plan, and it being proposed elsewhere that Local Plans would run for 10 years, means the requirement on communities to review Neighbourhood Plans every 2 years must be revised.

The suggestion of a 'one size fits all' approach is not supported as this will over-ride local distinctiveness and reduce the value and importance of Local and Neighbourhood Plans.

Q7(a) Do you agree with our proposals to replace existing legal and policy tests for Local Plans with a consolidated test of "sustainable development", which would include consideration of environmental impact?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

No detail is provided on the suggested 'simplified process for assessing the environmental impact of plans' so it is difficult to say whether that is supportable. It is recommended

**'environmental impact' includes consideration of the health and well-being impacts created by development on existing communities as the health of existing communities must remain a priority and should not diminish as a result of development.**

Q7.(b) How could strategic, cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate?

**Removal of the Duty to Cooperate could place additional pressure on communities in areas unable to deliver development, such as those urban areas already built out to their administrative boundaries. One way this could manifest itself is, contrary to the stated policy aim of providing a more equal society, if an area is unable physically to deliver more houses and more people still wanting to move in, prices will increase as will inequality, resulting in those least able to afford being forced out.**

Q8.(a) Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced?

Yes  
No  
Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

**The Government's target of 300,000 new homes being built per annum is a political decision and not an analysis of need. Having a standard method to impose proportions of that target on communities is likely to perpetuate an existing problem of putting housing in areas where it is not necessarily needed.**

**A standard method will also result in unequal development as at present, which the Paper seeks to overcome. For land in exclusive areas, whether in a National Park or Mayfair, these areas will remain largely without development and the suggestion that such historic under-supply will be addressed by a standard method simply will not materialise. What the continuing exclusivity will perpetuate, which is what will happen by 'factoring' in the purpose of National Parks and other, is requiring other areas to compensate for that and so change, some may say despoil, their own character.**

Q8.(b) Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated?

Yes  
No  
Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

**Future development would best be directed to support areas of future growth and sustainable locations - existing urban areas and affordability could be considerations but are not exclusive.**

Q9(a). Do you agree that there should be automatic permission in principle for areas for substantial development (Growth areas) with faster routes for detailed consent?

Yes

No

**Not Sure**

Please provide supporting statement

**Support should be dependent on how much local input has been sought and given from existing communities in the designation of Growth areas - if these areas are simply being imposed it would be reasonable for there to be more local debate, and consideration of that debate, prior to any grant of permission.**

**For exceptionally large sites, such as a new town, these could be delivered by the local authority taking responsibility for acquiring land, putting the infrastructure in place and supplying it to a developer(s) to build out. This will showcase that delivery of community infrastructure prior to development is a better model for communities, creating a sense of place from the outset of occupancy, minimise the wider disruption of development to the new community, and should be more efficient use of public monies.**

Q9(b). Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for Renewal and Protected areas?

Yes

No

**Not Sure**

Please provide supporting statement

**The suggestion of greater reference to the NPPF means there will be greater centralisation of decision making and less local input, meaning the value of Neighbourhood Planning undertaken by communities can be questioned; this would be regrettable.**

Q9(c). Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime?

Yes

No

**Not Sure**

Please provide supporting statement

**As stated in response to Q9a, exceptionally large sites such as a new town could be delivered by the local authority taking responsibility for acquiring land, putting the infrastructure in place and supplying it to a developer. Delivering this by means of a Development Consent Order could be appropriate.**

Q10. Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain?

Yes  
No  
Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

**The present system, it is understood, supports 90% of applications and so must provide considerable certainty. Quicker decisions will always be preferable but it is important to give time for local consultations, also for local authorities to complete 'checks and balances'. Of the latter, it could be said local authorities do not have the resource to do this effectively and efficiently due to political will constricting local resource rather than the process.**

Q11. Do you agree with our proposals for digitised, web-based Local Plans?

Yes  
No  
Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

**To create a national system as being proposed will require this to be led by Government, yet it has a poor track record for IT development so there can be little confidence in a system being developed either quickly or fit-for-purpose.**

**It is accepted that use of digital, particularly social media, could bring a new audience to the development of Local Plans. Sadly social media particularly has the experience of increased online abuse - this has no place in creation of a Local Plan and support could not be given unless strict protocols are in place to support and protect all parties.**

**Going digital will not necessarily ensure Local Plan proposals are known to all parties - some people do not engage digitally and to rely solely on digital would be discriminatory. Reliance on digital would also enhance the feeling of remote, face-less and less welcoming engagement/ decision-making; being able to meet or otherwise speak with local authority officers and members is important.**

Q12. Do you agree with our proposals for a 30 - month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans?

Yes  
No  
Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

**This is an ambitious target and the 30-month target is agreed with in principle. However, initially there will need to be an extended period for Local Plan production as Government and local authorities change procedures and guidance to fit, e.g. revised National Design Guide; and the proposed time limit will only be realised if enough skilled resource is available with local authorities and the Planning Inspectorate.**



Q13. (a) Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system?

Yes  
No  
Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

Q13 (b) How can the neighbourhood planning process be developed to meet our objectives, such as in the use of digital tools and reflecting community preferences about design?

Q14. Do you agree there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? And if so, what further measures would you support?

Yes  
No  
Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

**In agreeing a stronger emphasis on build out of developments, this is to be balanced with timely build out - having developers not developing land, whether because it would not satisfy their economic viability or because there is not enough skilled building labourers, is not in the interest of the public. Developers must commit to completion by a certain date as part of the consent process; there could be additional Infrastructure Levy charge for delay (given the on-going inconvenience to the local community and potential knock on effect of development delay); and Infrastructure Levy funds should not be delayed for any failure to build out.**

Pillar Two – Planning for Beautiful and Sustainable Places

Q15. What do you think about new development that has happened recently in your area?

- A. Not sure / indifferent
- B. Beautiful / well-designed
- C. Ugly / poorly-designed
- D. There hasn't been any
- E. **Other** (please specify):

**Some has been attractive though much has been uniform with emphasis on utilitarian 'boxes' and not on making a community. It has been noticeable that 'affordable' homes are allocated in the least desirable parts of developments - this is not considered fair and does not help with community development and cohesiveness.**

Q16. Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area?

- A. Less reliance on cars
- B. More green / open spaces
- C. Energy efficiency of new buildings
- D. More trees
- E. **Other** (please specify):

**All of the above are important and should be adopted as a matter of course to achieve the 2050 net zero target and to improve the quality of local environments. Additionally, modern technology for energy generation should be fitted as standard once it is tested and found reliable for homes and business units, with units using their own generated energy before drawing on the National Grid supply.**

Q17. Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

**It is not stated what revisions are proposed for the various guidance documents. In having national standards, whilst this would be a fallback for Government there will by necessity be no specific and therefore the value is questionable.**

**It is agreed there should be local input into local design guidance, and this must be given great weight in planning decisions so that Neighbourhood Plans and other local input can be seen to have been worth communities working to achieve. Where there is no local guidance, applicants should submit proposals having undertaken their own assessment of local vernacular, etc. to evidence why they have chosen to design as proposed and planning authorities should weigh this, together with National Design Guide, etc., in making a decision; so essentially retaining the existing system. This will ensure accountable decision making remains local rather than a national, centralised model.**

Q18. Do you agree that we should establish a new body to support design coding and building better places, and that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making?

Yes

No

**Not Sure**

Please provide supporting statement

Q19. Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England?

**Yes**

No

Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

Q20. Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty?

Yes

**No**

Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

**Beauty is an attractive criterion to encourage in future design; however, it is only one of many and to disproportionately weight that in determining consent would not be appropriate.**

Pillar Three – Planning for Infrastructure and Connected Places

Q21. When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it?

- A. More affordable housing
- B. More or better infrastructure (such as transport, schools, health)
- C. Design of new buildings
- D. More shops and/or employment space
- E. Green space
- F. Don't know
- G. Other (please specify):

Q22. (a) Should the Government replace the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold?

- Yes
- No**
- Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

**Whilst replacing S106 and CIL with one levy is reasonable as regards monies, communities can often benefit in other ways through existing S106s, e.g. gifted land - the proposal suggests this benefit would no longer be achievable.**

**As to only charging a Levy above a set threshold, this will not recognise that said development will still be adding to the local infrastructure pressure. It would be fairest and appropriate for all developments to contribute to local infrastructure pressure.**

Q22. (b) Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally?

- A. Nationally at a single rate
- B. Nationally at an area-specific rate
- C. **Locally**

Q22. (c) Should the Infrastructure Levy aim to capture the same amount of value overall, or more value, to support greater investment in infrastructure, affordable housing and local communities?

- A. Same amount overall
- B. **More value**
- C. Less value
- D. Not sure

Please provide supporting statement

**Nationally we are facing an infrastructure crisis so more money needs to be found to deliver this. Unless this additional money is secured from development it will need to be raised in other ways, e.g. local taxation.**

Q22. (d) Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area?

Yes

No

**Not Sure**

Please provide supporting statement

**There is a danger borrowing will cost local authorities additional monies - the levy rate must include cover for local authority borrowing costs. Additionally it will expose local authorities to a debt, especially if the development does not complete timely or in full - see response to Q14.**

Q23. Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

**Change through permitted development rights will more often than not increase value for the rights holder so it would be fair for that to be shared with the local community. Also, many permitted development changes will increase need for local infrastructure improvements so this pressure should be offset by a levy charge.**

Q24. (a) Do you agree that we should aim to secure at least the same amount of affordable housing under the Infrastructure Levy, and as much on-site affordable provision, as at present?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

**In addition to realising affordable housing through development, and as many developments do not provide enough, local authorities should be permitted to build more affordable or social housing as in past times. Local authorities should be allowed to build new development themselves for their communities using the Infrastructure Levy or borrowing from central funds, which are the cheapest rates.**

Q24. (b) Should affordable housing be secured as in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy, or as a 'right to purchase' at discounted rates for local authorities?

Yes

**No**

Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

**In accepting affordable housing as an in-kind payment of the Levy, and thereby bringing additional demand on local infrastructure, it reduces the Levy 'pot' to realise the necessary local infrastructure, and so will place more strain on the local environment.**

**Were the principle accepted, the rate needs to be carefully set so the balance is not tilted in favour of the developer over the community - when delivering such build, developers will benefit from economy of scale as already on-site whilst the local community would effectively be starting from scratch and have to bear a greater proportion of start-up costs.**

Q24. (c) If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

**Should there be an overpayment to the local authority and the developer accepted to pay that in the knowledge it was achieving its site viability sum, additional monies going to the local authority should be retained as these will circulate better in the local economy or act to compensate for the inconvenience to communities during delivery.**

**On the suggestion local authorities 'flip' affordable homes back to the market at times of a market fall, this suggests the local authority will be taking a loss and also not achieving necessary infrastructure delivery or much needed affordable housing provision; so it is not supported.**

Q24. (d) If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, are there additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

**Quality must be paramount for all future development - the situation of Persimmon Homes failing to meet standards must not be allowed to be repeated.**

**Requiring local authorities to be resourced and monitor development more closely allied with powers to enforce corrections/ improvements will ensure adherence to policy and Local Plans.**

**Building control regulations should be revised to specify new targets, particularly environmental standards (e.g. energy generation). This should apply to all new construction and not just affordable housing.**

Q25. Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Please provide supporting statement

**The Levy must, however, be spent on infrastructure improvements - as stated earlier, nationally we have an infrastructure crisis so using the money for offsetting Council Tax, loans or other would not be appropriate.**

Q25 (a) If 'yes', should an affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed?

Yes

No

**Not Sure**

Please provide supporting statement

26. Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010?

END