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EAST SUSSEX STRATEGIC PLANNING MEMBERS GROUP AGENDA

Thursday, 26 September 2013

at 3.30 p.m.
(please note revised time)

Refreshments will be available from 3.15 pm

Civic Community Hall, Vicarage Lane, Hailsham BN27 2AX

Authority: Members of the Group: Supporting Officers:
Wealden District Council
Eastbourne Borough Council
East Sussex County Council
Hastings Borough Council
Lewis District Council
Rother District Council
South Downs National Parks Authority

Clerk: WDC

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Apologies for Absence

3. Introductory Report: Co-operation on Strategic Planning Matters (Pages 1 - 4)

4. Local Plans - Position Report (Pages 5 - 8)
   Members and Officers from each Authority are invited to advise the latest position on their local plans and advise on any particular experience in relation to the Duty to Cooperate.

5. Housing Provisions - Issues and Potential Areas for Co-operation (Pages 9 - 14)
To discuss:

- The role of meeting and preferred frequency of meetings – The Memorandum of Understanding is attached for information.

- Options for co-operation with other Authorities – Attached is the request for inclusion from Brighton and Hove Council and an indicative plan of neighbouring authorities with which to co-operate.
Memorandum of Understanding

BETWEEN

MEMBERS OF

East Sussex Local Authorities

July 2013

Introduction

1. This is a Memorandum of Understanding between the local authorities with responsibility for planning which combine to form the administrative area of East Sussex whose administrative boundaries and responsibilities necessitate constructive, active and on-going co-operation in their planning and delivery of key strategic objectives principally for planning, economic development and regeneration matters, but also other relevant strategic issues that may be identified, not least in respect of Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011.

2. In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that local planning authorities will be expected to demonstrate evidence of having effectively co-operated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts when their Local Plans are submitted for examination. It goes on to state that co-operation should be a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking through to implementation (paragraph 181).

3. The Memorandum sets out a shared framework through the creation of a Joint Portfolio Holder Members Group to underpin that co-operation and collaboration, and, where necessary and / or appropriate, joint working between relevant parties on specific projects.

4. The Memorandum sets out matters of agreement, reflecting the spirit of co-operation between the parties to the memorandum. It is not legally binding nor is it intended to cover every detailed aspect of their relationships; rather it is a statement of principles to guide relations between the parties and provide a set of workable ground rules for early discussion and co-operation in addressing strategic and cross-boundary issues.

5. The memorandum does not override the statutory duties and powers of the individual parties.

Parties

6. The East Sussex Local Authorities with responsibility for planning are:
Purpose

7. The purpose of the Joint Portfolio Holder Members Group is to underpin effective co-operation and collaboration between the authorities and other bodies, including, but not limited to, those bodies prescribed in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 to help oversee and deliver the essential strategic planning, infrastructure and regeneration responsibilities of the constituent partners to provide optimal synergy of delivery across boundaries.

8. The Group is intended to further existing good practice in cross-boundary co-operation, to share understanding and promote priorities for investment to support the future development growth and the regeneration of the wider area.

9. A key area where the Group will add value will be to facilitate the early alignment of cross-boundary infrastructure issues and other strategic Local Plan matters which extend across the county and beyond.

10. This purpose will be achieved through two primary activities:
   i. To raise awareness in general about current and future activity and issues
   ii. To explore key matters of concern to understand how these are affecting development and / or delivery of plans

Limitations

11. The parties to the Memorandum recognise that there will not always be full agreement in respect of all the issues on which they have a duty to co-operate. For the avoidance of doubt this agreement shall not fetter the discretion of any of the parties in relation to any of their statutory powers or duties, and is not intended to be legally binding.

Roles and responsibilities

12. There are a number of roles and responsibilities which shall be carried equally by the member authorities of the Joint Portfolio Holder Members Group.
13. Signatory authorities to this Memorandum will
   i. Provide regular meetings and effective levels of member and officer representation so as to allow the participating authorities to interact effectively in the working and progress of the Joint Portfolio Holder Members Group;
   ii. Ensure that, where official representatives of the Group commit to the provision of manpower or other resources, or to undertake specific tasks, these are fulfilled within appropriate, agreed time scales;
   iii. Contribute, with the appropriate resources, to requests received from partners for responses and support on matters which impact across administrative boundaries, for example through joint consultation exercises, public exhibitions and delivery programmes;
   iv. Receive, through their official representatives, a range of information, presentations and reports, including any necessary formal reports to provide input for local decision making purposes, so that agreed programmes of work in relation to strategic planning, infrastructure and regeneration matters can be taken forward.

12. In addition to the shared roles and responsibilities set out above, each partner of the Joint Portfolio Holder Members Group will have discrete roles and responsibilities which reflect their own mandatory and discretionary duties and powers as they may relate to any project overseen by the Joint Portfolio Holder Members Group.

13. Each authority shall be represented by their Strategic Planning / Economic Development Portfolio Holder / Lead Member (or appointed equivalent) supported as appropriate by a suitably senior officer.

14. Meetings of the group shall be arranged on a quarterly basis with appropriate, but light touch arrangements made for calls for reports, agenda items and discussion papers. Meetings will briefly minuted, with action points.

Liaison with other relevant groups

15. Senior Officials of each party to this Memorandum will liaise formally through existing county-wide officer groups. As appropriate they will ensure that this Memorandum and the activities and interests of the Joint Portfolio Holder Members Group are formally discussed at those other meetings, with actions recorded in the minutes.

16. Informal liaison will continue between officers will continue to take place about the matters contained in this Memorandum.

Timescale

17. This Memorandum of Understanding will run for a period of three years from July 2013.
18. It will be reviewed annually by the parties to establish how effective it has been and whether any changes are required. The results of this review will be reported to the relevant internal body of each party and made publicly available.

**General**

19. The terms of the Memorandum may be amended at any time by agreement in writing between all the parties.

20. The parties agree that this Memorandum and any disputes arising under or in any way connected with the subject matter or formation of this Memorandum shall be governed by and construed in accordance with English law and to the exclusive jurisdiction of the English courts.

**Signatures**

For and on behalf of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East Sussex County Council</th>
<th>Dated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rother District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealden District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Downs National Park Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EAST SUSSEX STRATEGIC PLANNING MEMBERS GROUP

Notes of meeting held on Thursday, 26th September, 2013 in Civic Community Hall, Vicarage Lane, Hallsham BN27 2AX (3.30 p.m. to 5.20 p.m.)

PRESENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority:</th>
<th>Members:</th>
<th>Officers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealden District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Borough Council</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rother District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Downs National Park Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received from Councillor [name redacted] (Hastings Borough Council).

12/1 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

WDC [name redacted] welcomed participants to the meeting and checked that they were happy that she acted as host Chairman. All participants introduced themselves.

[Wealden Council Chief Executive] [name redacted] advised on the background to how and why the Group was formed, following discussions by the East Sussex Chief Executives Group. He emphasised that it did not affect the rights of Authorities to come to their own views on strategic planning matters, but was an opportunity for discussion and a shared understanding under the Duty to Cooperate. It was not a formal or a public meeting. All the papers had been prepared by the East Sussex Local Plan (formerly LDF) Managers Group.

12/2 INTRODUCTORY REPORT: CO-OPERATION ON STRATEGIC PLANNING MATTERS

The Group received and discussed a report which set out its purpose, in the context of the working on co-operation on strategic planning matters.
Members agreed that Planning Inspectors were increasingly challenging Local Authorities (LAs) to show how they were discharging the ‘Duty to Co-operate’. Co-operation was taking place between all Local Development Managers, and with Members and Officers on specific pieces of work, but it was agreed it was important to have an East Sussex cross-boundary group at Executive Member level to show a greater and closer political engagement with the process.

Co-operation would also be needed beyond East Sussex boundaries, and how this should work would be discussed later on the agenda. However, this Group provided an important way of starting to facilitate and demonstrate co-operation in a consistent way.

The Group agreed to:
1. Note the reasons for the formation of the Group, its function and co-operative approach; and
2. Ask the East Sussex Local Plan Managers Group to propose a programme of work to align with and support Local Plan timetables within East Sussex and its neighbouring authorities for consideration at the next meeting.

12/3 LOCAL PLANS - POSITION REPORT

Representatives from each Authority advised on the position on their local plans and their particular experience of being challenged on the Duty to Co-operate. A summary of the progress of Local Plans in East Sussex was set out in the papers.

It was recognised that most of the Authorities in East Sussex, with the exception of the South Downs National Park Authority, were in a similar position in terms of having adopted plans or proposing to be adopting Local Plans in 2013 and 2014, and could share support and co-operate in joint work or procuring specialist advice. At the same time it would be appropriate to look at the medium / long term plans and the reviews of the various plans.

Although LAs would not always agree on their approach, it was felt that there was strength in having an agreed position wherever possible on strategic planning matters. This was helpful for when challenged at Examination In Public or at appeal, and when lobbying Government. Paragraph 14 of the report set out a number of areas on which the Group could give early consideration and it was agreed that these could be pursued further.

It was suggested a good example for group work could be developing consistent AONB (Area of Outstanding National Beauty) Policies and Evidence to support them.

The Group agreed to:
1. Note the position of each Local Planning Authority in relation to progress on plan making; and
2. Consider the implications of the respective timetables for the priorities for future co-operation.
HOUSING PROVISIONS - ISSUES AND POTENTIAL AREAS FOR CO-OPERATION

A report was circulated on the importance of discussions on housing areas in relation to the ‘Duty to Co-operate’. The Group reviewed the actual and projected housing needs and provision for each Authority area as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

The question was asked whether it was possible that the Group could work on an agreed methodology for strategic housing market areas assessments.

It was suggested that a cross-boundary approach on housing numbers was imperative, given the challenges for LAs, but it was ‘how’ this might be done that would be most challenging. It was suggested that Officers could develop some potential options for a discussion to take place at the next meeting.

It was recognised that any discussion of housing numbers and location had to take into account the wider requirements of infrastructure, including roads, jobs, schools, hospital, and economic impacts. The South East Plan, which was no longer in place, had had positive and negative aspects for different authorities, but had given a more rounded understanding of the potential ‘carrying capacity’ of the area. It was felt that the Group could work on building a similar shared understanding of local constraint, capacity and infrastructure needs.

The Group agreed to:
1. Note the substantial difficulties in fully meeting housing needs within the County and the risks these create for the future adoption of Local Plans; and
2. Ask the respective Local Planning Authorities (LPAs), through the Local Plan Managers Group, to give further consideration to, if and how a cross-boundary approach may assist the LPAs in ensuring that a sustainable level of development is planned for.

FUNDING AND DELIVERY OF STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE

The Group discussed the relationships between LAs in the funding and delivery of infrastructure, including Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

County Officers and Members were thanked for their work with District LAs on their Infrastructure Delivery Plans (IDP). It would be very important for LAs to come to a shared understanding of ranked priorities for the area to be included in the Plan, and of their interdependencies and appropriate sequence. This would strengthen any bids for additional funding to meet the shortfall in infrastructure funding. The LEP (Local Enterprise Partnership) would be an important partner in this process. It was suggested that developing a shared view could be a key task for this Group. This could include seeking a common approach by the District Councils as the Charging Authorities for CIL and on ‘Regulation 123 lists’.

Agreed that the Group -
1. Note the relationship in the funding and delivery of infrastructure across the County;
2. Work with the County Council and other relevant infrastructure providers to
identify and prioritise the delivery of strategic infrastructure across the County; and
3. Work together to identify opportunities for collaborative bids for funding.

12/6

FUTURE MEETINGS - DISCUSSION

The Group endorsed its Memorandum of Understanding. The South Downs National Park Authority representatives advised that they had not been party to the original development of the document, but were happy with the contents.

The Group noted the request from Brighton and Hove Unitary Authority to be part of the Group. It was agreed it was very important for there to be wider collaboration beyond the boundaries of East Sussex, however there was a potential case for each of the neighbouring authorities to be invited and that would make the Group too unwieldy. In addition, it was recognised that on some issues co-operation would need to go beyond even these Authorities. Instead it was suggested that neighbouring authorities should be invited to attend specific meetings, relevant to the particular topic of the meeting.

It had been agreed under Note 13/2 that a work programme for the Group would be developed by the Local Development Managers Group and this could identify the necessary frequency and attendees of each meeting.

[Redacted] (ESCC) highlighted the need for wider co-operation on all aspects of infrastructure and transport, and advised that there was a meeting hosted by BT on infrastructure for Openreach broadband taking place at Stansted Airport on 14th October and extended an invitation to Portfolio Holders and Officers to attend.
EAST SUSSEX STRATEGIC PLANNING MEMBERS GROUP AGENDA

Wednesday, 2 April 2014

at 2.00 p.m.
(Refreshments will be available from 1.45 pm)

Civic Community Hall, Vicarage Lane, Hailsham BN27 2AX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority:</th>
<th>Members of the Group:</th>
<th>Supporting Officers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealden District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rother District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Downs National Park Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Attendees: Representatives of Brighton and Hove City Council have been invited to attend the meeting.

Clerk: WDC

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Apologies for Absence
3. Notes of the Last Meeting (Pages 1 - 4)
4. Presentation on East Sussex Councils ‘Open for Growth’ Peer Challenge (Pages 5 - 14)
5. Housing Provisions - Future Co-operation for Consideration of Growth (Pages 15 - 20)
6. Identification and Delivery of Strategic Infrastructure (Pages 21 - 26)

8. Date of Next Meeting and Work Programme (Pages 29 - 54)

Attached is the Work Programme report previously circulated to the Group and a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding. The Group is invited to agree a date for the next meeting.
EAST SUSSEX STRATEGIC PLANNING MEMBERS GROUP

Notes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 2nd April, 2014 in Civic Community Hall, Vicarage Lane, Hailsham BN27 2AX (2.00 p.m. to 3.43 p.m.).

PRESENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Members of the Group</th>
<th>Supporting Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealden District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rother District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Downs National Park Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Attendees: [Redacted] of Brighton and Hove City Council also attended the meeting.

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received from Councillors [Redacted] (Hastings Borough Council) and [Redacted] (Rother District Council).

14/1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

WDC [Redacted] welcomed participants to the meeting and in particular Cllr [Redacted] and [Redacted] from Brighton and Hove City Council. It had been agreed at the last meeting that representatives of different neighbouring authorities would be invited to each meeting, depending on the topic to be discussed, to enable wider co-operation, and Brighton and Hove was the first Authority to be invited.

It was noted that [Redacted] (Wealden District Council) would be attending for Item 4 (Minute 14/3), as he was a lead officer on the Peer Challenge.

SPMG13
NOTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The notes of the meeting held on 26th September 2013 were agreed.

PRESENTATION ON EAST SUSSEX COUNCILS 'OPEN FOR GROWTH' PEER CHALLENGE

(Wealden District Council) gave a presentation on the inspectors’ high-level findings from the ‘Open for Growth’ Peer Challenge. It was noted that a draft report from the inspection would be made available for comments, before it was published in its final format. The existence of the Members Group and co-operation across Authorities was in particular praised by the Inspectors, and it was noted that it was ahead of some other areas.

RDC highlighted that the presentation had focused in particular on the findings of the peer review in relation to the Duty to Co-operate, but it also raised a number of points in relation to economic development. The review had recognised that there were commonalities and differences across the Districts and the County Council, and the economic strategies in each area were addressing particular local opportunities and working with different sectors. For example, in relation to the Education Sector, it would be important to link the development of skills to economic development needs. It was confirmed that East Sussex County Council would be bringing forward a skills programme in May / June 2014, drawing upon best practice from other areas of the Country, and linked to European funding for 2015-2020. This was currently being consulted upon, with a particular focus on working with local businesses.

The minutes of this group had to date not been published to a wider audience, but it would be important for authorities to provide evidence to inspectors of the way in which they were co-operating. To this end, the Group agreed that the minutes of the meeting could be made public. The meetings and agenda papers would in general remain private for the time being to allow a freedom of discussion required to progress important issues. A report of this meetings activities would be made to the East Sussex Leaders’ Group and this also provided an important link into the LEP.

ESCC advised that a press release would be issued today to confirm that a bid for a local growth fund of around £149m (2015-2022) had been successful, which would enable leverage of further funding of £450m from public and private sector. This was a significant fund for Team East Sussex to direct in relation to local growth.

WDC The Group thanked for his presentation and noted the key matters raised from the Investment (Open for Growth) Peer Challenge.

HOUSING PROVISIONS - FUTURE CO-OPERATION FOR CONSIDERATION OF GROWTH

RDC presented a report on behalf of Local Plan Managers on proposals for co-operation between planning authorities on housing provision,
to provide for sustainable growth, and reduce the risk of local plans being found unsound. The Chair invited Authorities to advise on their progress in relation to plans for housing growth and to discuss the proposals for a co-ordinated approach.

It was recognised that the report expressed a sound principle of all local authorities co-ordinating future housing where possible. The fact that local plans were not all at the same stage and time frame made retaining a consistency of approach challenging. The recommendations of the report were focused on developing a mechanism for early engagement with all relevant authorities on Housing Market Assessments and, providing a consistency of boundaries and approach.

It was agreed that it was good for Authorities to consider housing and regeneration growth together, although historically the two have dealt with as separate issues.

Representatives of Brighton and Hove Council advised on its position in relation to the Duty to Cooperate. Inspectors had recognised that the Council had made every effort to work with other authorities to meet housing need, but neighbouring authorities had not been able to assist. The inspectors had stated that the Council must work with and put pressure on neighbouring authorities to meet this need. The implications were that in future both receptor and exporting authorities would have difficulty getting local plans through inspections unless these were met. A copy of the Inspector’s letter was circulated to the Group for information.

The Group noted that there were implications of the London Local Plan for South East authorities. It was concerning that London would not be meeting a significant part of its identified housing need and had made assumptions in relation to this being met by neighbouring authorities, which would have an impact on the housing market in the whole of the South East. London was not covered by the Duty to Cooperate, and it was important to establish a way in which the implications for the South East could be taken into account.

It was agreed that a letter should sent to the Central London Authority (CLA) to argue for South East Authorities to have the opportunity to make representations in relation to London Plan and its implications for infrastructure requirements. It was suggested that this letter could be co-ordinated with Authorities in the Members Strategic Planning Groups in Coastal East Sussex, Mid-Sussex and Surrey.

The Group agreed:

1. To note the progress of Local Plans, on-going work in and around the County in relation to housing needs and the new National Planning Practice Guidance as it relates to housing;

2. To urge the local planning authorities in East Sussex (including the South Downs National Park Authority) to:

   a) agree the principle of linked assessments of housing and employment
needs in future reviews for their market areas;

b) establish formal arrangements between all councils in relation to cooperation on the early definition of housing market areas within or overlapping the county;

c) ensure that the housing monitoring/reporting framework for housing market indicators is robust in line with NPPG

3. To write a joint letter to the Central London Authority (CLA), in conjunction with the strategic planning groups in Coastal West Sussex, Mid-Sussex and Surrey, arguing for the opportunity to make representations in relation to the London plan and for its implications for housing growth and infrastructure in the South East to be taken into account.

14/5. IDENTIFICATION AND DELIVERY OF STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE

WDC presented a report on behalf of Local Plan Managers setting out progress in relation to the infrastructure workstream agreed as part of the work programme.

It was recognised that each local plan had different infrastructure requirements and priorities. These had been approved by inspectors, and it was not intended to standardise them.

However, it was important to have a way of identifying the highest priorities of all the infrastructure projects. The proposal was to do this through the development of a countywide strategic infrastructure delivery plan (IDP). To develop the plan it would be important to define what was a significant impact and have agreed criteria. Examples of criteria which could be considered were set out in the report. However, it was intended to bring a further report back to a future meeting of this Group to agree the infrastructure criteria for the new strategic IDP, if agreed.

The Group discussed and endorsed this proposal. It was noted that the term ‘desirable’ infrastructure was currently used within IDPs, and it was suggested that this could be misleading in suggesting a lower priority. WDC explained that the term ‘desirable’ had been used in IDPs for infrastructure that was required but not critical to immediate timescales in the context of establishing which infrastructure could be funded through CIL and which could not. IDPs were now having a wider role, and therefore would need to be developed and adapted for this purpose, with appropriate terminology. It was also noted that there could be a cumulative effect of development, where supporting infrastructure could move through stages from desirable to critical very quickly and this must be taken into account in any common approach.

Some examples of key priorities were discussed. The improvements to the A27 were a priority for the LEP and essential to support growth for Eastbourne and Wealden, and therefore would be a high priority in future IDPs. It was noted that Wealden Council had been working with East Sussex on the ‘road map’, to map highway requirements for planned developments, looking at both the finance currently available and then looking at identifying other funding
sources. This had demonstrated a number of funding gaps, and supported the need for a strategic approach to infrastructure development.

In addition, communication between Authorities, wider than county boundaries, would be critical for cross-border development.

Overall it was agreed that the new strategic IDP proposed sat squarely within the purpose of the Group. Identifying critical infrastructure requirements, would greatly assist each Authority’s planning and bidding process and the countywide IDP would give the Group a real focus, sitting above the individual Authority plans.

The Group agreed:
1. To note the findings of the review of Infrastructure Delivery Plans;
2. To support the creation of a County Wide Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan; and
3. To agree to a further report on the definition of Strategic Infrastructure in consultation with stakeholders.

14/6. DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMON EVIDENCE BASE AND POLICY DIRECTION IN RELATION TO TOPIC-BASED POLICIES

presented the report on behalf of the Local Plan Managers Group on the development of a common approach to policy direction. The report provided an update on progress to date. It was noted that much of the discussion around Duty to Co-operate requirements focused on housing areas and development needs, but that inspectors were increasingly also looking for joint work on areas of common policy concern.

The report highlighted four main areas of focus for development of common policy:
- Development in the High Weald AONB
- Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure
- Equestrian Development
- Older Persons Housing/Tourism/Sustainable Transport/Energy Developments/Community Facilities

It was recognised that some of these policies would be applicable to only a few authorities, whereas others would involve all. It was felt there was merit in the Group working together in relation to a common approach in these areas. Regular reports would come back to future meetings on the work being undertaken, and there could be other policy areas where further co-operation would be important.

Brighton and Hove advised that they were looking at City Status, and it was suggested that this could be an issue which would need to be taken into account in a number of policy areas, in terms of regional impact.

Representatives from the South Downs National Park Authority highlighted that the Authority supported the work in developing common policies, but that it would not always be able to be part of this as it had to have joint policies
across two other County areas as well. The Group confirmed that this position was understood.

It was agreed that the work on common policies was a very important area and should continue as presented.

The Group agreed:
To note the progress of work on the development of a common evidence base and policy direction for local plans.

14/7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING AND WORK PROGRAMME

The Group noted the Work Programme attached, which had been agreed by Authorities since the last meeting.

A copy of the Memorandum of Understanding was also attached and it was agreed that arrangements would be made to have this formally signed.

The Chair thanked all Authorities for attending, in particular representatives of Brighton and Hove City Council.

It was agreed that the next meeting should look to take place at the end of July if possible, and potential dates would be circulated.

Host Chair

WDC
EAST SUSSEX STRATEGIC PLANNING MEMBERS GROUP AGENDA
Monday, 21 July 2014

at 3.30 p.m.
(Refreshments will be available from 3.15 pm)

Civic Community Hall, Vicarage Lane, Hailsham BN27 2AX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority:</th>
<th>Members of the Group:</th>
<th>Supporting Officers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealden District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rother District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Downs National Parks Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WDC
1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Apologies for Absence
3. Notes of the Last Meeting (Pages 1 - 6)
4. Definition of Strategic Infrastructure (Pages 7 - 26)
5. Housing Provisions - Update (Pages 27 - 32)
6. Development of a common evidence base and policy direction in relation to topic-based policies (Pages 33 - 36)
7. Date of Next Meeting and Work Programme (Pages 37 - 42)
The date of the next meeting to be agreed. Attached for information is the Work Programme previously agreed by Group.
EAST SUSSEX STRATEGIC PLANNING MEMBERS GROUP

Notes of the meeting held on Monday, 21st July, 2014 in Civic Community Hall, Vicarage Lane, Hailsham BN27 2AX (3.30 p.m. to 4.50 p.m.).

PRESENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority:</th>
<th>Members of the Group:</th>
<th>Supporting Officers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealden District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rother District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Downs National Park Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Attendees: [Redacted] of Brighton and Hove City Council also attended the meeting.

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received from [Redacted].

14/8. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

WDC [Redacted] welcomed participants to the meeting. She emphasised the importance of this Group and working together for meeting Duty to Cooperate requirements, in particular in the light of the emphasis placed on this in the Examination in Public for the Wealden Strategic Sites Local Plan she had attended in the last few days.

14/9. NOTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The notes of the meeting held on 2nd April 2014 were agreed subject to a correction to Minute 14/3 (Paragraph 4) to state that a bid had been ‘submitted’ by Team East Sussex for the local growth fund. [Redacted] confirmed that a proportion of the funds bid for had been achieved.
14/10. **HOUSING PROVISIONS – UPDATE**

RDC presented the report updating the Group on the workstream on planning for sustainable housing growth areas across the County, and including information on recent planning inspectorate decisions in this area and potential implications.

It was noted that since the agreement at the last meeting to work together wherever possible in relation to housing assessments, there had been several examples of joint work. Wealden Council had commissioned GVA to undertake a strategic housing market assessment to its review of its Core Strategy, and given assurances that the other Planning Authorities would be engaged as part of the process, and this was welcomed. Lewes Council in partnership with Coast West Sussex Authorities and Brighton and Hove City Council had published its housing development needs assessment.

The report provided an update for each Authority in relation their progress on local plans and housing delivery. RDC advised that since the report had been written the Inspector on Rother’s Local Plan Strategy had found it sound, subject to minor amendments. SDNPA in addition provided an update in relation to the National Park Authority. In particular, it had been advised that the Authority would have to have a Housing Market Assessment in relation to each area within its area that cross another Local Planning Authority, and this was a significant change.

It was noted that Authorities were being required to keep up to date their estimates of overall housing need, normally through annual monitoring and based on the NPPG. However, recent case law showed that housing assessments were not rendered outdated automatically when new PPG was issued. In addition, Inspectors had accepted that an Authority did not have to show how it would meet all its assessed housing need, if there were recognised constraints for not doing so.

As agreed at the last meeting, a letter had been sent to the Greater London Authority, in conjunction with the Gatwick Diamond Local Authorities Group asking for an opportunity to input to the London Plan, due to concerns that south east authorities would be expected to take significant housing numbers from London without consultation. SDNPA (Brighton and Hove) advised that Brighton had also written independently. A response had been received to the letter inviting a representative to the hearing sessions. An update would come back to this Group in due course on any progress.

**The Group agreed to:**
1. Note the progress in relation to local plans and related housing work, as well as on housing delivery;
2. Request a future report on the implementations of housing projections when these are published; and
3. Note the implications of the key legal judgements referred to in the Report.

14/11. **DEFINITION OF STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

WDC introduced the report concerning the workstream on
strategic infrastructure. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan Group had put together a Discussion Paper to go out to providers and other stakeholders on the definition of strategic infrastructure.

The proposed Discussion Paper was attached at Appendix A of the report, and included a brief introduction to the Duty to Cooperate and why it was important to define ‘strategic infrastructure’. The Paper set out a number of questions regarding criteria to be used to enable an assessment of ‘significant impact’ for given priority to specific infrastructure. The Paper made it clear that this was not about consulting on funding or about specific schemes at this stage. In addition to feedback via the Discussion Paper, a workshop would be offered to providers in September 2014. The intention was that the Infrastructure Delivery Group would then review the feedback received and draw up a definition to be considered at the next meeting of this Group in November.

The Group gave consideration to the list of providers to be consulted, as set out at Appendix B. It was agreed that the list of consultees should be updated to include Team East Sussex and telecommunications providers. There was a discussion on whether the public and local communities should also be consulted at this stage. The majority view was that it was important not to dilute the response needed from providers, however Councils could individually advise their residents that the consultation was taking place via websites or newsletters, should they wish to do so.

The question was raised as to why the Local Nature Partnership was relatively unknown. It was noted that this was a body that was required to be consulted under the Local Plan process. **[redacted]** confirmed that he sat on this body but that it was only just beginning locally, only having met three times, but that it would play a key role in giving a different perspective to development.

The Group agreed to:

1. Agree the proposed discussion paper (as set out at Report Appendix A);
2. Agree the list of key stakeholders (as set out in Report Appendix B), subject to the inclusion of Team East Sussex and representatives of the telecommunications industry; and
3. Agree the arrangements of consultation set out in the Report.

14/12. DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMON EVIDENCE BASE AND POLICY DIRECTION IN RELATION TO TOPIC-BASED POLICIES

**ESCC** introduced the report providing an update on the work on the development of a common evidence base and policy direction for local plans.

The report set out the work was progressing in the areas of a) development in the High Weald AONB, b) Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure, c) sustainable transport, e) renewable energy, f) community facilities, g) older persons housing, and h) tourism facilities and equestrian development. In some cases a single officer was leading on the work in dialogue with representatives from other Authorities, in other cases the work was being carried out via a small working group.

**[redacted]** advised that the key findings had not yet come out of the
workstreams and he hoped to bring a fuller update to the next meeting.

The Group agreed to:
1. Note the progress of work on the development of a common evidence base and policy direction for local plans.

14/13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING AND WORK PROGRAMME

The agreed Work Programme was attached for information. It was agreed that in line with this the next meeting would take place in November 2014.

A discussion took place as to the fact the papers for the meeting were marked as ‘not for publication’. It was noted that Authorities were free to publish the minutes of the meetings and the work programme, as this had been agreed by the Group and was part of establishing evidence of compliance with Duty to Cooperate requirements for examinations. The agendas and meetings remained ‘not for publication’ to enable the meeting to have working discussions on issues without being held in public.

WDC

Chairman
EAST SUSSEX STRATEGIC PLANNING MEMBERS GROUP AGENDA

Monday, 8 December 2014

at 1.00 p.m.

Civic Community Hall, Vicarage Lane, Hailsham BN27 2AX

(Coffee and Mince pies will be available at the start of the meeting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority:</th>
<th>Members of the Group:</th>
<th>Supporting Officers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealden District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rother District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Downs National Park Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clerk: WDC

Also attending – Brighton and Hove City Council.

1. Welcome WDC
2. Apologies for Absence
3. Notes of the Last Meeting (Pages 1 - 4)
4. Development of a Common Evidence Base and Policy Direction in Relation to Topic-Based Policies LDC (Pages 5 - 10)
5. Housing Update RDC (Pages 11 - 20)

SPMG24
6. Development of the Strategic Infrastructure Plan (Pages 21 - 40)

7. Wealden District Council Affordable Housing Delivery Local Plan (Pages 41 - 44)

8. Date of Next Meeting and Work Programme (Pages 45 - 50)
   To agree the date of the next meeting, based on the work outstanding from the agreed work programme (attached).
EAST SUSSEX STRATEGIC PLANNING MEMBERS GROUP

Notes of the meeting held on Monday, 8th December, 2014 in Civic Community Hall, Vicarage Lane, Hailsham BN27 2AX (1.00 p.m. to 2.32 p.m.)

PRESENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority:</th>
<th>Members of the Group:</th>
<th>Supporting Officers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealden District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rother District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Attendees: and of Brighton and Hove City Council.

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received from , (Eastbourne), and (South Downs), and (Wealden).

14/14. WELCOME

welcomed participants to the meeting. WDC

14/15. NOTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The notes of the meeting held on 21 July 2014 were agreed.

14/16. DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMON EVIDENCE BASE AND POLICY DIRECTION IN RELATION TO TOPIC-BASED POLICIES

presented the progress report on the common policy issues work programme. It was noted that none of the work areas had yet reached final recommendations. highlighted the progress on each:

- Development in the High Weald AONB – guidance notes had been produced on a range of relevant matters.
- Biodiversity / Green Infrastructure – no further progress had been made since the production of a Green Infrastructure Study, but East Sussex was continued to work with individual authorities on green infrastructure requirements in relation to individual site allocations in local plans.
- Renewable Energy – due to the breadth of subject matter, the group had sub-divided the work into solar energy, wind energy and other renewable
energy, and was producing guidance / issues papers on all areas.

- **Community Facilities** – the initial conclusion had been that as each Authority’s Core Strategy included a different definition, it would not be possible to come to a common policy on this issue.

- **Older People’s Housing** – work to date had shown that each Authority was likely to have a separate policy in relation to Older People’s housing. The County Council had provided detailed demand mapping work to each District / Borough and the National Park Authority, which would be required as an evidence base if Authorities wished to make accessible and adaptable housing a requirement of planning applications.

- **Tourism Facilities** – the initial scoping work had finished and existing policies and evidence base were identified. A meeting would be held early 2015 for all Authorities to review the findings and agree a way forward.

- **Equestrian Development** – the work had shown that most Authorities’ policies were aligned, but with some additional work required on interpretations of ‘small scale’ development, issues of adequate pasture, and policies for domestic and commercial properties.

LDC confirmed that a further update and recommendations would be brought to a future meeting.

Members of the group confirmed that although this work was taking time, it had been worthwhile for building understanding of different Authorities’ approaches, for highlighting key issues across the County, and for assisting individual authorities to identify where their own evidence base should be strengthened.

The Group agreed to note the progress of the work on the development of a common evidence base and policy direction for local plans.

**14/17. HOUSING UPDATE**

LDC introduced the report on housing provision issues across the wider region, and on the delivery of housing locally.

The Group discussed the representations being made to the Greater London Authority on the London Infrastructure Plan. Two letters had been written from the Group, highlighting the need for south east authorities to have an input into future plans for housing in the region, resulting from the Local Plan. WDC had attended a meeting of South East England Councils (SEEC) and was on a task and finish group, and offered to circulate to other members of this group, the terms of reference. The intention was to present the task and finish group’s recommendations to the SEEC Board in March 2015.

In addition, there was an emerging officer group, and it was agreed it would be helpful for this to include an officer from one of the East Sussex Authorities. BHCC advised that Brighton and Hove Council, would be happy to assist with this matter. He confirmed that the Council was facing similar issues, with the requirement from inspectors to find additional housing land, whilst being prevented from using particular areas of land for development such as protected greenbelt. This was also an issue being raised by outer London boroughs, such as Bromley and Croydon. He confirmed that the Greater Brighton partnership group were in discussions with several
London Boroughs on these issues.

The Group agreed that it was important to work together to look at the issue, and that co-operation continued to be key.

The Group went on to discuss where different Authorities were with delivery of housing. It was recognised that there were housing targets in each of the respective local plans, with different start and end dates. [Redacted] tabled a copy of a graph showing projected housing completions across East Sussex, and by authority area, up to 2027. The Group highlighted that completions would depend not only on land availability, but also whether developers could deliver that level of development, and funding availability, but this was not recognised by Inspectors for target setting. The projections would change when the South Downs National Park Authority's count was included, but provided a useful background to strategic infrastructure plans.

It was noted that Authorities were treating ‘windfall’ development in different ways, as to whether it counted against housing requirements. This was particularly difficult for Authorities without an adopted Core Strategy or Local Plan.

Of all the Authorities in East Sussex, Wealden District Council was the only one with a requirement for an early review of housing needs. [Redacted] advised on its work on strategic housing market assessments, in liaison with other Authorities. She confirmed that the majority of Wealden's strategic site allocations already had consents, but were not yet built out.

Both Eastbourne and Brighton and Hove Council's highlighted the difficulties they had with land banks being held and not released by owners for development, due to lower land values, and that this could have an effect on housing delivery.

It was noted that the Government was due to issue information on commuting flows into the area, and this would have an impact on the assessment of housing market areas.

The Group agreed to:
1) Note and endorse the action taken in response to the emerging London Infrastructure Plan; and
2) Note the respective Local Plan Housing targets and the anticipated housing trajectories.

14/18. DEVELOPMENT OF THE STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN

[Redacted] presented a report summarising the responses to the Group's consultation regarding the definition of 'strategic' or 'significant', in relation to infrastructure planning.

The Group had agreed a discussion paper for consultation in July 2014, and this had been sent to all infrastructure providers and authorities for comment by the end of October, with a supporting workshop held on 30 September. The report summarised the responses received, and concluded that the same
criteria of ‘significant’ would not fit all organisations. Based on the responses, it was recommended that an approach was followed which acknowledged where issues were common and where the infrastructure required would support the development strategies of two or more areas it was to be defined as significant, taking into account a checklist of seven criteria set out at paragraph 6 of the report.

The next stage would be to create a draft Infrastructure plan, in consultation with all East Sussex Authorities and wider, and in discussion with all the infrastructure providers. It was recognised that identifying the resources for infrastructure development would be challenging. The intention was to produce the draft plan within 6 months.

ESCC highlighted the key role that the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) provided to infrastructure development, and both he and WDC provided a link to the LEPs from this Group. It would be important to take into account infrastructure needs across borders. WDC advised that early indications were that all the major parties for the General Election were supporting the continuation of LEPs, although funding streams could well change.

WDC advised that Wealden District Members were working with the Clinical Commissioning Groups regarding infrastructure needs and delivery, there was scope for employment land trajectory work, and there had been recent meetings between the Planning Managers and Economic Development Officers Group, and all this would contribute to the development of the draft infrastructure plan.

It was agreed that this was a really useful piece of work.

**The Group agreed to:**
1) Note the consultation responses;
2) Agree the proposal for the definition of significant impact; and
3) Agreed the arrangements for the development of the Strategic Infrastructure Plan.

**14/19. WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL AFFORDABLE HOUSING DELIVERY LOCAL PLAN**

Members of the Group were invited to comment, without prejudice, on Wealden District Council’s Proposed Submission Affordable Housing Delivery Local Plan.

It was noted that this had been developed as a single policy local plan, due to a delay in the Council’s Strategic Sites Local Plan. It was recognised that the Government guidance issued in the last few days, might require the Council to go out for a further round of consultation.

The Group discussed the key questions raised for Wealden in relation to affordable housing thresholds, differing thresholds for urban and rural areas, and options for taking a commuted sum in place of provision from developers.

RDC highlighted similarities and differences for Rother District
Council’s approach.

It was suggested that a future area of joint work for this Group could be to look at policies on negotiating commuted sums methodology and calculations.

It was asked if social providers might prefer social rented provision. [Masked] advised that each calculation would be on a site by site basis on what was needed. The Council was achieving above 35% affordable housing on some existing sites, and the CIL viability would take into account higher levels. The key was to future-proof the policy, and therefore achieve affordable housing, but with a flexible approach.

The Group agreed to note the policy contained within the Wealden District Proposed Submission Affordable Housing Delivery Local Plan for comment.

14/20. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING AND WORK PROGRAMME**

It was agreed that the next meeting would be held in March, on a date to be identified.

The Local Plan Managers Group would update the Work Programme ahead of the next meeting, to include revised target dates for each of the workstreams.

WDC [Masked] Chairman
EAST SUSSEX STRATEGIC PLANNING MEMBERS GROUP AGENDA

Tuesday, 23 February 2016

at 10.00 a.m.
(Refreshments will be available from 9.45 am)

Conference Room Vicarage Lane, Hailsham BN27 2AX (Please report to Main Reception)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority:</th>
<th>Members of the Group:</th>
<th>Supporting Officers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealden District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rother District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Downs National Park Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also attending –

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brighton and Hove City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge Wells Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clerk: WDC

1. Welcome
2. Apologies for Absence
3. Notes of the Last Meeting (Pages 3 - 8)
4. Wealden Local Plan Issues, Options and Recommendations
   Presentation (to follow) will include:
   Content of Plan (brief summary)
Responses to cross boundary strategic matters
Key strategic issues
Next Steps (including timetable)

5. Discussion on key issues and next steps (Wealden Local Plan Issues, Options and Recommendations Presentation)

6. Oral update and discussion on London development matters
   **Covering:**
   The context in which Wealden District attends
   Latest information
   How to get involved

7. Any Other Relevant Business (AORB)

8. Date of Next Meeting (Pages 9 - 14)
   To agree when the Group wishes to hold its next meeting.
Wealden Local Plan and Hailsham Area Action Plan

East Sussex Strategic Planning Members Group

23rd February 2016
Introduction to the Local Plans

• Required by Core Strategy (Policy WCS1)
• Wealden Local Plan (WLP) - Strategic and local policies covering all policy requirements, including site allocations
• Hailsham Area Action Plan (HAAP) – Detailed policies including allocations and town centre. Includes the Hailsham, Arlington and Polegate area
• When adopted supersedes Core Strategy and 1998 Local Plan
• Must meet legal requirements and ‘tests of soundness’
Stages of Local Plan Production

1. Publication of Issues, Options and Recommendations for consultation
   - October to December 2015

2. Publication of Proposed Submission Document for representations
   - November to December 2016

3. Submission of Local Plan
   - April/May 2017

4. Examination
   - Legal compliance
   - Soundness
   - Proposed modifications
     - Assessments
     - Consultation

5. Final Report

6. Adoption by the Council
   - To be determined by Planning Inspectorate

Wealden District Council
Housing Market Area

* The draft Tunbridge Wells and Sevenoaks HMA includes the northern part of Wealden District.

© Crown Copyright and database right 2015. Ordnance Survey 100018602
Overall Growth

Starting point **Objectively Assessed Housing Need**
= 735 dwellings per annum

Proposal = 19,950 dwellings from 2013 to 2037
which is 832 dwellings per annum (including 7,200 approved and allocated under the current plan)

Results in some 12,750 dwellings in addition to what is already expected

On this basis we are accommodating 2,300 dwellings on behalf of Eastbourne
Vision and Strategy

- Significant housing and employment growth around the existing areas of south Wealden
- Protection of Ashdown Forest and South Downs National Park
- Growth within villages and towns, including settlements within the AONB
- Retail opportunities to significantly expand
- Road and rail improvements
- Growing hi-tech sector and encourage new businesses
- Increase workplace wages and improve skills
- Improvements to leisure facilities
Delivery of growth

Preferred Options for Testing

• 9380 additional dwellings within and around Hailsham
• 1000 additional dwellings in Polegate (including 700 already allocated within the Core Strategy)
• 800 additional dwellings in Heathfield
• 500 houses within Stone Cross (including 44 allocated to Stone Cross in the Core Strategy)
• Housing allocated in villages relating to sustainability and size
• Limited development to Uckfield and Crowborough
• Increase to allocation at the edge of Tunbridge Wells
Infrastructure

- A27 improvements part of the strategy
- Strategy conditional upon increase in waste water capacity in South Wealden
- Considering significant improvement to leisure
- Education, roads, health care facilities will need to be identified and delivered
- Green infrastructure as well as other more local infrastructure will also be required
Other Policies

- Town and Village Centres
- Gypsies and Travellers
- Design
- Natural Environment
- Landscape
- Development in the Countryside
- Affordable Housing
- Housing
- Historic Environment
Responses

2025 responses received from 413 sources
8 Local Authority Responses
Also responses from
- Environment Agency
- Historic England
- Natural England
- Highways England
- CCGs
Summaries - LAs

Comments regarding the HMA –

• Eastbourne BC (EBC) request greater level of detail in line with Eastbourne SHMA
• Tunbridge Wells (TW) wish to treated in a similar manner to Eastbourne due to established link between North Wealden and Tunbridge Wells
• Lewes District (LD) acknowledges that there is an overlap with housing market areas to the east of the Sussex Coast Market area
• Rother District (RD) does not regard Rother as part of the housing market area
Meeting Housing Needs

• EBC welcomes that WDC is seeking to meet part of its needs but requests WDC to consider more housing to meet EB shortfall in full

• TW cannot currently state whether it can meet its own need but wishes WDC to be flexible within the north of the district if TW are unable to meet needs

• LDC acknowledge that the FOAHN cannot be met within the District but considers that the preferred location of meeting that need is elsewhere

• RDC is unclear as to why WDC are seeking to meet some need from EB but not from RD
Economy

- The economic relationship between WD and EB is acknowledged by EB and seek to undertake work on this basis
- The strategic tourism strategy also welcomed by EB
- RDC concerned regarding the impact of job provision on car based commuting on the A27/A259. Further discussions requested
- ESCC provided detailed comments on the economy
Infrastructure

- A27 improvements acknowledged and LDC, EBC and RDC and all authorities wishing to work together
- No specific comments regarding the SRN from Highways England
- ESCC committed to work with WDC on transport requirements, identifying the importance of transport infrastructure on the strategy within the Plan
- Some cross boundary matters acknowledged in terms of education from ESCC
- CCGs commented on WDC facilities only

Wealden District Council
Environment

- Both LDC and TWBC raise significant concerns regarding the Ashdown Forest policy to mitigate development on the SPA.
- EBC, ESCC and NE seek clarification on certain environmental matters including matters regarding SSSIs. Green Infrastructure matters also raised.
- Flood risk matters are raised by both EBC and ESCC as well as EA.
- EBC consider coalescence of settlements an environmental constraint.
Other matters

• Non cross boundary strategic matters provided by both ESCC and LDC, which will be incorporated where appropriate
• NE also provided detailed responses including impact of infrastructure on the environment
• CCGs have asked for a forum where ‘housing departments’ of Boroughs and Districts come together to discuss mutual interest – helpful addition to joint planning mechanisms for health and social care
Key Issues

- HMA
- Road infrastructure
- Flood risk
- The economy
- Environmental issues
Next Steps
Drafting of Proposed Submission Document by September 2016 work to include:

- SFRA (joint with Eastbourne)
- Retail, Employment and Town Centre studies (to include duty to cooperate)
- Transport modelling
- Conclude nitrogen deposition work
- Undertake Ashdown Forest visitor survey, bird monitoring and analysis
- Green Infrastructure study
- Open space and leisure study
- SHELAA
- Joint work on policies eg AONB
Key Issues and Next Steps - DTC Discussion
Key Issues – Any more to add

HMA
Road infrastructure
Flood risk
The economy
Environmental issues

Next steps – how can we work together to make sure DTC is met
EAST SUSSEX STRATEGIC PLANNING MEMBERS GROUP

Notes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 23 February, 2016 in Conference Room Vicarage Lane, Hailsham BN27 2AX (10.00 a.m. to 11.50 a.m.).

PRESENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Members of the Group</th>
<th>Supporting Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealden District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rother District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Downs National Park Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge Wells Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APOLOIGIES: Apologies for absence were received from Councillors [redacted] (SDNPA), [redacted] (Rother DC), [redacted] (Lewes DC), [redacted] (ESCC), [redacted] (Eastbourne BC), [redacted] (Tunbridge Wells BC) and [redacted] (Brighton & Hove CC), and from Officers: [redacted] (ESCC), [redacted] (Lewes DC) and [redacted] (Brighton & Hove CC).

16/1 WELCOME

WDC [redacted] welcomed participants to the meeting and invited all those present to introduce themselves.

16/2 NOTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The notes of the meeting held on 8 December 2014 were agreed.

16/3 WEALDEN LOCAL PLAN ISSUES, OPTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Strategic Planning Manager for Wealden District Council [redacted] gave a presentation, which set out the background to the development Wealden Local Plan and Hailsham Area Action Plan and the stages of production. She presented information on:

- the overlapping Housing Market Areas (HMAs) relevant to Wealden District HMA;
- the objectively assessed housing needs;
- the vision and strategy for the Wealden Local Plan;
- the options for testing which had gone out to consultation; and
- some of the infrastructure which would be needed and environmental
challenges to be resolved if the numbers identified were to be delivered.

The presentation also summarised the differing responses to the consultation on the Local Plan from neighbouring authorities and statutory consultees, and the range of other plans and policies which would be written as part of development of the new Local Plan.

The key next step would be drafting the proposed submission document by September 2016. In order to inform this document a number of studies would be required and included:

- SFRA (joint with Eastbourne);
- Retail, Employment and Town Centre studies (to include duty to cooperate);
- Transport modelling;
- Conclude components of nitrogen deposition studies on Ashdown Forest;
- Undertake Ashdown Forest visitor survey, bird monitoring and analysis;
- Green Infrastructure study;
- Open space and leisure study;
- SHELAA; and
- Joint work on policies e.g. AONB.

The Group welcomed the presentation.

16/4

DISCUSSION ON KEY ISSUES AND NEXT STEPS (WEALDEN LOCAL PLAN ISSUES, OPTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS PRESENTATION)

The Group was invited to discuss the key issues raised from the presentation and whether these should be the main areas of focus and how all the Authorities concerned could ensure that the Duty to Co-operate requirements were met. The key issues to focus on as a group had been suggested as:

- Housing Market Areas (HMA)
- Road infrastructure
- Flood risk
- The economy
- Environmental issues

It was commented that this was a completely new Local Plan for Wealden, and that it was an incredibly challenging timetable to ensure that all cross-boundary issues were discussed. [Redacted] responded that it was a very tight timetable, but that the Council was currently vulnerable to applications being granted on appeal and in the wrong places, until it was able to show that it had plans in place to meet its objectively assessed housing need. In addition, [Redacted] highlighted that through the previous Local Plan development period the Council had found that the longer the plan took to prepare the more changes that arose in Government Policy requiring revisions. It had therefore been decided that it was best for the Council to pursue an expeditious process. [Redacted] advised that the Duty to Co-operate related to strategic cross-boundary matters, and this was particularly important with regard to discussions on meeting the Duty to Cooperate. However, WDC was looking for appropriate joint work and liaison on non-strategic cross-boundary issues.
and policies, and encouraged members of the Group to contact her if there were particular policies or discussion to which other Authorities would want to contribute. It was suggested that the Group could revisit the list previously discussed of matters which had to be dealt with as ‘Duty to Cooperate’ matters, in order to prioritise work.

There was a discussion on the extent to which the delivery of infrastructure would be a constraint on the plan. It was confirmed that the numbers of houses to be delivered and the timescales were fully reliant on infrastructure delivery. For example, the testing would involve determining the ‘criticality’ of improvements to the A27 related to mitigation for the Ashdown Forest. If such improvements did not enable the levels of traffic going either side of the forest on the A22 or A26 to decrease or remain the same in conjunction with planned development, then the numbers that were being tested in the south of the District might need to decrease. It was noted that the County Council was undertaking the transport study. It was agreed it would be helpful for this or the Planning Managers Group to receive a specific briefing on the study when complete and [redacted] agreed to arrange this.

It was recognised that ‘landscape’ was a critical issue for a number of Authorities, in particular the South Downs National Park Authority, Lewes, Rother and Wealden. [redacted] confirmed that this was within the heading of Environmental Issues in the presentation, but would be addressed individually in the Local Plan document.

[Tunbridge Wells BC] asked if it was correct that Kent County Council had not responded to the plan consultation. [redacted] confirmed that this was the case and agreed to follow up as to whether Kent CC wished to comment now and also West Kent CCG. [redacted] advised that Tunbridge Wells Borough Council was just beginning its consideration of issues and options, and would be interested in what sites had been submitted on the border with Wealden, and on working jointly on the Tourism and Retail policy.

The Group discussed the level of work with Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs). [redacted] advised that the local CCGs had asked to meet with a strategic group of Councils looking at housing, and it was agreed that this may be best as a sub-group of this Group or the Planning Managers Group.

The Group discussed in general the high level of dwellings identified in the plan, and whether these could be delivered physically in the timescales. It was confirmed that this was why the plan was being tested, but that all Authorities were under the duty to ‘positively prepare plans’ and that a plan that only considered and tested modest delivery would not be sound. However, if evidence showed that it was necessary to do so, the numbers could reduce.

It was asked why the 2,300 dwellings identified over and above Wealden’s objectively assessed housing need, had been provisionally placed as meeting Eastbourne’s housing need. It was confirmed that the additional numbers were located within the south of the District, close to Eastbourne and that with the strong relationship it was decided that Eastbourne’s undersupply (if proven) should be considered first. It was anticipated that there would be robust
challenges during the process of Local Plan preparation that the numbers with arguments that the numbers were both too high and too low and how they were assigned.

The Group had a discussion on the use of Neighbourhood Plans and the experience in each authority area. There was a variety of experience of their development, and it was recognised that there was a significant amount of work for both Parish and Town Councils and the Local Authority to enable a plan to be developed. Lewes DC and the National Park Authority had the most Neighbourhood Plans in place or being developed of the Authorities present. Wealden DC had a relatively low number in development, and [REDACTED] confirmed that these were not expected to delay the timetable for the development of the Local Plan.

The Group agreed that this had been a useful discussion and [REDACTED] reminded members of the Group to contact her if they wished to be involved in the development of specific underlying policies to the Wealden Local Plan.

16/5 ORAL UPDATE AND DISCUSSION ON LONDON DEVELOPMENT MATTERS

[REDACTED] advised that she regularly attended meetings of SEEC (South East England Councils) as part of her role of the Chairman of this Group, although it was predominately comprised of Council Leaders in the South East. SEEC had set up a group to hold a dialogue with the Mayor of London’s Office of any implications of the London Plan on South East Authorities. The main contact for the group from the South East was [REDACTED] of Aylesbury BC.

[REDACTED] advised that the Mayor’s Office currently considered that London Assessed Housing Needs could be met within London. However, it was good to keep up a dialogue under the duty to co-operate to ensure that there was not an assumption made that the South East could deliver on any future under-provision. It was also an important route to highlight that if South East Authorities are to deliver on their own housing numbers then strategic infrastructure must be provided.

[REDACTED] advised that local authorities represented in this Group could raise any local issues up to the Mayor’s Office via her and the SEEC group. It was yet to be seen if the Mayoral election later in the year would change the arrangements.

It was noted that the SEEC agendas and minutes were available on its website (www.secouncils.gov.uk).

16/6 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Local Plan Managers Group would identify the date for the next meeting.

[REDACTED] Chairman
### EAST SUSSEX STRATEGIC PLANNING MEMBERS GROUP AGENDA

**Wednesday, 8 March 2017**

*at 1.30 p.m.*

(Tea and Coffee will be available from 1.15 pm)

Civic Community Hall, Vicarage Lane, Hailsham BN27 2AX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East Sussex Authority</th>
<th>Members of the Group</th>
<th>Supporting Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealden District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rother District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Downs National Park Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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Also invited—

| Brighton and Hove City Council         |                      |                     |
| Mid Sussex District Council            |                      |                     |
| Tunbridge Wells Borough Council        |                      |                     |

Clerk: WDC

SPMG57
AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Draft Wealden Local Plan Update  (Pages 3 - 14)
   A presentation on the draft Wealden Local Plan is attached. The full Draft Wealden Local Plan Document is available to read on the Council’s website at Item 5 of each of the agendas for the meetings of Local Plan Sub-Committee and Joint Planning Committee North and South taking place on 13 March 2017.

3. Other Duty to Co-operate Issues - Discussion
Wealden Local Plan Update
Duty to Co operate Meeting

8th March 2017
Introduction

- Background
- Ashdown Forest air quality, traffic flows and nitrogen deposition
- Housing numbers
- Objectively Assessed Housing Need
- Issues
- Next steps
Background to the Local Plan

- Review required by Core Strategy (Policy WCS1)

- Wealden Local Plan (WLP) - Strategic and local policies covering all policy requirements, including site allocations

- When adopted supersedes Core Strategy and 1998 Local Plan
Stages of Local Plan Production

Publication of Issues, Options and Recommendations for consultation → October to December 2015

Publication of Proposed Submission Document for representations → 1st quarter 2017

Submission of Local Plan → Autumn 2017

Examination
- legal compliance
- soundness
- Proposed modifications
  - Assessments
  - Consultation

To be determined by Planning Inspectorate

Final Report

Adoption by the Council
Ashdown Forest AQ and Nitrogen

• Nitrogen monitoring shows that there is damage to the Ashdown Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC) close to roads
• Our preferred option for testing from IOR will deposit further nitrogen well above acceptable levels alongside the forest roads
• Our current commitments will also deposit nitrogen above the acceptable levels alongside the forest roads
• The monitoring shows high but currently acceptable levels across the SAC as a whole
• We recognise the need to allow development across the district if possible
Ashdown Forest AQ and Nitrogen

Our approach is therefore to:

1. Deal with the high levels of nitrogen deposition alongside the roads by provide compensatory habitat for the damaged area having considered alternatives and maximised mitigation.

2. Set development across the district to a level which will ensure the integrity of the SAC is not damaged by excessive nitrogen deposition.
Ashdown Forest AQ and Nitrogen

- We are discussing our approach with the Minister, Natural England, Ashdown Forest Conservators and consulting with neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Co-operate.
- To provide an accurate position on what development will be possible further modelling is underway with results due shortly.
- The modelling is for:
  - The current level of commitments and completions – 7,392
  - Up to 11,456
  - Up to 14,101
- We are also modelling the effect of a plan period from 2013 to 2028.
Housing Numbers

- With a plan to 2037 it is unlikely we would be able to achieve 11,456 dwellings due to the Ashdown Forest constraints.
- It is expected that an Inspector would reduce the plan period in these circumstances especially in the light of the Housing and Planning White Paper.
- With a plan to 2028 we anticipate the potential for housing numbers to be between 11,456 and 14,101 in total.
- We are proposing regular reviews triggered by further nitrogen monitoring, Hailsham waste water treatment delivery and A27 upgrades in line with the White Paper.
Objectively Assessed Housing Need

- Our OAHN has been recalculated following updated population and household formation projections
- Significant demographics increase plus uplift required for market signals
- Results in OAHN range of 895 to 968 with a median and cluster around 932 per annum
- Total of 22,400 from 2013 – 2037
- 2013 – 2028 calculation commissioned
Issues

- Delivery of the Ashdown Forest approach
- Planning applications while compensation measures are progressed
- Mid Sussex Interim Examination findings
- Duty to Co operate approach
- Housing and Planning White Paper
  - OAHN standard calculation
- Timing of formal consultation
  - 8\textsuperscript{th} May to 19\textsuperscript{th} June
Next steps

- Revised version of draft Wealden Local Plan produced for representation consultation stage
  - Local Plan Sub Committee and Joint PCS / PCN on 13th March
  - Full Council on 22nd March
- Completion and publication of studies and evidence base
- Representation stage consultation
  - 8th May to 19th June
- Representations considered and final submission version of the plan produced
- Submission to the Planning Inspector
- Examination in Public
- Adoption
Questions and discussion
EAST SUSSEX STRATEGIC PLANNING MEMBERS GROUP

Notes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 8th March, 2017 in Civic Community Hall, Vicarage Lane, Hailsham BN27 2AX (1.30 p.m. to 2.57 p.m.).

PRESENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Authority</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealden District Council</td>
<td>(Host Chairman).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rother District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Authorities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge Wells Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Sussex District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received from Councillors [redacted], [redacted] (Lewes District Council), [redacted] (South Downs National Park Authority) and [redacted] (Brighton and Hove City Council).

17/1 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

WDC [redacted] welcomed participants to the meeting and invited all those present to introduce themselves.

17/2 DRAFT WEALDEN LOCAL PLAN UPDATE

WDC [redacted] gave a presentation on the Wealden District Council Draft Local Plan Submission due to be considered by the Local Plan Sub-Committee, Joint Planning Committee and Full Council in the next two weeks, and confirmed why the review process was required and the anticipated timetable for adoption.

He confirmed that the Issues, Options and Recommendations document which was put out for consultation had had a preferred option for testing of up to 20,000 properties to be delivered by 2037 across the District, but focused in particular in South Wealden. The SHEELA process had identified land which could give up to 24,000 properties. However, the testing in relation to traffic flows, nitrogen deposition and ecological impact on the Ashdown Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC) had shown that although the level of nitrogen across the SAC as a whole was acceptable, the levels alongside
forest roads based on current commitments (of 7,400 properties) were above acceptable levels, and the preferred option for testing would result in deposits well above acceptable levels resulting in ecological damage.

It was recognised that the Council did need to allow growth across the District if at all possible, but that it was essential to get the balance between development and protecting the environment including the SAC and Forest. The proposals coming forward were to reduce the length of the plan and the number of properties to set development across the district to a level which would ensure the integrity of the SAC was not damaged by excessive nitrogen deposition. In addition to deal with the high levels of nitrogen deposition alongside the roads by providing compensatory habitat having considered alternatives and maximised mitigation. Wealden Council was modelling effects in relation to the current committed and completed properties of 7,392, for up to 11,456 properties and for up to 14,101 properties, and with a plan period of 2013 to 2028, and would expect results back in the next few days. It was recognised that the impact being modelled was from a much wider area of the Wealden District and beyond than previously thought and the modelling was complex, with different impacts depending on location and traffic flow associated with development.

WDC outlined the reasons for reducing the plan period and advised that, in line with the proposals in the Housing and Planning White Paper, regular reviews were proposed which would be triggered by further nitrogen monitoring, Hailsham waste water treatment delivery and A27 upgrades.

He confirmed that the Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) had been revised based on new demographic data, giving a range of 895-968 (and median of 932) per annum. A 2013-2018 calculation had been commissioned, but it was anticipated that Wealden Council may no longer be able to meet its own Housing Need projections, or to provide any headway for neighbouring authorities, if the nitrogen modelling resulted in the lower end of the housing numbers being proposed.

It was recognised that this approach to the Forest would have implications for neighbouring authorities and their plans, and it was hoped that neighbouring authorities could work together under the Duty to Co-operate. Meetings were being held with a representative of Natural England, who had been positive informally about the approach being proposed, the Government Minister had also been briefed and a number of other discussions were taking place. It was confirmed that this new approach would mean that any new planning applications outside plan areas would need to be assessed as to their impact in terms of increased traffic flow and nitrogen deposition.

WDC confirmed this was a very different approach from previously proposed by Wealden District Council and invited comments and questions from the representatives of neighbouring authorities present. 

(East Sussex County Council) asked what the position was in term of unimplemented allocations in the Core Strategy in terms of assessing traffic flow impact. 

WDC advised that the number/locations of development
granted in the last few years had not been envisaged by the Core Strategy. The new Local Plan would effectively re-write the Core Strategy when adopted. Officers were relying on information on what were the implications of applications already committed, and any other applications would be assessed on a case by case basis, as to their impact in terms of traffic flow and nitrogen deposition.

The ESCC confirmed that there had been very good liaison and joint working to date between Wealden Council and the County Council on modelling of traffic flows, but that further was required in relation to the latest figures. In addition, he asked what accommodation has been made for jobs, types of jobs and deployment, noting that the growth in the economy in East Sussex was 5.2% above the national average of 2.9%. The WDC gave assurances that it was recognised that County Officers had not had a chance to provide additional modelling on the latest figures, and there would be further liaison on these matters. In relation to economic development, the WDC responded that there were area allocations identified in Hailsham and Polegate for enterprise, and it was recognised in the plan that there was a need for a distribution of jobs across the area close to housing, but these would need to use existing capacity rather than increase traffic movements, although the Ashdown Business Park and business site at Swallow Barn were already approved. In the previous plan there had been an identification of the quality and qualification of jobs required, but as Wealden Council had lost an appeal on this basis, the new proposed plan took a more general approach. There was an affordability issue in relation to housing in the area, so the plan focussed on building smaller houses where possible. In addition, it was important to look at other ways to market Wealden as a place for business, to attract employment into specific areas, such as Hailsham.

(Tunbridge Wells) asked whether there was a particular distance from the Ashdown Forest that had been assessed as having an impact, and if the numbers in the plans of authorities such as Tunbridge Wells and Mid-Sussex which were close to the border had been considered. The WDC confirmed that Wealden Council had looked at its own growth and also included a level of background growth, which took into account growth in other Council areas in general. However, the intention was to work on a model that would allow inputs from other Authority's local plans.

The WDC confirmed that the Mid-Sussex plan contained a 7km zone in relation to Ashdown Forest, which was in Wealden's previous plan. It was noted that the outcome of the Wealden Judicial Reviews in relation to Lewes and South Downs National Park Authority were still awaited. The WDC confirmed that all parties would have to wait for the outcome of these. It was a difficult if all authorities were making calculations differently, although there seemed to be a common understanding on the need to protect the SPA in terms of recreational pressure. The WDC confirmed that it was not Wealden Council's intention to be confrontational, but the Council had felt it had had to defend its position and approach. However, there had been good collaboration with neighbouring authorities in relation to SANGs and SAMMs and it was hoped that such joint working would continue.
(Mid Sussex District Council) advised on the feedback received from its Plan Inspector to date and that at the moment the inspector was asking for the Mid Sussex Council to increase the number of properties. It was confirmed that Mid Sussex Council recognised Wealden Council's constraints, but advised that Mid Sussex had to work within its own constraints.

WDC thanked Members of the Group for discussing the issues and confirmed that the Council would be looking to keep other Authorities updated and to work with them going forward.

17/3 OTHER DUTY TO CO-OPERATE ISSUES - DISCUSSION

A question was raised by (Rother District Council) on the impact on the potential development of the A27 of the new proposals from Wealden Council. ESCC confirmed that the County Council had yet to model its requirements on the new figures and whether these could be accommodated by the in line developments and junction changes already advertised by the Government or would still need a more substantial re-development of the A27.

It was commented that on one hand the lower numbers could mean there was less evidence to support the need for the more substantial development of the A27, on the other it could be argued that this would re-direct traffic flows and allow greater growth. In either case, it was unlikely that the full funding of the improvements would be made available from the Government.

WDC thanked everyone for attending the meeting.
EAST SUSSEX STRATEGIC PLANNING MEMBERS GROUP AGENDA

Friday, 2 November 2018

at 10.00 a.m.
(Tea and Coffee will be available from 9.40 a.m.)

Civic Community Hall, Vicarage Lane, Hailsham BN27 2AX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East Sussex Authority</th>
<th>Members of the Group</th>
<th>Supporting Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealden District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rother District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Downs National Park Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also invited--

| Brighton and Hove City Council                |                      |                    |
| Mid Sussex District Council                   |                      |                    |
| Tunbridge Wells Borough Council               |                      |                    |

Clerk: WDC

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Apologies for Absence
3. Minutes of Meeting on 8 March 2017 (Pages 3 - 6)
4. Discussion on cross boundary strategic planning matters concerning the Wealden Local Plan - Presentation to follow
5. Waste and Minerals Plan review - East Sussex County Council (Pages 7 - 8)
6. Rother District Council Development and Site Allocations Local Plan Update
7. Date of Next Meeting
To: Members of the EAST SUSSEX STRATEGIC PLANNING MEMBERS GROUP:

Dear ESSPMG Member

East Sussex Strategic Planning Members Group - Friday 2 November 2018

Further to the agenda and papers for the above meeting, previously circulated, please find attached the following report marked “to follow”:

4. Discussion on cross boundary strategic planning matters concerning the Wealden Local Plan - Presentation (Pages 3 - 12)

Yours sincerely
Wealden Local Plan

November 2018
Introduction

- Background/ Housing Need within Wealden District
- Summary of Wealden Local Plan
- Issues considered
- Overall housing numbers
- Representations Received
- Moving forward
Housing Need within Wealden District

- Objectively Assessed Housing Need for Wealden District (OAHN) is 950 dwellings per annum (2013 to 2028) – which equates to 14,250 dwellings

- Local Housing Need (Government formula) is 1,130pa – which equates to 13,559 dwellings from 2017 to 2028* (undersupply of 1283 dwellings up to 2028).

- Housing delivery around 500 to 600 dwellings
Wealden Local Plan

- 2393 dwellings completed
- 5307 dwellings with planning permission
- 4012 dwellings allocated within the plan
- 2516 dwellings through windfalls

Total: 14,228
Distribution of housing

- Focused on south of the District within transport constraints
- Allocations and windfalls included
- Spread across the District including northern and smaller settlements to provide distributed growth
- Growth allocated to Sites, Development Boundaries, Core Areas and policy compliant dwellings within the Countryside
Employment Provision

- Key allocations in A22 corridor
- Employment provision across the district
- Aiming to increase quality of jobs and wages
- Objective of reducing out commuting
- Linked with housing distribution
Issues Considered

• Meeting Need and Available Land
• Environmental Constraints
  • Ashdown Forest SAC/ SPA, Pevensey Levels SAC and Ramsar Site, Lewes Downs SAC
  • National landscape designations (High Weald AONB and South Downs National Park)
• Hailsham Waste Water Treatment Works
• Highways improvements including A27 upgrade
• 5 year housing land supply and deliverability
Representations Received (1)

Developers
• District’s OAHN is too low
• More development should take place in the north of the District
• Ashdown Forest SAC is not a constraint to growth

Residents/ Non Stat bodies
• Housing growth is too high
• Infrastructure is not in place/ will not be delivered
• Flood risk in south Wealden
• Ashdown Forest mitigation measures are not effective (in relation to growth)
• Objections to specific sites on environmental/ infrastructure grounds
Statutory Representations Received

Duty to Cooperate objections:
- Habitats Regulations Assessment
- Housing numbers too low
- Plan period should be increased

Environmental objections:
- Inclusion of an offline A27 policy
- Major development in the AONB

Transport objections:
- Delivery of transport infrastructure in relation to south Wealden

Comments received:
- Undersupply in the longer term may need to be met by WDC
Moving Forward:

- WDC commissioned work to consider NE advice on HRA to complete Appropriate Assessment
- WDC to speak to Ashdown Forest Officer Steering Group regarding issues raised
- Taking into account initial considerations there is a need to work together on future proposals
- Potential for statement regarding future working
EAST SUSSEX STRATEGIC PLANNING MEMBERS GROUP

Notes of the meeting held on Friday, 2nd November, 2018 in the Civic Community Hall, Vicarage Lane, Hailsham BN27 2AX (10.00 a.m. to 11.50 a.m.).

PRESENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority:</th>
<th>Members of the Group:</th>
<th>Supporting Officers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealden District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rother District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Downs National Park Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Authorities:</th>
<th>Members of the Group:</th>
<th>Supporting Officers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid Sussex District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge Wells Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received from Councillors [redacted] and [redacted]. Officers: [redacted]

18/4 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

WDC [redacted] welcomed participants to the meeting and invited all those present to introduce themselves.

18/5 MINUTES OF MEETING DATED 8 MARCH 2017

The minutes of the meeting dated 8 March 2017 were approved as a correct record.
DISCUSSION ON CROSS BOUNDARY STRATEGIC PLANNING MATTERS CONCERNING THE WEALDEN LOCAL PLAN - PRESENTATION

WDC

gave a presentation on the Wealden District Council Local Plan, which advised that the Objectively Assessed Housing Need for Wealden was 950 dwellings p.a between 2013 and 2028, which equated to 14,250 dwellings. However, it was noted that the Local Housing Need (Government formula) was 1,130 p.a, which equated to 13,559 dwellings from 2017 to 2028 (therefore an undersupply of 1,283 dwellings up to 2028).

advised that 5,307 dwellings had been granted planning permission but were still to be built. She explained that the distribution of housing concentrated on the south of the District with key allocations of employment provision along the A22 corridor.

The Group noted the issues that had been considered, namely the environmental constraints arising from the Ashdown Forest SAC, Pevensey Levels SAC and Ramsar Site, Lewes Downs SAC, High Weald AONB and the South Downs National Park, as well as Hailsham Waste Water Treatment Works and the highways improvements (including the A27 upgrade).

The representations received were illustrated to the Group and then concluded her presentation by considering the way forward, which included considering Natural England’s advice on the HRA to complete the Appropriate Assessment and discussing the issues raised with the Ashdown Forest Officer Steering Group. She stressed the importance of working together on future proposals.

Following the presentation, invited comments from the representatives of neighbouring authorities in attendance.

(East Sussex County Council) commented that the changes in Wealden’s housing figures had caused the County Council some concern due to the additional work that had been necessary to remodel the traffic movements of the revised proposals. In addition he asked for clarity on how CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) had been spent.

replied that County had known about the revised figures 18 months ago as it had been discussed at IDP meetings, and was noted in the 8 March 2017 minutes of this Group.

advised that Wealden District Council would be reviewing CIL next year and would take on board the comments from the County Council. She stated that £7 million had been collected from CIL, with parishes receiving £1 million of this. Many parishes had expressed concern at how to spend this funding and Ms Brigginshaw suggested that the County could work with Wealden District Council to liaise with the parishes on this issue.

(Wealden District Council) stressed the need to work with other neighbouring authorities, to demonstrate to an Inspector that there had
been dialogue and co-operation.

[Name] (Eastbourne Borough Council) felt that there had not been much co-operation from Wealden District Council as many of the houses built in Wealden used Eastbourne’s facilities and this was not recognised by CIL.

WDC In response, [Name] clarified that a proportion of the CIL had to be given to parishes, but CIL could be spent outside of Wealden District Council and she would be happy to discuss CIL contributions in the future (for example funding for schools).

WDC [Name] added that she felt that some of the representations received from the neighbouring authorities had been quite critical and unexpected and she had hoped that a dialogue between them could have taken place before these had been submitted.

WDC [Name] explained that the neighbouring authorities’ issues were complex, and there were similar constraints for all of them. She mentioned that a number of the bordering authorities were looking to Wealden in the longer term to meet some of their housing need and, as a result, needed to consider the wider area.

[Name] (Rother District Council) advised that her authority had been disappointed that Wealden had objected to Rother’s planning applications due to the impact on the Ashdown Forest with no prior warning or discussion. [Name] (Eastbourne Borough Council) added that Wealden’s approach had not been well received and did cause upset amongst other authorities.

WDC [Name] expressed her apologies again for this and stated that an apology had been issued to all the relevant neighbouring authorities and those letters of objection had since been withdrawn. She hoped that this had not been the reason for all the representations received. [Name] (Wealden District Council) repeated this apology and hoped that the Group could now move forward and work together.

[Name] (South Downs National Park Authority) expressed his appreciation of the complexity of Wealden’s situation and, although his authority did not have housing need to consider, it did have other issues to address. He added that CIL did need clarifying, and parishes and the County Council should be encouraged to work together to deliver the infrastructure required. [Name] stressed the need for a Planning Policy Officers’ Group to meet regularly.

[Name] (Lewes District Council) explained that the Lewes Downs and the Pevensey Levels SAC remained an issue and a study undertaken by her authority had not been taken into account by Wealden, and therefore the comments submitted by Lewes remained. She added that Wealden’s Local Plan did not recognise the infrastructure issues of Lewes District Council or Eastbourne Borough Council, such as leisure access, and how this impact could be mitigated.
In response to a question regarding the consequences of an Inspector dismissing the Local Plan, [position] (Wealden District Council) explained that Wealden would have to investigate further development taking place in the North of the District and County would be required to undertake further infrastructure modelling for this. He warned that once the District had reached its capacity, it would need to consider its protected areas and the Inspector could look to neighbouring authorities to take Wealden’s housing need.

[Tunbridge Wells Borough Council] felt that the Ashdown Forest Working Party was the most appropriate forum to discuss infrastructure requirements.

LDC stated that a number of the Ashdown Forest Working Party meetings had been held at which participants had requested information from Wealden Officers, which had not been forthcoming. She felt that there had been a consistent failure from Wealden to share information, and that is why she felt that they had failed in their duty to co-operate.

WDC explained that Wealden now had a new Chief Executive and Director and the Council wanted to move forward. She accepted that some local authorities had a genuinely held belief about Wealden’s approach to the Duty to Co-operate, but that the Council would defend itself on that point. However she acknowledged a keen desire to work more closely with neighbouring authorities on the Local Plan in future.

WDC asked for an update from each authority on the status of their Local Plan and the number of dwellings to be delivered, following which she thanked Members of the Group for discussing the issues associated with the Local Plan process and confirmed that Wealden would be looking to work with them going forward.

18/7  WASTE AND MINERALS PLAN REVIEW - EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL

[County Council] presented a report to the Group which updated Members on the progress of the review of the East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton and Hove Waste and Minerals Local Plan.

The Group noted that the first policy review of the Waste Minerals Local Plan (WMLP) commenced last year, with the initial consultation taking place between September and November 2017. [position] explained that, as a result of the consultation, three sites had been submitted by mineral operators and these were currently being considered, alongside the other responses received.

ESCC advised that there had been some slippage in the Review timetable due to ongoing discussions regarding sand/gravel sites in the east of the County. A Regulation 18 consultation was now likely to be towards the end of the year/early next year.

RESOLVED that the progress on the review of the WMLP be noted.
ROTHER DISTRICT COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT AND SITE ALLOCATIONS
LOCAL PLAN UPDATE

(Rother District Council) advised that Rother’s Proposed Submission Development and Site Allocations (DaSA) Local Plan had been approved by Full Council on 15 October 2018 and published for a 6-week public representation period finishing on Friday 7 December 2018. He stated that the housing development target for the District as a whole was for at least 5,700 new homes to be built over the plan period.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting would be confirmed in due course.
Thank you for sending through the meeting minutes, though it would have been useful for us to have seen a draft first which we could have commented on.

Though it is appreciated that they have been circulated as final minutes we do have one major area of concern and would appreciate that an amendment is made to better reflect the actual position. Our proposed changes are as follows:

[East Sussex County Council] (East Sussex County Council) commented that the changes in Wealden’s housing figures had caused the County Council some concern due to the additional work that had been necessary to remodel the traffic movements on transport modelling and education forecasting of the revised proposals. In addition he asked for clarity on how CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) had been spent. Councillor Newton replied that a similar housing figure had been one of the options considered 18 months ago which County had known about the revised figures 18 months ago as it had been discussed at IDP meetings, and was noted in the 8 March 2017 minutes of this Group. A lower overall housing figure however was taken forward by Wealden District Council soon after. The figure was changed again this year with County being informed at the Road Map meeting on 16 May 2018 and an actual breakdown of the proposed distribution of growth provided in July 2018.

Kind regards,

[Signatures]

Economic Development, Skills and Infrastructure Service
Communities, Economy and Transport

eastsussex.gov.uk
Dear [name]

I understand other officers may have contacted you about requested changes to the minutes. I am not sure the minutes entirely reflect some of the discussion points but of key concern to the SDNPA is the following:

(South Downs National Park Authority) expressed his appreciation of the complexity of Wealden’s situation and, although his authority did not have housing need to consider, it did have other issues to address. He added that CIL did need clarifying, and parishes and the County Council should be encouraged to work together to deliver the infrastructure required. [name] stressed the need for a Planning Policy Officers’ Group to meet regularly.

We think the following is a more accurate recording of what was said:

(South Downs National Park Authority) expressed his appreciation of the complexity of Wealden’s situation and, although his authority did not have to meet housing need, it did have other issues to address particularly conserving and enhancing the landscape of the National Park. He added that CIL did need clarifying, and parishes and the County Council should be encouraged to work together to deliver the infrastructure required. [name] stressed the need for a Planning Policy Officers’ Group to meet regularly.

Please let me know how you are incorporating comments into the final version and when you expect further meetings of the group (or sub-groups) to be held.

Kind regards

[Name]

South Downs National Park Authority

South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst, West Sussex GU29 9DH

www.southdowns.gov.uk | facebook | twitter | youtube