

**FAIRLIGHT PARISH COUNCIL
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PRESENTATION
MONDAY 14TH NOVEMBER 2016**

Meeting started at 6.30pm – 20 present including steering group.

Those present included representatives of

- Fairlight Residents Association
- The Club – youth provision
- Fairlight Preservation Trust
- East Field Action Group
- MoPPs – older peoples provision
- Rector for Pett and Fairlight
- Owners of potential development site - plus
- Former MP for the area 1992- 1997 (Fairlight resident)
- Former Leader of ESCC (Fairlight resident)
- Apologies had been received from Haydon Luke

Stephen Leadbetter (“SL”) began by explaining the purpose of the meeting and our vision before showing the slides.

Simon Apperly (“SA”) stated that it does not say the time frame i.e. how long will the Neighbourhood Plan last.

SL explained that the plan would have legal force for 15 years.

SL also explained that a survey was sent out to whole Village and we received 120 replies. We also carried out a drop in Event at the Village Hall and had 134 visitors who left 69 comments.

We were asked how many properties we were supposed to have.

SL explained that it was 35 and that we could not go below that. He also explained that for the Market Garden site it was at least 15.

A member of the public asked how many properties had been built and Izzy Horsley asked if it counted for properties whether they were one to five.

SL explained that no properties had been built which would count towards the Neighbourhood Plan target. Anything under 6 houses did not count and, therefore, would not reduce the number of 35, it had to be 6 or more.

SL mentioned that we had sent out through the email system and other media, a Call for Sites. SL explained that we had looked at sites that had previously been refused as well as sites that had been put forward by members of the public. SL explained that these were now with the Steering Group and could not be discussed in detail until these had been investigated by the bodies concerned.

We were asked if Gem Select worked with the Parish Council with regard to their proposal for the Market Garden Site.

SL stated that they had not and we had written expressing our disappointment..

We were asked how many people mentioned developing the Playing Fields.

SL said that no one had except David Wright (“DW”), the questioner

SL discussed Gem Select and the Market Garden site which had been allocated for housing in the 2006 Local Plan. The East Field had been identified as having potential for a development for 20 properties. It was classified as an Amber Site by Rother Planning as it was considered developable but with difficulties to be overcome.

SL went through the sites we had reviewed.

KJ asked whether we could incorporate the need for more parking spaces within the Neighbourhood Plan.

KJ also asked about Compulsory Purchase Orders for any site.

SL stated that he was not aware of any and did not believe they could be used.

Andrew Meir (“AM”) stated that with regard to the Review of Policy, National and Local policy could not be changed but that policies could be supplemented and amended to meet our needs.

Article 4 was mentioned.

It was stated that the Neighbourhood Plan has to go to the Village for approval once it has been completed.

Jacqui Lait (“JL”) whether modelling had been carried out for future employment and housing demands.

SL stated that the Parish Council had enquired of Rother District Council with regard to housing and stated that only 3 people from Fairlight were currently on the list. There was no future employment modeling.

JL stated that we should with regard to employment modelling we should enquire of a University Land Planning Departments in this regard as there was increasingly large demand to move to Hastings and the creative community was growing There could be significant pressure to move out to Fairlight.

Richard Barron (“RB”) stated that more families had moved to Fairlight over the past three months.

There was mention of the 2011 census but JL pointed out that the national population was due to go up to 70 million.

Design

AM explained that he would be leading a group on Design Standards which could include things like the overall look of properties including things like drainage and asked for volunteers.

Peter Jones (“PJ”) said that Rother planners were more prepared to consider modern design for properties close to the coast but less so inland.

Aspirations

- Improving Communications – fibre optic broadband
- A new Village Hall (consider renewal over a 15 year period – problems with the building getting older – car parking inadequate. PJ suggested visiting new Village Halls in the area.
- Supporting local businesses and employment opportunities
- Care services for the elderly and facilities for the young
- Recreation facilities

Other Matters Arising

RB mentioned a piece of land on the north side of Battery Hill from where the Luton Van is situated to just beyond the bus stop. He said it was owned by the Martyrs Memorial Trust and had once been used for adventure camps but now seemed to be unused.

SL said that it was unlikely that this would be able to be used as it was within the strategic gap and AONB but it may be able to be used for recreation purposes.

KJ asked that if the Neighbourhood Plan is implemented do we have to develop where they state do we have to go there or can we tell them to go elsewhere.

JL stated that there could be potential for dead AONB land to be reclassified.

Paul Draper (“PD”) asked if a Neighbourhood Plan would have any powers to force Southern Water into action – should this be in the Plan.

JL discussed the benefits of using Reed Beds and whether Rother would consider these. She stated that Craig Sam’s site opposite the Post Office would be ideal and support his environment project.

We were asked what the time scales for completion of the plan would be.

SL stated that we were not able to answer this point as there were too many uncertainties.

Meeting closed at 7.45pm.