

## PRESENT

Richard Keatley (RK) *Pulborough Community Partnership* (Chair of Steering Group)  
Andy Tilbrook (AT) *Pulborough Parish Council* (Vice chair of Steering Group)  
Ray Qusteded (RQ) *Pulborough Parish Council*  
Peter Jones (PJ) *The Local Action Team*  
Anne Ball (AB) *The Pulborough Society*  
Gwen Parr (GP) *Pulborough & District Community Care Association* (PDCCA)  
Elaine Kipp (EK) *Pulborough Parish Council*  
John Wallace (JW) *Pulborough Parish Council*

## IN ATTENDANCE

Rowena Tyler (RT) *Action in Rural Sussex (AirS)*

## APOLOGIES / ABSENT

Keith Russell (KR) *Pulborough Churches Together*  
Sarah Norman (SN) *Clerk to the Parish Council*  
Rachel Gill (RG) *Pulborough Parish Council*  
Les Ampstead (LA) *At the invitation of the Chair/Vice Chair*  
Holly Bune (HB) *Support volunteer*

### 1. Notes of Previous Meeting 17<sup>th</sup> February 2014

Notes were accepted and agreed. Completed ROIs from JW and GP were given to RK to pass on to the clerk.

### 2. Progress since meeting

RK, AT and LA have met again with HDC to explore ways of working closely together during the process.

RK and JW attended a meeting organised by Sussex Association of Local Councils (SALC - <http://www.sussexalc.org.uk>) to discuss neighbourhood planning. It was useful but emphasised how restricted the process is to the existing planning framework. The meeting agreed that this restriction needed to be borne in mind at all times to avoid raising and dashing hopes that a neighbourhood plan can deliver more than is possible.

The idea of producing a companion document containing community-backed policies that did not fit into a neighbourhood plan was discussed and RT reported that other areas are following this approach.

RT also reported that neighbourhood plans are meant to be valid for 15 years.

There was a brief discussion of the AiRS datasets and the significance of basing them on the average rather than median statistics. It was also agreed that evidence showing a trend is far more useful than a one-off snapshot.

## ACTIONS

- **Keep a watching brief on the usefulness of statistical evidence (AT)**
- **Monitor/chase requested data from community justice programme (PJ)**

### 3. Budget

RK reported that we had secured £5,750 of the Locality grant rather than the expected £7,000. This shortfall was due to changes in the grant programme. RQ reported that an expenses budget/float of £500 will be available to the neighbourhood plan project and will be administered by the Parish Office.

### 4. Project approach

RK reported that he and other steering group members had discussed concerns that some confusion remained about the overall aims and direction of the neighbourhood plan project, and that this had prompted a review resulting in the following high level breakdown of the project:

#### PHASE 0 – INITIATION

- Establish steering group and working groups.
- Announce the project to the community.

#### PHASE I – GATHER EVIDENCE

- Produce the State Of The Parish Report, which is a statement of fact (data provided by AiRS) with local perspectives and opinions ('Community Views' gathered by the working groups).
- Working groups will put together the 'Community Views' using existing information and fresh consultation (including a household survey).
- *Milestone/output: Pulborough's State Of the Parish Report*

#### PHASE II

- Turn the State Of The Parish Report into concrete planning policies.
- Document the proposed policies as a Neighbourhood Plan.

The meeting agreed this breakdown made sense and allayed most concerns.

#### **ACTION**

- **AiRS examples to be adapted for Pulborough NP and sent to group for review (RK)**

RK reported that HDC had rejected the suggestion that Pulborough be designated a business area (and so get a separate business referendum) but had expressed support for strong engagement with local business. This was felt to be sensible and positive.

### 5. Public Meetings

The upcoming public meetings were discussed in detail. RK reported that publicity had been started as per the current communications plan (posters, village signs, articles in local press and parish bulletin, social media) and the agenda for each meeting was agreed along with attendance and roles.

The meeting agreed that the public meetings had two key purposes:

1. To inform the public about the Neighbourhood Planning process happening in Pulborough and how they can be involved.
2. To recruit community members to the working groups.

It was also decided that the term to be used for the working groups would indeed be “working groups” and not “focus groups” or “theme groups”. It was also agreed that the group names would be finalised as follows:

- Our Community
- Our Housing
- Our Infrastructure
- Our Environment & Heritage
- Our Business, Economy & Skills
- Our Transport
- Our Health & Wellbeing

RT pointed out that this list is longer than most areas but it was agreed that for now it provided a reasonable structure and depending upon progress and personnel it may well be that working groups amalgamate.

### **ACTIONS**

- **Produce agenda and final detailed arrangements for public meetings (using RT’s resources checklist) (RK/SN)**
- **Produce brief for each working group based on RT’s example (AT/RK)**

### 6. Steering Group Membership for Next Phase

It was restated and agreed that after the initial public meetings and the creation of the working groups, the Steering Group would be made up of the Chair, Vice Chair, Parish Council Chairman, and the leaders of each working group. This may see some current Steering Group members choose to leave and serve at a working group level.

### 7. Communications Plan

RK reported that he and AT had approached David Hurst about leading/building a Communications & Publicity.

RK reported that the idea of a local Beacon Network of neighbourhood contacts was still something to pursue but that no Steering Group members had sent any comments back on the draft spreadsheet.

### **ACTIONS**

- **Members to review the Beacon Network spreadsheet and feed through any names/neighbourhood areas to RK/SN (ALL)**

### 6. Risk Register

The risk register was reviewed and it was agreed to add a risk regarding the progress of HDC’s local plan.

### **ACTIONS**

- **Update the Risk Register with a risk regarding HDC’s progress towards an approved local plan (RK)**
- **Send the Steering Group the overview of HDC’s local plan timetable (RK)**

7. Any other business

No other business was discussed.

8. Date of next meeting

TBD. Possible dates are Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> April 10:00 or Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> May 10:00 in the Parish Room.

**ACTION**

- **Finalise date and book parish room (SN)**