

## **South Mid Sussex County Local Committee**

14 July 2011 – At a meeting of the Committee held at 7pm at Oakmeeds Community College, Station Road, Burgess Hill.

Present: Mr P Griffiths, Mrs S Knight and Mrs H Ross (Chairman).

Apologies for absence were received from Dr C Wilsdon.

### **Chairman's Welcome**

25. The Chairman introduced the Committee and Officers and welcomed all to the meeting.

### **Declarations of Interest**

26. There were no declarations of interest.

### **Minutes**

27. Resolved – that the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 19 April 2011 and the minutes of the special Adults' Services Grants meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2011 be approved as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

28. The Committee extended their thanks to all the volunteer and community groups for the work that they do.

### **Urgent Matters**

29. The Chairman agreed take an additional Authority Governor application under agenda item 10.

### **Progress Statement**

30. The Committee noted the report.

31. Mrs Knight joined the meeting at this point.

### **West Sussex Waste Plan Strategic Sites**

31. The Chairman introduced the Strategic Planning Manager, Mike Elkington, to outline the report. Mike Elkington informed the meeting that West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) was the waste planning authority for the County except for the area covered by the National Park which was the responsibility of the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA). Any applications would be dealt with by the WSSCC planning procedures and Mid Sussex District Council would be a consultee. WSSCC had to plan to deal with municipal, commercial and industrial, and construction and demolition waste. The waste plan was designed to cover the next 20 years with certain assumptions being made about development and waste arising. The plan had to be able to change if necessary. WSSCC aspired to be a zero waste to landfill authority; 40% of the County's waste currently goes to landfill.

There was a need to identify new sites for recycling, treatment of inert waste and biodegradable waste etc.

32. Mr Griffiths joined the meeting at this point.

33. The County Council could not be prescriptive about the future use of sites in order to allow for new technologies that may come forward in the future. A desktop study was carried out of 35 sites that had been narrowed to 9 sites for built facilities. More detailed work was being undertaken to look at highway and landscape issues. These were potential sites and there was no guarantee that planning applications would be forthcoming. Mr Elkington was happy to meet with parishes and would welcome comments on the sites and the assessments. The Chairman stressed that this was the beginning of a listening exercise ahead of difficult and long-term decisions. The consultation needed to be meaningful and valuable to residents but views needed to be expressed in a constructive fashion.

34. The Chairman invited questions and comments from residents. The following issues were raised:

- A representative for the owners of Northlands Farm, part of the Hickstead site, informed the Committee that alternative development was planned for the farm, possibly a supermarket so this site may not be available.
  - Parish Councils had had a last minute informal meeting with officers in February 2010 about this issue and expressed their concerns about the lack of consultation and information.
  - Many local residents expressed their concern and anger that they had not been informed that these sites had come forward and had not been informed that the meeting was taking place.
  - The County Council had looked for brownfield sites and sites that were in industrial estates but these were not forthcoming in the area. The sites would only go forward if the landowner were in agreement.
  - Impacts on the highway network; detailed safety and pollution concerns would be addressed at the planning application stage.
  - The member's task force had been scrutinising the process and had endorsed it.
  - The impact of any stacks needed to be carefully considered as it could be a significant structure, could have impacts on the South Downs Way and was in an area of attractive countryside.
  - Some sites would likely drop out of the process but WSCC had to look at the capacity needed but it was very difficult to plan for the waste within West Sussex in the future.
  - WSCC were looking to work closely with East Sussex County Council and Brighton and Hove City Council on cross boundary issues such as the movement of waste.
  - WSCC would work closely with Mid Sussex District Council and parishes to take account of parish plans.
  - Residents and Parish Councillors asked that various facts be corrected within the assessments.
  - A District Councillor requested that leaflets with all the contact details be placed in libraries to allow people to write in by hand.
- *Post meeting note: the reasons why the sites size/capacity ratios differ is that (a) the capacity figures were indicative and (b) the reported area for the Goddards Green site is wrong. The boundary of the site was redrawn to make it*

*smaller but the area was not changed. It should be 5 **not** 8 hectares. However, the extent of all the sites is being reassessed and the capacities (based upon their developable areas i.e. having excluded areas that would not be developed such as landscape buffers) will be firmed up if the sites go forward as allocations. Unfortunately the service do not enough resources to prepare leaflets to be placed in libraries.*

35. Mr Griffiths informed the meeting that this was the first time he had heard that the task force reviewed the process for consultation and questioned whether the Strategic Environmental Services Select Committee (SESSC) had actually considered brownfield sites and he proposed that the Committee:

- i) Write to the Chairman of the SEESC task force with regard to the process because it was manifestly incomplete, it did not provide all options for public consumption i.e. Brownfield sites, sites in Brighton and Hove or within the South Downs National Park and it did not fit with local strategic priorities e.g. the Hurstpierpoint Development Plan.
- ii) Write to the Deputy Leader and Portfolio for Communities, Environment and Enterprise and ask that he receive all the information sent from residents, reviews this and request that he restarts the process.

36. The Committee agreed with the proposals above.

### **Priorities for Traffic Regulation Orders**

37. The Committee had before it a report by the Director of Communities and Infrastructure (copy appended to signed minutes). The report sought the Committee's input and approval for the list of local TRO priorities. A number of issues were discussed:

- The review of the waiting restrictions in Church Road had the support of local businesses and ensured a good turnover of customers although enforcement was an issue that needed to be looked at. The officers would draw up plans for local members to be consulted on.
- The Committee had deferred the proposal for Ferndale Road last year awaiting the outcome of the CPZ consultation but the Committee supported this going ahead, following consultation and agreement by the local Member Mrs Knight, as the road took traffic for three schools.
- The Committee asked that all assessments be carried out in term time as standard
- The Committee asked for the Speed Indicator Device (SID) to be deployed in Chanctonbury Road, Burgess Hill. Mrs Knight, as the local member, asked to be consulted about the location.
- The Committee asked that Stairbridge Lane, Hurstpierpoint, be assessed again as not all traffic turns out of the industrial estate onto the A2300.

38. Resolved – that the priority order for implementing Traffic Regulation Orders within the South Mid Sussex CLC area as set out below for the 2011-2012 year be approved:

- 1) TROBH117 – Church Road, Burgess Hill – review waiting restrictions
- 2) TROBH108 – Upper St Johns Road/Park Road, Burgess Hill – waiting restrictions

- 3) TROBH006 – Ferndale Road, Burgess Hill – waiting restrictions at junction with Keymer Road

### **York Road, Burgess Hill – Authorisation for an application to Stop Up part of the Highway**

39. The Committee had before it a report by the Director of Communities and Infrastructure (copy appended to signed minutes) which sought a decision from the Committee following a request to stop up part of the highway in York Road, Burgess Hill. The County Council as the highway authority has confirmed that the land in question is no longer needed for highway purposes.

40. Resolved: -

1. That authorisation is given to the Head of Democratic and Legal Services to make an application to the Magistrates Court to Stop Up the part of the public highway shown cross hatched on the plan contained in Appendix 1 and

2. That authorisation is given to the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to appoint external solicitors as agents to process the Highway Stopping Up application

41. Mrs Knight left the meeting at this point.

### **A272 Cowfold Road, Bolney - Speed Limit Assessment**

42. The Committee had before it an information report by the Director of Communities and Infrastructure (copy appended to signed minutes). The report outlined the results of a speed limit assessment carried out on the A272 Cowfold Road, Bolney. A number of issues were discussed:

- In the last two weeks there had been four bad accidents on the road and one fatality. The Committee asked that the accident statistics be checked and reported back.
- There was a dip in the road, which meant it was extremely difficult for people coming out of the petrol station to see oncoming traffic.
- The Committee wanted to promote a 30mph speed limit along the road and asked that the road be re-assessed and added to the Traffic Regulation Order Priority List

43. Resolved – that the Committee noted the report and requested that the A272 Cowfold Road be reassessed and added to the Traffic Regulation Order Priority list.

### **Community Initiative Funding**

44. The Chairman introduced the report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services (copy appended to the signed minutes).

45. Resolved

i) That the following awards be made:

**1612/SMS** Bolney Village Society, £330, towards the purchase of a marquee for use on village day.

ii) That the Parish Initiative Funding be merged with the Community Initiative Funding.

46. The Committee asked that the 'Speak Up' group be invited to a future meeting to report back on their 'Thumbs Up' campaign.

### **Authority School Governors**

47. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Learning (copy appended to signed minutes) that set out proposed nominations to school governing bodies and the criteria for their appointment.

48. Resolved - That the following appointments be approved:

- i) Mr Terry Prue to London Meed Primary School for a 4 year term
- ii) Dr Catherine Davies to Hassocks Infant School for a 4 year term

### **Talk with Us Open Forum**

49. A Parish Councillor questioned whether there would be a meeting to discuss the section 106 priorities this year as there had been last year. The Committee thought that the Infrastructure Planning process would pick up this issue but they agreed to discuss it at their next pre-agenda meeting.

### **Date of Next Meeting**

50. It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would take place on Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> September 2011 at a venue yet to be determined.

The meeting closed at 9.31pm.

Chairman