



**NOTES OF A MEETING OF THE CR3 FORUM STEERING GROUP HELD WITH TDC ON
WEDNESDAY 19TH JULY 2017
1000 UNTIL 1200 AT TDC OFFICES, OXTED**

Present:	Geoff Duck (GD)	Richard York (RY)
CR3 Attendees	Cherie Callender (CC)	Mike Smith (MS)
	Edward Howard (EH)	Jenny Gaffney (JG)
	George Dennis (GDe)	Chris Windridge (CW)
	John Orrick (JO)	John Cheetham (JC)
	David Carlisle (DC)	Maureen Gibbins (MG)– note taking
TDC Attendees	Sarah Thompson (ST)	
	Peter Bond (PB)	

1 Introduction

All present introduced themselves to those in attendance.

2 Brief History of CR3 Forum and progress to date

Geoff Duck (GD) gave a brief history of the CR3 from when it originated via ABC to the progress made to date and what is required to finalise the NP.

There is a need to finalise work in context of Evolving Local Plan and NPPF.

Mike Smith reported that there has been a lot of consultation since 2014 from which policies have arisen and there is good quality planning based on evidence. A Basic Conditions Statement is required to explain to the public why decisions have been made.

GD reiterated that the plan needs to be packaged ready to submit to IPE for comments.

GDe confirmed that issues in emerging local plan must be addressed and must be planning compliant. It was agreed that planning is always left to interpretation.

PB commented that the Steering group needs to look at policies that don't quite fit and reassess then can look at moving forward with the document.

ST confirmed that the Local Plan will look at allocating sites. It was agreed that site allocation will have fundamental impact re the garden villages.

ST further confirmed that key policies that need to be removed from the plan are U04 and U07 as both are addressed by County and not legally compliant for a NP. RY was not convinced that the NP cannot look at Fracking and Waste Facilities however ST stated that legislation stipulates that the district/Parish/NP would only be a statutory consultee.

Discussion ensued and it was agreed the issue regarding Fracking and Waste could be incorporated into the back of the document with reference that they have been considered and were considered at the consultation. RY still considers they are strategic objectives which need to be dealt with.

ST reinforced that the policies should be compliant with the Core Strategy; NPPF; Emerging Local Plan and the NP should address issues which are local to the area and evidence should be reiterated to reinforce the reasons for including the policy in the NP.

If the policy is not appropriate the planning officers will look no further.

DC commented that flooding is not sufficiently specific to the NP area in the policy and more specificity is required e.g Caterham Bourne and flooding at Queens Park.

The strong message evolved from most in attendance that there is much more need for local evidence in the policies which are important to the NP area and something extra needs to be brought to the policy than is stated in the NPPF and emerging Local Plan.

ST confirmed that TDC will adopt policies but with more localized issues.

It was considered that some of the policies are contradictory.

Maps included in the NP need to be linked to policies.

LGS is important to the neighbourhood.

ST confirmed that the Visioning/Objectives/Monitoring needs to be more streamlined and at a higher level. Make Vision shorter and clear

Look at Objectives in relation to policies.

Have indicators for objectives and ask 'can they be monitored at the end?'

EH repeated that it is needed for each section to be defined for the public and not just for planners.

The SEA/SA needs to be checked against policies following Reg 16.

Steering Group to provide ST with reports and reviews. ST would prefer to review as a whole.

Monitoring is undertaken at District level however if a local issue then this will need to be monitored at Parish level.

DC will provide a template from the Windsor NP regarding green infrastructure policy.

Best value from IPE will be to submit policies on which a view is required. If policies do not match basic conditions then plan will fail.

Programme after IPE will be really tight and all are hopeful that TDC will be content with response.

A middle ground needs to be identified so as not to repeat NPPF but comply. Concern was expressed by the Steering Group that the draft comments from TDC in response to the Reg 14 NP consultation has been very negative. ST agreed that following this meeting she would be redrafting the comments. The redraft will be reviewed by Piers Mason, Peter Bond and Geoff Duck before submitting.

Next meeting with TDC will be on Thursday 31st August, 10am at TDC.

Post meeting discussion

It was agreed the QUOD document needs to be reviewed in relation to the NP document. In light of consultation after 29 July, reconcile TDC/QUOD/what CR3 Forum wants and against Basic Conditions.

Where are the local geographical areas re Fracking Fracking/Minerals – fall on legal/technical however can be objectives with action plan and monitored.

Polish Vision Statement and Objectives. Strategic Objectives to be linked to policies

Single team to work through Basic Conditions. Need to reduce 66 policies down

Change some policies to objectives

GDe needs evidence base for LGS. Currently not a lot of supporting evidence

MG to submit QUOD report to Steering Group and request comments by 21st July or meeting on 26th July.

Reg 19 will be under way for 5 Garden Villages and new sites. Considered that new sites should go through Reg 18.

Local Plan – extra sites to be requested to go to Reg 18 consultations. MG to request that District checks with District solicitor that this is compliant.

Utilities – neighbourhood infrastructure. Strategic flood risk assessment is needed.

CIL is the format for monitoring.

CR3 Forum will be Statutory Consultee for all plans once the NP is passed.