

**Peacehaven and Telscombe Neighbourhood Plan
Steering Group Meeting
18th March 2021 at 7pm via Zoom**

IN ATTENDANCE:

C Gallagher (CG)	Chairman
L O'Connor (LOC)	Vice Chair
N Watts (NW)	Steering Group Committee
C & P Bowman (C/PB)	Steering Group Committee
Cllr R White (RW)	Steering Group Committee
G White (GW)	Steering Group Committee

COUNCILLORS:

Cllr I Sharkey (IS)	
Cllr D Judd (DJ)	
Cllr D Paul (DP) part	
Cllr Andy Smith (AS)	
Cllr Lynn Mills (LM)	
Cllr G Hill (GH)	
Cllr D Seabrook (DS)	
Cllr A Goble (AG)	
Cllr L Symonds (LS)	
S Newman (SN)	Telscombe Town Clerk
J Boot (JB)	Project Consultant
N Astley (NA)	Planning Consultant
M Edser (ME) part	SPO Peacehaven Town Council
R Brown (RB)	Communications
B Meiler (BM)	Webmaster
M Gatti (MG)	Peacehaven Focus Group
G Lees (GS)	Pegasus Planning
K Sanderson (part)	Resident
M Hutley (MH) (part)	Resident

1. Introduction

CG welcomed everyone and explained the purpose of this special meeting was to present the results of the recent Masterplan survey. GW would follow up on social media and JB had drafted a Press Release.

2. Masterplan Survey results

The Masterplan consultation took place during January 2021 and was delivered to every household in Peacehaven, Telscombe and East Saltdean, (although an initial survey was held a year earlier). The 25-page report summarising all the feedback from the recent survey would be shared with the SG shortly. JB explained the findings would be incorporated into the Masterplan Consultation Statement – providing ideas and options to develop Peacehaven over the next few years and give guidance to developers. The Consultation Statement gives an overview of the Masterplan and summarises the community's response. Over 800 responses received in total: (200+ on paper, 600+ on-line).

The analysis of the 800 responses and 500 comments therein were broken down into themes and topics to provide an understanding of people's preferences. Notable headlines were:

- 204 respondents were concerned about roads and traffic
- 167 opposed to more housing
- 156 wanted more retail (smaller shops)
- 136 concerned about the impact on GPs and Dentists
- 126 respondents wrote about the proposals to reduce the size of the Co-op – 39 wanted to retain a large one but 87 wanted a new provider or competition.
- 77 respondents wanted the community centre library retained or enhanced
- 62 respondents wanted to see a greater hospitality offer

- Very few responses from under 25s, therefore responses were largely from an older population (143 respondents were age 65+).
- Detailed breakdowns under each section listed above were provided during the presentation.
- Pedestrian streets and squares: 42% of respondents to the paper questionnaire and 60% of the online survey respondents were in favour of this option.
- Differences in preferences to type of housing for flats/town houses, sheltered accommodation and care home were minimal.
- Shared ownership was more popular than social rent, discounted market home and sheltered housing – historically, Peacehaven was built on a home ownership idea.
- Facilities for young people: outdoor/indoor physical activities, social activity centre, youth/community centre, swimming pool, café/bar were all popular ideas put forward.
- Business hub or enterprise centre on the industrial estate ideas were well supported.

Overall result whether respondents agreed with the preferred option for the Masterplan: agree 28%, disagree 31% and 42% neither agree nor disagree.

Over 1200 other comments for Town Councils or developers for the centre of Peacehaven were generated and these were analysed to create pie charts to demonstrate results. Most comments related to concerns about roads, more housing, more retail and infrastructure, parking, retaining community services and improved green spaces and hospitality. The overall view was against more housing (6 for, 167 against). Respondents were also concerned about parking and there were 116 negative comments against the planned proposals.

CG thanked JB for the analysis and presentation. It was noted the Masterplan was always a concept document to create discussion and provide views from the community: this had certainly been achieved! CG also reminded the meeting that any comments should not relate to the recently published HDD plans as it was not for this group to discuss.

3. Q & A

- a) LS observed the number of negative comments from residents who feel their voices are not heard and asked about changes to the Masterplan. JB replied that it was a concept document to tease out views, therefore it will not be revised but publication of the Consultation Statement will publish the views expressed and policy recommendations will be made from this including the 5 UoB reports (JB to discuss with NA). The exercise has documented the views of residents.

The town is required to provide new homes, therefore the conversation with residents should concentrate on minimising the impact and meeting the population's needs - compromise will be necessary. NA added the Masterplan is only one stage and is a tool towards the end result, which is the NP. The data provided now sits within the NP and reflects the views of the local population - the data will be extracted and worked into the policies for the NP.

- b) PB suggested the only way to finance the demolition and re-purposing of a town centre is via housing – and asked what level is needed to provide the money for this? NA responded that the Steering Group is not submitting a planning application: the Masterplan is only a concept within the NP, a strategic vision. It is about the type of housing, businesses and their designs, it is not concerned with costs so there is no requirement to build a business case, only to evidence the views.
- c) Discussion took place regarding underground parking - JB said it was expensive. The most cost-effective way was to build the car park under or over the supermarket, but this would require greater funding which would result in less money for other improvements.
- d) MG said the main difficulty for residents was in separating the NP Masterplan from the HDD proposal - many people believed they were the same thing. Residents had previously put forward their view and the HDD proposal had ignored them. JB responded that the Masterplan survey explained that it was not a planning application - HDD will have full access to the report, as will other stakeholders. CG said the SG were aware of the confusion and further explanation would be needed, however the NP is gaining awareness and engagement. She hoped MG would assist in further publicising the message. The FAQs would be revisited but the Meridian site was only part of the NP.

NA agreed the overlap and timing was poor, however the Neighbourhood Development Plan was started in 2015, AECOM came on board in 2018 and it was known then that the Meridian site was pivotal. The NP listed strategic policies across the town, and every communication and document issued should emphasise the difference between the NDP concepts and HDD Planning Application for Meridian site.

- e) RW felt it important to encourage people to complete the HDD survey and have conversations about it, including on social media. Pupils at PCS were asked to participate as well, however survey results don't always reflect the population. He suggested delaying publication of the Masterplan survey results. PB agreed about the confusion - he had issued a special TRA newsletter explaining the differences to his mailing list, encouraging everyone to complete the HDD form and suggested the SG should do similar.
- f) NW asked if there was a way of recommending sustainable community transport for Peacehaven similar to The Big Lemon that serves Brighton. CG responded that PTC are working on this, but nothing will happen quickly, and another survey about buses will be issued to get the public's views.
- g) LS had concerns about affordable housing – young people are unable to find it within Peacehaven, therefore are living at home longer. Many of the new homes being built were sold to outsiders – homes for local people were needed. NA explained the concept of 'affordable housing' was complicated due to definitions of 80% of market prices, part buy/part rent schemes which are unaffordable. Private schemes to fund affordable housing do not meet Government requirements. House prices have recently increased around 20% due to the Brighton influence, so little can be done.
- h) GW felt the consultations were very similar and future communication must clearly identify the differences. He was unsure about the appetite for more surveys.
- i) BM felt advertising had been poor – there were no posters about it in the Meridian Centre and to reach more people, the whole campaign should be marketed more. CG responded that the team were volunteers and working through Covid had added extra difficulties - but the NP was in the final stages of getting a draft document in place. When restrictions are lifted, it was hoped to do more communication and events.

JB observed a recent survey done by B&HCC had a response of 500 people – therefore 800 for Peacehaven was excellent. Survey leaflets were sent to every household, press releases had been issued, articles in digital media, social media – much had been done to publicise the plan.

- j) RW observed the future of Peacehaven will be dictated by responses to the HDD survey and suggested a banner at the Dell to encourage people to participate. This was agreed to be a good idea.

4. Any Other Business

- CG summarised that this was a complex NP with many different elements and the team have worked very hard to get to this point. The expense of sending out the Masterplan survey and the analysis was worth the money to achieve the responses.
- AECOM had taken on board the views expressed at the meeting last week and JB will now pull everything together before feeding back to the SG. Anyone with comments on the Design codes should respond by return as JB and CG will co-ordinate comments by 31 March.

5. Next Steering Group meeting: Thursday 8th April at 7pm.

Meeting closed at 8.32pm