



Tel: (01444) 247726
Fax: (01444) 233707
Website: <http://www.burgesshill.gov.uk>

30 August 2019

To: **MEMBERS OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT KEY AREA GROUP, BURGESS HILL TOWN COUNCIL**

A **MEETING** of the **STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT KEY AREA GROUP** will be held in the Council Chamber on **3 September 2019** at **19.00 hours**, when your attendance is required.

Steve Cridland
Chief Executive Officer

****PLEASE NOTE THE START TIME OF THE MEETING****

Filming, recording of Council meetings and use of social media:

During this meeting members of the public may film or record the Committee and officers from the public area only providing it does not disrupt the meeting. The Confidential section of the meeting may not be filmed or recorded.

If a member of the public objects to being recorded, the person(s) filming must stop doing so until that member of the public has finished speaking.

The use of social media is permitted but members of the public are requested to switch their mobile devices to silent for the duration of the meeting.

A G E N D A

1. OPEN FORUM

Members of the public are invited to put questions or to draw relevant matters to the Council's attention. Each member of the public is allowed to speak once only in respect of a business item on the agenda (whether in the Open Forum or during the meeting) and shall not speak for more than three minutes at the discretion of the

Chairman.

If it appears that the number of speakers is likely to unreasonably delay the disposal of business items on the agenda the Chairman may direct that a member of the public submits a question or comment in writing which shall be answered in due course.

2. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

3. **SUBSTITUTES**

4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In respect of any matter on the agenda.

5. **NOTES OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT MEETING**

Notes of the meeting held on 2 July 2019. The Background paper discussed at the previous meeting will need to be revisited for clarification.

6. **BRIDGE THE GAP**

Terms of Reference are attached as Appendix 1

7. **COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW**

7.1 Legislative background

7.1.1 Under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (“the Act”) there are provisions which allow for the review of “the whole or part of the principal council’s area” (“a community governance review”). These reviews allow a principal authority to make recommendations to create new parish councils or amend the areas of existing parish councils. In certain circumstances the principal council may implement these recommendations.

7.1.2 The Act includes provisions which allow a community governance review to be triggered by way of a community governance petition (s80 (1) of the Act).

7.1.3 For the purposes of any petition which Burgess Hill Town Council wishes to create the following conditions must be met:

- (a) It must be signed by 7.5% of the electors (s80 (3) (c) as amended by SI 2015/998 art 3(c)) This is the required percentage for the electorate of Burgess Hill;
 - (b) It must define the area to which the review is to relate;
 - (c) Specify one or more recommendations which the petitioners wish a community governance review to consider making;
- and

(d) It must define the area of the parish as it would be after the alteration.

7.1.4 The principal council must complete its corporate governance review within 12 months of receipt of the corporate governance petition (s93 (8) as amended by SI 2015/998 art 10).

7.2 Areas considered amenable for review

7.2.1 There are two areas of land that are contiguous with the boundaries of Burgess Hill that are amenable for review. These are:

- (a) The land known as the Northern Arc which currently sits in the Ansty and Staplefield parish; and
- (b) The land off Valebridge Road which currently sits in the Wivelsfield parish.

7.2.2 The principal councils in respect of 2.1 (a) and 2.1(b) above are respectively Mid Sussex District Council and Lewes District Council.

7.2.3 Maps setting out the defined areas to be considered for review are attached to this report.

7.3 Reasons for moving the boundaries

7.3.1 The development strategy on the **Northern Arc** was always predicated on the understanding that it was a trade-off between Burgess Hill taking a greater share of the housing allocation in return for the release of funds to meet the inner town's shortfall in public realm assets. This was clearly signposted in Burgess Hill's Town wide strategy (2011) and it formed a cornerstone of the town's neighbourhood plan.

7.3.2 The Northern Arc is part of the Burgess Hill growth area. Whilst this growth area covers a number of other parishes it is fair to say that the natural town centre for the development is Burgess Hill rather than the village centres of Hurstpierpoint, Ansty or the town centre of Haywards Heath.

7.3.3 The proposed redevelopment and regeneration of Burgess Hill's town centre will make it a natural draw for new residents on the Northern Arc. Whilst the town centre redevelopment provides opportunities it also presents a number of infrastructure challenges (notably traffic congestion and parking) which the development on the Northern Arc will exacerbate.

- 7.3.4 The **land off Valebridge Road** in Wivelsfield Parish is mostly developed, though there may also be undeveloped land with outstanding planning consent. The properties form a natural unit with all of the other properties off Valebridge Road and access to and exit from these properties is only possible via Burgess Hill.
- 7.3.5 Another material consideration relates to the risk of further housing development on the Wivelsfield Parish/Burgess Hill border adding to infrastructure pressures on Valebridge Road, Junction Road and Leylands Road.
- 7.3.6 Both the Northern Arc and the land off Valebridge Road are contiguous with Burgess Hill and form a single unit with the town. They use the services of the town for retail, leisure and public services. Burgess Hill's town centre is their focal point. From a community and democratic perspective these areas should form part of the Burgess Hill town council area.
- 7.4 According to Electoral services at MSDC there are currently 24,484 electors registered in Burgess Hill. 7.5% equates to 1834 signatures needed.

RECOMMENDED:

1. Identify and map the specific areas that should form the basis of the community governance reviews;
2. confirm the minimum number of signatures required for a community governance petition (7.5% of the electors)
3. confirm the wording required on the community governance petition
4. Initiate 2 community governance petitions (1 each for the Northern Arc and the land and houses off Valebridge Road)
5. The collection of signatures for each community governance petition so that each may be presented to Mid Sussex District Council and Lewes District Council (as appropriate) by 31st October 2019.

7. CULTURAL QUARTER UPDATE

- 7.1 Council's solicitors have provided the committee with a draft CIO constitution to consider.
- 7.2 Dame Vera Lynne has provided her consent to have the auditorium in the Beehive Centre named after her.
- 7.3 A planning application has been submitted and the outcome is expected on 4 November 2019.

- 7.4 Members of the public were invited to submit a CV to join the Cultural Quarter Committee if interested. CVs received are attached and are for consideration under the confidential section of this agenda.

For Noting

8. **DARE TO DREAM**

Staff and members of the Council were asked to submit ideas that they had for the town. This forms part of the Bridge the Gap project which is aimed at improving the town generally and the centre of town specifically. The list of ideas forms Appendix 2. The Group is asked to consider the suggestions and decide on how best to proceed. Some ideas are ambitious while others would rely on a third party to make them happen.

9. **RECOGNITION OF GLOBAL CLIMATE AND BIODIVERSITY EMERGENCIES**

Council instructed the KAG as follows:

The Council instructs the Strategic Development KAG to formulate a plan for, and include in the strategic planning process for the council, any and all relevant actions & measures to further the spirit and intent of this motion.

The motion is attached as Appendix 3.

CONFIDENTIAL

10. **EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

In view of the confidential nature of the business about to be transacted, it is proposed that, in the public interest, the public and press be temporarily excluded and they be requested to withdraw from the meeting.

11. **MEMBERSHIP OF CULTURAL QUARTER COMMITTEE**

To consider applications from volunteers to join the committee.

BHTC Strategic Development KAG - Our Objectives 2nd July 2019

Background

Burgess Hill developed a town-wide strategy, which was initiated around 2006 by a Lib Dem regime and subsequently was taken forward by the Conservatives, the final document being published in 2011. It was in response to a central Government target given to Mid Sussex to build some 17,000 homes by John Prescott – we as a town looked at what was feasible to be built in the Burgess Hill. The report concluded that BH could take around 4,000 and recommended that we should take the hit, on the assumption that we could raise on Section 106 contributions around £10,000 to £20,000 per house. It contained a list of infrastructure needed if the development went ahead, totalling £40m. This included money for an Arts Centre to replace the Martlets at a cost of £4m.

In the development of this plan, the contractors who had been approached with the task of building the housing agreed that they would contribute a further £40m to the BH Town Council to build the additional infrastructure to support the town expansion.

This approach was rejected by MSDC as the planning authority, but much of the content of the strategy was incorporated into the District Plan. However, because of disagreements within MSDC this plan was only submitted for agreement in 2018, and in consequence a much lower level of section 106 money was raised, not all of which was spent on BH infrastructure. The deal between the developers and BHTC was scrapped. No Community Infrastructure Levy has been raised either, 25% of which would have been payable to BHTC.

In fact around 2,000 houses have been given planning permission since the rejection of the strategy, and a further 3,500 to 4,000 will be built on the Northern Arc.

The Key Documents

The BH Town-wide Strategy 2011

<https://www.burgesshill.gov.uk/strategicvision>

The BH Neighbourhood Plan 2015

<https://www.burgesshill.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplan/>

The District Plan 2014

<https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/planning-building/mid-sussex-district-plan/>

Supplementary:

The Sustainability Report

<https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/planning-building/mid-sussex-district-plan/>

The BH Transport Strategy

Not on website – several documents

The BH Cultural Quarter

<https://www.burgesshill.gov.uk/culturalquarter>

The BH Regeneration Programme

The Regeneration Programme has several components, each a separate project:

- Burgess Hill Town Centre transformation (£65m)
- The Northern Arc plus other sites already under construction (5,000 new homes)
- A Technology Business Park (25 hectares - 15,000 new jobs)
- A sports complex
- Full Fibre Digital Infrastructure
- Upgrading the A2300 to dual carriageway
- Improved Transport Connectivity

The total cost of all these developments nears £1bn.

The BH Regeneration Programme has an overarching political board, supported by an executive board. The four who sit on the political board, having overall control of the programme, are Louise Goldsmith (Leader WSCC), Lee Harris (Chief Exec WSCC), Jonathan Ash-Edwards (Leader MSDC), Kathryn Hall (Chief Exec MSDC). They tend to meet quarterly.

Reporting to them (to do the work) is an Officer Group, who meet monthly. This is chaired by Judy Holmes, supported by Sally Blomfield (both MSDC planning). Also on this sits Duncan Barrett, senior programme manager for WSCC, who is responsible for this and four other major change programmes (he is about to leave). Paul Jackson-Cole, who reports to him, is responsible for managing the BH Regeneration Programme.

Supporting and critiquing these boards is a group of Councillors. This is chaired by Jonathan Ash-Edwards (who is responsible for oversight of the economics of the BH Growth), Andrew Barrett-Miles as County Councillor (the only one who lives in Burgess Hill), Joy Dennis, Andrew McNaughton (MSDC cabinet member for planning), plus an array of officers including Judy Holmes, Duncan Barrett, and the transport Manager for West Sussex.

In the whole set up there is only one person who represents Burgess Hill, and there are no Lib Dems.

Cllrs Roger Cartwright (Chairman), Graham Allen, Joseph Foster, Kathleen Willis, Andrew Barrett-Miles, Robert Duggan

In addition there is/was a Sustainability Project that has some 10 members whose task is to check that all the component parts of the Programme are supported by the correct infrastructure, including road, railway, parking facilities etc.

Judy Holmes chairs, in addition, a user group on which sit representatives from the towns and villages who are likely to be affected by the BH Regeneration, including the likes of Twineham and Bolney. Some BH Councillors are likely to be invited to attend the future meetings.

BHTC ran a Transport Group which took a specific interest in the transport aspects of the programme - it has reported and has faded. It should be regenerated itself since there are big transport issues to consider. All the grants for transport improvements eg A2300 widening have to be spent by 2021 so these schemes are being pushed through quickly. WSCC is responsible for the delivery.

There is a SHEILA working group which is responsible for ensuring a land supply strategic planning, in particular house building. Sue Hatton is our representative on this body.

The BHTC Strategic Development KAG has a prime responsibility to represent the interests of BH, and to ensure that the Regeneration Programme is delivered in line with the 2011 Town-wide Strategy and indeed in the current interests of the residents of BH.

BH Town Centre

The planning and delivery of the transformed BH Town Centre was outsourced to New River Teil, who were given a termed lease from MSDC the Freeholders to redevelop an area that broadly equates to the Martlets centre. The Martlets Centre was included within this deal, and the proposal was that the Centre itself would be closed and not replaced.

The Culture Quarter

Following strong public protests about the closure of the centre, an advisory committee was set up by the Town Council including representatives of the Centre users to look at options for the design, development and running of what became terms as an Arts Centre, including a purpose-built theatre for the performing arts. Currently this is chaired by Robert Eggleston and supported by the BHTC chief executive.

The Role of the Strategic Devt. KAG

The role of the Strategic Development KAG is to ensure that the needs of Burgess Hill are met within the current planning framework, which includes the BH Regeneration Programme.

Our Immediate Objectives

- a) We look to have a greater representation of Burgess Hill Councillors in the governance of the Regeneration Programme.
- b) We aim to get a realistic share of the development money to fund the infrastructure needs of the town given its rapid current and planned expansion.
- c) We need to agree the recommendations of the Cultural Quarter Committee and canvass support for its recommendations within the governance of the Regeneration Programme.
- d) We will look to a way of updating the Neighbourhood Plans which is incremental only and does not involve another major exercise at great cost of time and expenditure.

Annex 2

Thank you for meeting with us last week and sharing your presentation ahead of the public display last Saturday. We found the meeting most helpful and I am sure you will have realised from the response you had on Saturday just how passionate our public is about the town and in particular the new development. I hope that you will be in a position to provide us with regular updates to allay rumours and any fears that the public may have. To this end it would be useful to have a contact (unless you would like us to contact you) with issues which may arise. The Help Point has in the past felt inadequate in their ability to provide information. Their concern is that the public find them lacking as many questions cannot be answered. Believe me, the public can become vicious if they feel that the Council should be better informed.

Cllr Eggleston has asked that I list a few important points which have been identified:

1. Delivery of the plan - this is the 4th attempt and it has to be delivered this time. The public is losing confidence and the recent elections show their displeasure with the progress to date as well as the lack of communication.
2. There will need to be private and public sector support to "Bridge the Gap" whilst development takes place. Small traders in particular are finding the trading climate very difficult and I am aware of some that are facing closure due to amongst other things, heavy overheads. I am aware that NRR has made some concessions already but more may be needed to ensure that they survive the ever lessening footfall especially when Lidl moves. From our side we would be happy to provide events in town including the sand pit which is a great attraction

during the summer holidays. If you have any other suggestions about how we might help, please let me know.

3. There is a considerable amount of support, indeed demand, for a Changing Places Toilet facility. We need to set out our aspirations for a town that supports all needs - the able bodied through to serious disabilities plus being a welcoming place for people with 'hidden' illnesses (building on the dementia friendly town concept). We believe that a facility such as this would set the centre apart from the competitors. I should highlight that Burgess Hill probably has more than the average number of needy people due largely to Woodlands Meed school and the nearness of Chailey Heritage which is a large centre caring for all disabilities. NRR would derive considerable support if it were to make this a key point of the development.
4. Another strong theme is the return of a market and in particular an indoor market. Again a potential commercial plus and something that the town would welcome. Locating it near the new town square - say the former Argos building and possibly in the meantime along Church Walk. Now that Ian is leaving, has NRR any ideas on how to progress this idea? The Town Council would be very supportive and there are sufficient funds in the Town Centre Partnership pot to set it all up.
5. Could you provide confirmation that there will be disabled access to the serviced office space? There is also the potential for some of the space to be available for hourly lets to provide additional meeting room space in the town.
6. Could you give some thought to the potential use for the unit next to the Library to be used for some sort of public service/third sector service use? Perhaps we could discuss this next time we meet.
7. We mentioned in our meeting the cost to the Council (£70k per annum) to service a £3million loan over 50 years to pay for the community performance centre to replace the Martlets. Despite the report commissioned by MSDC which tried to show that the users of the Martlets could be accommodated elsewhere and that the facility was only 43% used, we believe the report to have been flawed and that there is sufficient support in town for a smaller centre. This can be substantiated by the Clark report commissioned by the Town Council which showed that there was a need for a flexible community space incorporating a performance space in the town centre. In addition to the £3 million loan a further £2.5 million is needed. Approximately £400k can be covered by council reserves and section 106 funding but we will be reliant on a fundraiser to raise the balance. This could well form part of the section 106 negotiations when your next planning application is submitted. We will be following this with keen interest.
8. The Town Council is an important influencer/stakeholder and want to be supportive of this scheme, however we need to be guardians of our residents' interests – something which the ballot box showed was not previously the case.

9. The Council is delighted by the new approach to communication and fact that there is planned further presentation to come following feedback from Saturday. We look forward to future meetings and in particular ahead of any future public presentation.