



# North Horsham Parish Council

**Notes from the Novartis Parish Liaison Meeting held online on Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> May 2025 at 10am**

**Planning Applications DC/25/0415 and DC/25/0629 - Former Novartis Site Parsonage Road.**

**Purpose of the meeting:-** to be updated on and to discuss the development on the Former Novartis Site, Parsonage Road following submission of the above planning applications.

**In Attendance:**

Jane Apostolou	WRRRA
Shannon Betteridge	Paul Bash Associates
Ellen Bryan	Muse - Development Manager
Isabelle Clay	HGP Architects
Cllr Joy Gough	NHPC Cllr and Chair of NHCLT
Cllr Warick Hellawell	HDC Cllr
Cllr Donald Mahon	NHPC Cllr
Will McKay	Lovell Partnership - Development Manager
Trudie Mitchell	Denne NC
Sarah Norman	NHPC Parish Clerk
Cllr Neil Simmond	NHPC Cllr
Nik Smith	Nexus Planning
Guy Stanley	Forest NC
Kirsty Tickner	NHPC Committee Clerk
Cllr Ray Turner	NHPC Cllr and <b>Chairman of the meeting</b>
Francis Vernon	HD Cycle Forum

**1) Welcome and Apologies**

Cllr. R. Turner welcomed all in attendance to the meeting, introducing himself as Chairman of both this Liaison Group and the Planning, Environment and Transport Committee for North Horsham Parish Council (NHPC).

The Chairman went on to say it is good to be moving forward with the development of the Novartis site and was looking forward to the update from the Developers. The Chairman made everyone aware that the Parish Councillors at this meeting may ask questions about the development but they would not be making comments on the two applications until the next Committee meeting on the 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2025.

The Chairman went on to say how representatives invited to attend the meeting included representatives of Muse Developments Ltd and their partners in this project, HDC Planning, and others from the community such as Denne and Trafalgar Neighbourhood Councils, Horsham Society, Wimblehurst Road Residents Association and North Horsham Community Land Trust. There are also Councillor representatives from NHPC.

The Chairman stated that he did not have the intention for everyone to introduce themselves but asked if they could indicate the organisation they represent when speaking. Apologies were **NOTED** from Ron Bates, Cllr Tony Bevis, Cllr Nigel Friswell, Jason Hawkes, and Cllr Morag Warrack.

**2) Notes from the previous meeting**

Notes from 24<sup>th</sup> January 2025 meeting having been circulated previously and available on the Parish Council website, were **NOTED**.

**3) Chairman's Update**

The Chairman had no specific update and asked if the representative from Lovell wanted to go first with their update.

**4) Update from the developer.**

Nik Smith (NS), the Nexus Planning Consultant for Muse Developments Ltd, jumped in quickly to say that they are delighted to see things moving forward, and that the planning applications are available to view on the HDC website and how this update will give an overview of the scheme.

NS introduced others from the development team including Ellen Bryan (EB) - Muse Development Manager, Will McKay (WM) - Development Manager from the Lovell Partnership, Isabelle Clay (IC) from HGP Architects, and Shannon Betteridge (SB) from Paul Basham Associates, who are the transport consultants advising the project.

NS then handed over to WM to proceed with the Lovell update.

WM presented slides (attached as an Appendix to these Notes) talking through each of them. WM went through where the scheme was as part of the reserved matters application a few years ago, following consent for the scheme then. A reserved matters application was submitted when the scheme was for 260 homes, the retention of the existing building, and a mix of flats and houses across the scheme. Following a fair amount of engagement with Horsham Councillors, Horsham District Council (HDC) Officers and Tree Officers etc, a few elements have evolved from the reserved matters application, that most notably was the condition of the existing trees along the boulevard, where the health and integrity of those trees dropped off quite significantly and became quite a health and safety concern. The longevity of the trees moving forward into the new development was questionable, so following that engagement, they took a step back to consider what the key principles of the site are, where are the opportunities and constraints of the scheme, where are elements that they can actually optimise it, to move it forward into this new application.

WM went on to say, recovering the report given at the last meeting, a key point was the enhancement of the boulevard in the view through the site from Parsonage Road, celebration of the heritage asset and how they can potentially enhance that, through the development. It was then they started to look at that reserved matters scheme and the boulevard and thinking about the open space on this site and how they can make it a better, more useable space than just smaller pockets along that boulevard.

When Muse started to develop their residential scheme, it included the connectivity between the two, with common themes and connectivity running through the site, enhancing the site for residents of the two schemes, and also rationalisation of the parking resulting in the development of the scheme as shown in the Masterplan Development slide of the overall site plan, which is the same as what has been submitted as part of the application. They have maintained the main boulevard running through the centre with replacement trees alongside, with smaller pockets of green space along that boulevard, moving green space to the front of the Heritage Building, with more prominence to the open space there, feeling that this is a more usable space for all involved. The arrangement of the houses and flats was reconsidered resulting in a reduction in the number of units by 54, by lowering the number of flats on the site and increasing the number of houses, and looked at the relationship of how they front on to that boulevard and make better use of that space, and that came out of removing the existing trees, replanting, and making a more efficient use of that space.

The house types and elevations are all very similar to what was in the original reserved matters scheme, it is more the orientation of the layout of the houses that has changed by creating these mews elements coming off the boulevard where there was a bit more freedom in terms of the space. They have retained a lot of key aspects with the smaller Mews houses fronting onto Parsonage road, the retention of the existing building, the removal of the back block in replacement to those there, and the two blocks of flats either side flanking the building. WM went on to say they have removed two blocks either side of the Heritage Building and replaced them with houses which, in their opinion, gave more prominence to the building by lowering the heights and creating more of a view and helped manage parking better.

The scale of the buildings is exactly the same as the reserved matters. WM showed the Proposed Layout slide showing 47 houses and 159 flats, and working on the basis of policy compliant of affordable housing which is currently 35%, which will be a mix of flats and houses. The principles of vehicular movement across the site, are much the same as the reserved matters, so the Lovell side will be predominantly served off of Wimblehurst road, along the main boulevard with secondary streets peeling off it. WM said he will come onto pedestrian and cycle lanes across the site. All the parking on the Lovell side is achieved on odd plots or parking courts and also reutilising the basement under the Heritage Building to serve the flats as well, giving up to a fairly healthy parking number which they feel is appropriate for the number of dwellings. Looking at 252 proposed parking spaces with 12 disabled spaces, all of which will have electric car charging spaces. On top of that, they also have cycle stores and cycle parking etc as well.

WM showed the Aerial view slide and went on to say that on the developed scheme they have produced visuals of the site, all within the design and access statement of the planning application, and they feel that when you start looking at the visuals, it is a much stronger scheme, and whilst taking a step back at the start, to reconsider some of those opportunities and constraints of the site, it is actually coming up to being a very successful scheme in their opinion.

WM highlighted the external view slide showing the view of the newly tree lined boulevard from Wimblehurst road, and the house types themselves and they have taken a lot of those principles into this scheme, and a slide showing a closer up view of the Heritage Building where it can be seen where removing those blocks of flats at the end and actually pushing back a little bit creating the newer boulevard gives the building more prominence. WM went onto highlight a slide of the external view from the southern side of the site with more usable open space at the side, and showed the side profile of the flats.

WM appreciated it was a swift run through but if there are any elements that anyone particularly wants to pick up, he is happy to drop back to a slide.

NS then stepped in to ask if anyone immediately wanted to question or raise anything regarding the presentation.

Francis Vernon (FV) asked WM if it is correct that the houses don't have garages? WM responded saying no they don't have garages.

FV went on to ask if there will be on street parking on the main boulevard? WM responded saying they have tried to incorporate a lot of landscape design features to try and avoid it and prevent it, and all the parking is taken off that main boulevard. WM showed a slide showing the Proposed vehicular parking strategy and went on to say how there are pockets of green space along the main boulevard and looking to make sure there are landscaped features which stop people pulling up on to those and a lot of those incorporate some of those green edges that feed into that rain garden and is part of their drainage strategy. The whole intention was to prevent people from parking along the main boulevard and pushes the parking to the sides of the plots and created parking courts on the side which gives people ample opportunity to park away from the main boulevard.

FV went on to ask how they are organising the cycle parking for the houses? WM responded saying there will be parking stores within the plots at the back of the houses. FV asked if there will be easy access from the back of the houses to the front for bikes to be brought out that way? WM responded saying yes, every plot can access their garden from the front of the house; there will be paths that go around to the back for the Terraced houses and similarly for the semi-detached, there will be gates, without having to pull bikes through the house unless someone particularly wants to.

FV thanks WM for the responses.

RT asked WM if they have decided on the species of tree along the boulevard. WM responded to say it is in the planning application, and NS then responded to say the trees are Dawn Redwood and were selected following the advice of their landscape advisors who felt they would grow to suitably impressive scale fitting the boulevard character. RT thanked WM and NS for their response.

The Chairman then asked if they wanted to move onto Muse now and reserve further questions until after that.

Trudie Mitchell (TM) queried the refuse collection points for the Heritage Building. WM responded to say there are specific collection points, as per the refuse and waste plan within the planning application which outlines that. There are bin collection areas for the Heritage Building where people drop off their waste, and the refuse collection team will pick up those bins. TM asked if the collection point would be in the basement of the building and WM confirmed they were not. Shannon Betteridge (SB) updated that they have made sure that across the development, the refuse vehicles are able to turn in the parking courts as required to avoid needing to reverse down into the undercroft parking areas. Therefore as you come down the boulevard and go around the corners towards the Heritage Building, there are parking courts in those locations where the refuse vehicles would turn and the bins would be in close proximity to that area. TM thanked SB.

WM showed the refuse collection point slide to show the various refuse storage locations and collection points.

Isabel Clay (IC) showed the slides for Muse and started with the site layout plan for Phase 3, and highlighted key points including the entry road off Parsonage road, and the 244 dwellings, which is a mix of 102 houses, including the coach houses, and 142 apartments, across seven blocks. Throughout the site, they have continued to emphasize the Heritage Building, mirroring the boulevard through the site, up to a central axis court yard which then branches off to the main local equipment area of play (LEAP) and local area of play (LAP) park area, before leading onto the southern green space. They have a range of 1 to 4 bedroom houses, 2 bedroom coach houses, and an array of 1 to 3 bedroom apartments throughout the scheme. They also have policy compliant parking throughout, and what they have tried to do with much of that is tuck it into parking courts, keeping it off the key boulevard areas, with the tree frontage to give a nicer street scene. The central court yards have parking in front of them, but parking is kept off the main boulevard, to give the emphasis to the public open space and the pedestrian friendly atmosphere. IC highlighted, from the building heights slide, the maximum four storey apartment blocks, and then the houses ranging from two to three storeys.

IC moved onto the Indicative 3D Visuals slide, highlighting the build up of the height towards Parsonage Road. They have the connectivity through the schemes and showed the connecting route that runs through and around the site connecting to the LEAP and the LAP which they have located on the Parsonage road side to unite the community with the existing community and phase 1 and 2. This creates a nice circular route for dog walks and local amenity, allowing incidental play as you go around. IC highlighted the heights and massing of the key frontages and the central court yards, and how the designs have been emphasized in certain areas to focus on those key points. IC highlighted the street scenes slide, pointing out the central boulevard that takes you from the Heritage Building to the left, right down to the central courtyard, before it branches off to go to the play areas and down to the point of the site where the public open space (POS) is. Also have the bottom section of the boulevard, where the height is brought down and gives a slight change to the atmosphere as you go through those streets.

IC showed Gateway slides pointing out certain areas such as the Gateway area, which you come into the site and turn down blocks A and B in the center, to go down the main boulevard, and then get to the point where they have emphasized the key features within the design. IC highlighted the Boulevard cross section slide showing emphasis on the pedestrian area and green space which also doubles as drainage in those spaces, and then went onto the Ecology Edge slides showing the perimeter areas which help line the edge of the site, and the lower area which emphasizes the route that wraps around the entire site, and Parsonage road. IC went onto the Parsonage Green slide and pointed out the level access which gives a nice emphasis to the height of those buildings where they have been brought up in height a little bit. IC went onto further street scene slides, which are in the planning application, and pointed out the bottom blocks that went on to the point of the site, and overlook the POS, and the perimeter areas and the section through the smaller central court yards that gives a different character in those different zones of the site.

IC moved onto the Elevation slide and highlighted Blocks A and B, the Gateway blocks, showing the gables which reflect the local vernacular in those areas. IC then went onto showing the Parking Provision throughout the site and they are policy compliant. They don't have garages but they do have coach house areas that have unallocated spaces together with some spaces at the front of the site which they aim to be for car club, encouraging sustainable transport.

IC highlighted their refuse strategy, saying they have tried to avoid having refuse collections from the main Boulevard to avoid a sea of bins on bin day. The collection points are tucked around the side with accessible routes, with the exception of main blocks that will have direct access. There are also bin stores in the gardens of houses, which is also where cycle storage has been housed thereby ensuring that they are all easy accessible as the bin stores have to be accessible.

The Chairman thanked the speakers for the reports and unless there are any issues Muse or Lovell wanted to bring forward, to move on.

**5) Update from Horsham District Council**

The Chairman advised that there was no update from HDC due to Jason Hawkes being unable to make the online meeting as the HDC IT system's not being in operation.

**6) Updates from other organisations**

The Chairman asked if there were any updates from other organisations and no comment was made, so they moved onto the next item on the item.

**7) Questions and comments**

The Chairman asked an initial question regarding the boundary between Parsonage Road and the development, and asked if the existing railings will remain. IC responded saying she believes the railings are being removed and it is going to be a soft boundary, including the landscaping.

The Chairman asked for any other questions and comments, and asked Jane Apostolou, on behalf of the Wimbleshurst Road Residents Association (WRRRA), to go first.

JA thanked the Chairman and went on to her questions.

**Timing of submission of both planning applications.**

Q Why were the planning applications for phase 1, 2 and 3 not submitted at the same time, because they are on the same plot and have a great deal of impact, one on the other?

A NS responded saying they were submitted to HDC at the same time, and as perhaps some may already know, as they go into the council, there is an administrative process of validation that goes on with the councils officers, and for one reason or another, the phase 3 application worked its way through that process more quickly than phase 1 and 2, so they appeared on the councils website at slightly different times due to that process, but they were lodged together. JA thanked NS for the response.

**Traffic management at junctions surrounding the site**

Q Are you proposing to provide an integrated assessment of traffic management at the junctions surrounding the site? The transport assessments for both areas of the development indicate that the mini roundabout is working above peak capacity, so gridlock will be a frequent occurrence.

A NS responded to the point about the mini roundabout, saying in terms of how the transport assessments dealt with the fact that there were two planning applications coming forward, the individual transport assessments looked at the impacts of the development that they were about, but also considered the fact there would be an application or a scheme coming forward next door to them, so it was the cumulative impact as well, but with the specific point of the mini roundabout, and invited AB to update further.

SB went on to say they have worked quite closely with West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and knew that there were some concerns about the roundabout, and of course other local junctions, including the presence of the level crossing nearby as well. What they have done is to have new traffic surveys done on lots of the local junctions, to really understand what is happening right now, and then the impacts of both developments on that. In terms of the roundabout itself, as the reports say, there are capacity constraints at the roundabout, but the way that policy is going now and through their discussions with WSCC Highways, it is more about how they can enhance and improve opportunities to create active travel as opposed to necessarily continually providing for vehicles. They have looked at the roundabout and identified potential improvements that can be made in terms of tactile paving, that are lacking at the moment, to enhance those routes to the bus stops, and try to create environments where people want to walk as opposed to getting in the car and driving all the time. That is the work they have been doing and are continuing to do, by working closely with WSCC Highways on those points. JA thanked NS and SB for their responses.

Q In neither proposal, is there any assessment of the likelihood of queues forming at peak times to enter and exit the developments. Is this because you don't see this as an issue? It is noted that this was raised by the road safety audit, but dismissed as a non-issue.

- A SB responded to check if JA meant the assessment of queues for the site access? JA confirmed it is for traffic entering and exiting at both entrances of the site. They have taken into consideration the proximity to the level crossing and the impact that has for traffic trying to get in and out of the site, so their assessments have been using new level crossing data that they commissioned and had done, they have had new seven day surveys put down on Parsonage road itself, to determine speeds and existing queues. The site access has been designed to have two lanes as drivers exit the site, to cater for anyone waiting to turn right out of the site, drivers can still turn out to the left. SB said she will double check the reports as she thought they had queue length surveys and data of the like in there and said they can certainly review that.

NS came in on this point to say HDC planning authority have instructed a third party independent audit of the information that is in the transport assessments, and that process is ongoing, so any queries that process generates will respond to those through those channels.

### **Build time and Construction traffic**

- Q What is the estimate for the build phases to be completed, and what factors might affect achieving this to date, with particular regard to construction traffic?
- A Ellen Bryan (EB) responded to give an overview of their programme noting that it was dependent on when their planning application gets approved, as that will impact their start on site.

WM responded saying other than the demolition of building 36, the construction element of theirs will lag a little bit behind the Muse side of things, and they anticipate the end date will not be dissimilar. In terms of construction management, and prior to commencement, they will have to submit a construction management plan, which will include traffic management, environmental management, etc. That will be a comprehensive document and will cover traffic management issues such as avoiding key school/commuter drop off times, deliveries, large vehicle movements etc, so prioritising them between say 9:30am/10:30am and 2pm for instance. There will be many mitigation measures to try and minimise the impact on the wider community, and this is before they start to look into dust management, noise management techniques as well. It is a robust document that they will be submitting prior to the commencement of the development which will outline how they are going to manage all of that.

NS that that Muse and Lovell are very experienced developers on sites like this where there are nearby neighbours, and very often in construction management plans, you will find contact details for a named individual or position, to contact if there are any questions or concerns during the construction phase. As WM said, there is generally a very detailed and robust document and the planning authority will insist on that.

### **Water Drainage and Contaminated soil**

- Q It is reported that contaminates have been identified around the site, and following a recent review of historical reports, Atkins Ltd have commented that the investigation of 2021, did not undertake testing north and south of the retained building, where substantial contamination was historically reported. Why didn't this happen?



- A NS responded saying to JA that there may be a topic that they haven't got the experts on hand to answer the question directly, but what you will of seen is comprehensive land quality and drainage reports have been submitted with the planning application, and they will be getting reviewed and scrutinised by the Councils environment protection officers, and any queries that arise from that process will have their consultant team review and address those.
- Q What are the risks to contractors, local residents and future householders from the contaminated land?
- A NS responded to say they don't think there is a risk associated but any conditions or requirements that the Councils Environmental Health Team impose on the planning permission will be attached and will need to be dealt with in the normal and proper way.
- Q Will a new contamination survey be carried out?
- A NS responded saying that it would depend on what HDC's Environmental Officers ask of them, as they review the information submitted and if they feel that any further work is required, they will let them know of what needs to be done.
- Q Is there a risk to Horsham Pond through contamination drainage, and how will this be monitored?
- A NS responded saying that as with the contamination surbey, if the Council's specialists have any queries or form a different view, that will need to be addressed of course.

### **Water Neutrality**

- Q Are Lovell planning on offsetting phase 1 and 2 water against phase 3?
- A WM responded saying that they will be dealing with their water neutrality as phase 1 and 2, and they won't be reliant on what Muse and phase 3 do for their water neutrality which will be independent of Lovells.
- NS responded that as the planning application has been submitted as two applications, each scheme will need to manage any impact generated by itself, and there will be separated strategies in place to deal with water neutrality on both schemes.
- Q Who will manage the water schemes as in SUDS, if the phase 1 and 2 areas of the site are a combination of market and affordable housing?
- A WM responded saying they haven't got a completely resolved management strategy yet, and that it will either be adopted by a utilities authority or will be managed by the management company across the site.

NS stated that it will be very likely that the Council will ask for a planning condition to be attached to a decision requiring final details of ongoing management and maintenance of such strategies.

## **Tree lined Boulevard**

- Q In the Heritage statement on the planning documents it states the trees are to remain, but in the planning application it states they will be removed and replaced with other trees. In the tree survey document, it states that all the cedars, apart from two, are in good health, and these have at least a 40 year life span left. It seems a real shame to be removing the trees and just replacing them with new trees?
- A NS thanked JA for flagging if there is an inconsistency in the Heritage statement and they can address that. In the context of a residential development site, 40 years sounds like a long time, but it is not a long time, and he agrees that it is a shame and they would prefer to not replace the trees, but given their relatively short remaining life, and the particular character of the trees, as they are prone to branches snapping and dropping, and the incompatibility of that characteristic with a new residential development, the decision needed to be made to replace them. They have had long conversations with planning officers about what the right replacement species is, and that is why the decision has been made to replant with Dawn Redwoods.
- Q As urban trees, the Cedars play a vital role in offsetting the carbon release from traffic and their extensive root system helps reduce flood risk in the local area. It is noted that the tree specialist used by the applicant comes from hundreds of miles away from Horsham. Why wasn't a local tree specialist used?
- A NS responded saying that is a difficult question to answer, and they selected who they think is the right team for the project, and the application as seen is supported by detailed air quality, drainage, flood risk reports, to make sure that the scheme being proposed is as it should be on all of those fronts, even with the trees being replaced.
- Q With the Cedar trees being so substantial they are helping with the flood protection of the area, and new trees won't work like that and it could create more flooding issues?
- A NS responded that the flood risk assessment that has been submitted will consider whether the schemes are going to increase or decrease local flood risk, and the conclusions that it reaches are that there won't be an increase in flood risk as a consequence of the development.

WM added that taking the Cedar trees in isolation, whilst it is a shame to replace them, as NS alluded to, they need to take a long view about the development as a whole, and in 5, 10, 20, or 50 years' time, as people live in this development and they certainly feel there is a significant net benefit in replacing those trees now with the Dawn Redwoods. The new trees won't be planted as saplings, they will be more established, and over the lifetime of this development and for the residents moving forward, it will be of benefit to them.

RT thanked JA for her questions and opened the floor to other participants.

TM said she does agree with the concern about the access and exit of the site, and as the transport assessment is a weighty document it would be nice to have a summary of that information. TM went on to ask that on the Lovell side, it was noticed that nearly all the dwellings now will be at least three storeys high, and wondered how popular that is with people who are purchasing houses? WM responded saying

that they feel what has been designed is market facing for Horsham and those in and around the area, and the design of the houses hasn't changed significantly from their original proposals as part of the reserved matters. WM went on to say they have tweaked the designs slightly but they were always three storeys, with the principle of three storey houses always having been consistent from the start of the project, with the blocks of flats also remaining at a similar height. TM said she is not so concerned about the blocks of flats, it is more the town houses and how willing people are to climb three storeys.

TM went on to ask about the Muse side of the site, where about 50% at least of the car parking is unallocated and feels it is a recipe for chaos? IC responded to say that all the parking they have is policy compliant with WSCC's principle on unallocated parking and feels it gives the best variety for everyone to have access to those parking bays closest to their homes, and also gives the shared spaces opportunity as well. It does have a few allocated spaces, usually with the larger dwelling, but it is a system that works elsewhere. SB came in on this saying they have looked at the guidance of what works best in the area and worked closely with the Councils guidance on that to get the best of everything, and unallocated spaces gives the flexibility of including visitors to the site as well. SB said they noted TM's point but they are confident with the mix they have and feel it will best suit the site. TM went on to say that there has been a lot of controversy in Horsham recently about residents not being able to park near their building because other people are getting in there first, and realises that the site is probably not expecting a large amount of vehicles that don't belong to the site but feels there will be some families with a lot of cars and somebody else saying that they can't park near their house. NS responded saying that he understands TM's point about management of the spaces and making sure things work properly on the ground and that will need to happen.

FV asked about SB's earlier point about trying to make active travel more attractive and working with WSCC to improve pedestrian walk ways, which he feels is absolutely the way ahead, and asked if they are looking at cycling in the area because it is one of the areas in town that he feels is unpleasant for cycling around there, on Wimblehurst road, Parsonage Road, North Heath Lane?

SB responded saying that is one of the comments back from WSCC Highways on the application, about how they can look to improve that further, and walking and cycling are both high up on the agenda of improvements that they need to look at, and they will continually be reviewing through the application process. They will consider the routes and how the scheme could help deliver some of those improvements and it is firmly on the radar. FV responded saying it will be interesting to see what is proposed and feels that the mini roundabout junction itself is quite dangerous. SV responded saying with the roundabout itself, they had put forward a scheme to raise the roundabout and prioritise pedestrian movements across that, and again the Highway comments, they are working through those with them, but because it is a bus route it maybe not be the most practical way of doing things. They are reviewing that, but certainly there are improvements that can be made in terms of looking at areas there that are missing tactile paving that could be prioritised with looking at a different surface etc, to reiterate that the priority is pedestrians as opposed to vehicles, so they are some of the improvements being looked at.

FV asked if they are giving consideration to the needs of children through the site, places to play and be around the site for example? IC responded saying their landscaping have got a massive focus towards play and showed the area at the top of the site on the map that is both a LEAP and LAP which is local equipped area of play and local area of play. IC said they have also got areas of stopping and meeting throughout the landscaping, which allow for younger children and families nearby to sit and meet, and the way the frontages are created around the site, ensure they are safe spaces that are overlooked as well, to ensure a positive attitude and community in those areas, which runs through the site. IC said they also have the central courtyard area that has links between the sites, to encourage play and meeting and that sense of community throughout. NS responded saying the space in front of the Heritage building will be a nice sizable green space.

FV asked if there is going to be any retail premises on the sites? WM responded to say there is nothing proposed. FV went on to ask if there will be any small shop or anything like that? WM responded saying no, they looked at it at length, and himself, EB, and NS had many conversations around it and looking at what the amenity and the shops are locally to it, and what a retail shop would serve on this site, and they came to a view that they would have marginal representation on the site itself, and would be pulling away from local centres elsewhere in the community, and it probably wasn't in the best interest. FV responded saying it feels like everyone has got to go somewhere else, even for small things and feels there is nowhere close to there. EB stepped in to say they, led by Lovell, also worked together on this with WSCC, they produced an assessment of nearby retail, and were comfortable of enough provision within a walkable distance to serve the new community. EB went on to say that WM has done a lot of work with retail agents on that, and is something they spent a lot of time deliberating.

FV thanked everyone for their responses.

**8) Any other business**

No other business was raised.

**9) Conclusions and date for next meeting**

The Chairman checked if anyone else had any questions and said that they wouldn't have heard much from NHPC today due to them having to reserve their opinion until they meet on the 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2025. The Chairman thanked everyone and went on to say he feels it has been a constructive get together and the updates from the Developers, and hearing some of the concerns, is helpful for when the committee discusses the applications and make their comments. The Chairman went on to say the updates from Muse is very helpful and also learning more about the Lovell development where they have only had a brief chance to look at the Lovell applications, but they will have ample opportunity before they meet later this month.

The Chairman brought the meeting to a close, and suggested another meeting probably sometime as the projects progress.

Meeting Closed 11.01am