

5 September 2016:

Minutes of meeting with Plaistow & Ifold Parish Steering Group members and CDC planning officers (Mike Allgrove - Planning Policy Manager, Valerie Dobson - Neighbourhood Planning Officer, Sue Payne - Planning Policy Officer and Tracy Flitcroft - Principal Planning Officer)

**N.B. PERSONAL EMAIL ADDRESSES HAVE BEEN REDACTED**

-----Original Message-----

From: Pierce [REDACTED]  
To: Knightley Denise [REDACTED]; Cllr Nick Thomas [REDACTED]; Capsey Sophie [REDACTED]; Colmer Philip [REDACTED]; Frost Malcolm [REDACTED]; Ribbens David [REDACTED]; Baker Sallie [REDACTED]; Townsend Bill [REDACTED]; Wyatt Richard [REDACTED]; Forwood Vivien [REDACTED]  
CC: Burrell Sara [REDACTED]; Weddell Beverley [REDACTED]  
<clerk@plaistowandifold.org.uk>  
Sent: Tue, 6 Sep 2016 10:03  
Subject: Plaistow & Ifold Parish - Neighbourhood Plan

Members of the Plaistow & Ifold Parish - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (Sara Burrell, Beverley Weddell, Vivien Forwood, Richard Wyatt and Christine Gibson-Pierce) met with Chichester District Council Officers in East Pallant House, Chichester on Monday, 5<sup>th</sup> September. Below is a summary of that meeting. Prior to the meeting the Parish asked the planning consultants - Colin Smith Planning - who are helping to draft our plan and policies to provide their opinion of the AECOM Site Options and Assessment Report. Please find that opinion attached.

- 1) CDC do not consider that the findings of the AECOM report prepared for the Parish Council has any bearing on the site allocation in the CDC DPD for *Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm* for the following reasons:
  - The AECOM report does not sufficiently weigh all parts of NPPF sustainability criteria across all the sites and in particular the Plaistow sites which are sensitive for their proximity to the Plaistow village conservation area and Grade II Listed buildings;
  - The AECOM report has not had sufficient regard to the proximity of the *Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm* site to the Ifold Settlement Boundary;
  - The AECOM report has not considered the fact that in the CDC Local Plan. Ifold and

Plaistow are designated as one Service Village.

*The fact that Ifold and the Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm site is separated from Plaistow village, which has all the facilities, by 1.6km over a narrow country road with a 40MPH and 60MPH speed limit and no safe footpath is not relevant in terms of sustainability. The CDC response was that the Local Plan passed examination and the time to dispute that has long passed.;*

- 2) CDC do not consider that there is any conflict between the decision from the Planning Inspectorate on the *Little Springfield Brownfield* site and the allocation of their preferred site: *Land to the North of Little Springfield*. The proximity of one site to the other is not relevant. They consider that the *Land to the North of Little Springfield* adjoins the Ifold Settlement Boundary and that the brownfield site does not.  
*But using this CDC logic - Tawlbroom, the residence in front of the brownfield, can be considered to be adjoined to the Settlement Boundary therefore the backland site behind Tawlbroom, the brownfield, should also be considered to be adjoined.*
- 3) CDC said they have undertaken an SA of the potential housing sites the Parish Council has identified in Plaistow village. The Parish requested copies of the SA's to be sent today (Tuesday 6th September), as this could have bearing on our Public Consultation being held the evenings of Tuesday, 6th September and Thursday, 8th September. We are doubtful an SA exists for all the sites as the officer, Sue Payne, stated. It was pointed out that CDC had also looked at the sites in a different way to the Parish, as we were looking at different gross areas to permit appropriate design schemes be drawn by future developers for any conservation area adjacent or environmentally sensitive sites; and to allow for sufficient green space between dwellings to maintain the rural, countryside character of the Parish. That the brownfield site is suitable for residential use and free from constraints that cannot be mitigated against.
- 4) Currently it is proposed the CDC DPD document will go to Cabinet 1<sup>st</sup> November and Full Council on 22<sup>nd</sup> November and out for consultation from 1<sup>st</sup> December 2016 through to 26<sup>th</sup> January 2017. If the Parish Council still maintains an objection regarding the site CDC have allocated then this will need to be restated. However, the officers advised they are only taking *comments of soundness*. Mike Allgrove, CDC Policy Manager, said the Parish can submit our neighbourhood plan without sites and then dispute the DPD outside the NP process as apparently Bosham have done. We said that this was unacceptable advice. The Parish stated that we wish to bring forward sites the community endorses and believe our assessments have been extremely thorough, and after the discussion with Sue Payne yesterday, more thorough in some case than the CDC officer's work (she was very defensive during the meeting). When challenged she admitted she had not physically visited the *brownfield* site and in many of the other sites had only completed a SHLAA form before discounting the sites completely. They include the Plaistow sites the Parish believes to be better options to the site CDC have allocated in their DPD: *Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm*. We reminded Sue Payne that she had only done a walk around in 2014 with the Steering Group in the Ifold settlement and had never attended site visits to Plaistow sites. We believe her assessments to be flawed and question if an SA has actually been done on all the Plaistow sites.

Essentially nothing has changed in the CDC stance to their site allocation in their DPD. They would rather allocate a greenfield site even though a brownfield site exists a mere 100m behind it. Mike Allgrove eventually said the Parish could still put the brownfield site forward (for 6 units) with our preferred Plaistow site (for 10 or 11 units depending on if the requirement for affordable housing was to be met) and CDC will provide a screening opinion. A discussion took place if we should present all our preferred sites including a reserve site for screening at the same time as screening takes approximately 21 days. It was agreed not to as the Parish could end up with all sites moving forward for housing far in excess of our allocation.

There is still concern in the Steering Group that if the Parish is going to continue to follow a path of bringing forward the brownfield and a Plaistow site (as suggested by CDC yesterday), that our Plan is predestined for failure as the LPA (CDC) seems to have pre-determined their preferred outcome regardless and we could fail at examination over the AECOM raised issue of sustainability.

It is not appropriate for an LPA to dismiss technical advice that has essentially been arranged through DCLG who governs the Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan process. It's suggested to discuss this matter with a representative from DCLG.

Sara Burrell and I believe this is to be an accurate summary of our meeting with Chichester District Council.

Please advise if you have any comments to make

Please advise if you have any comments to make.

Kind regards,  
Christine

Christine Gibson-Pierce

[www.plaistowandifoldparishnp.com](http://www.plaistowandifoldparishnp.com)