



MINUTES of Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council Meeting held on **Tuesday 13 October 2015**, in Kelsey Hall, Plaistow

Present: Sara Burrell (Chairman); Sallie Baker; Phil Colmer; Alan Dormon (part); Francoise Lillywhite; Paul Jordan; David Ribbens; Beverley Weddell (Clerk)

West Sussex County Councillor Janet Duncton and 35 members of the public were in attendance.

Apologies: Apologies had been received from Sophie Capsey, Nick Whitehouse, Vivien Forwood and Cllr Denise Knightley.

C/15/101 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest pertaining to agenda items.

C/15/102 Representations from Members of the Public

Mrs Linda Penny gave a presentation to the parish council regarding opposition to aircraft noise, which is appended to these minutes. The parish council resolved to join CAGNE and write to the relevant authorities.

C/15/103 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 15 September 2015 were approved as a correct record of the meeting.

C/15/104 Chairman's Report

The Chairman had attended the All Parishes meeting at CDC, which included an interesting introduction of CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy). The parish council should receive 15% of the levy and 25% when we have a Neighbourhood Plan, to hold for up to five years to spend on infrastructure projects within the parish. Other subjects covered included emergency planning and changes to policing and reorganisation. The Chairman gave a note of thanks to WSCC Footpaths and Bridleway Rangers for repairing the bridleway that connects Ifold to Wephurst.

The Chairman reported that following her letter to CDC regarding concerns about the amount of windfall development in Ifold, she had attended a meeting at CDC, along with the Clerk and Christine Gibson-Pierce, with the Planning Policy Manager and Neighbourhood Planning Officer. The meeting also concerned the Neighbourhood Plan as CDC need to make their site allocations by the end of the year and we are now working together to move forward and looking at site allocations in tandem with them.

The Chairman had attended a Chairman's training event.

ACTION

S Baker/Clerk

C/15/105

Reports from County and District Councillors

Cllr Duncton reported that she had concerns about the possibility of the Police Commissioner's Department taking over Fire and Rescue and that she would be totally opposed to that.

The government had issued a notice that day regarding changes to permitted development that would allow office buildings to get change of use to residential.

Cllr Duncton was waiting for an Ofsted inspection of the County Children's Services and hoped that they would get a much better rating.

Parents with children due to start school or move schools in September 2016 should be contacting schools now in order to meet the application deadline.

The County owned solar farm at Tangmere had been opened this week.

Mr Ribbens explained the problems that Durfold Wood were having to get Surrey County Council and West Sussex County Council to agree between them funding for the installation of Broadband at Durfold Wood. Cllr Duncton reported that fibre broadband installation was progressing and 95% of households should be able to access it by 2017.

C/15/106

Updates:-

a) Neighbourhood Plan. The Chairman, Christine Gibson-Pierce and the Clerk had met with Loxwood parish councillors on an advisory level to help move the plan forward. They strongly recommended we do a parish-wide questionnaire as the work we have done is now two years out of date and there are gaps in the information we gathered. Christine would set up a Steering Group meeting to put together the questionnaire for approval by the parish council. It was also proposed that there would be a couple of consultation sessions in each of the village halls to give residents an opportunity to ask questions. We do now have to start putting forward sites for consideration and CDC need to allocate the site for 10 houses by the end of the year and we will need to progress this quickly if the parish is to have any influence.

b) Crouchland planning and enforcement. The Chairman reported that the West Sussex Planning Committee had decided to approve a Certificate of Lawful Use but only for an on-farm anaerobic digester facility without the export of gas or import of waste. CBG have now appealed CDC's enforcement notice and WSCC's refusal of their planning application. It was expected that they would also appeal the Certificate of Lawful Use decision.

c) Queen's 90th Birthday celebrations. Mrs Baker reported a good turn-out for the working group meeting, with representatives from a good number of the community groups and village halls. She said that the Scouts, Guides, school and preschool were also keen to be involved. The working group had agreed it would be a good idea to hold the event in Ifold as the Jubilee celebrations had been held in Plaistow, and they were currently looking for a suitable venue. It had been agreed that the event would be a Royal Picnic with a Vintage Nostalgia theme, to be held on 12th June from 2.30pm to 7pm.

d) Community Right to Bid/Oak Tree Stores Closure. There was nothing to report.

e) Flooding. The Clerk had attended the Loxwood Flood Forum on 18th September. Unfortunately, the Clerk did not have enough information from residents to make a strong case for remedial work to be considered. It was agreed that a flyer should be produced to be delivered to all Ifold households requesting them to come forward with information if they've been affected by flooding. Once further information was received, the Clerk would arrange a site meeting with members of Southern Water, Environment Agency, West Sussex County Council and Chichester District Council.

C/15/107

Highway Matters

a) Matters reported by Members. There was nothing to report.

b) Progress on matters previously reported.

The Chairman and the Clerk were due to meet Mike Dare of WSCC Highways regarding the TROs for the speed reduction/extensions.

Resurfacing of Foxbridge Lane was scheduled to start on 2nd November.

S Burrell/Clerk

C/15/108

Financial Matters

a) Accounts for payment:

Payments were approved and receipts were noted. The attached Order for Payments was signed by the Chairman, one Councillor and the Clerk.

b) Members noted the External Audit Report, which stated that the information in the annual return was in accordance with proper practices and no matters had come to the auditor's attention giving cause for concern that relevant legislation and regulatory requirements had not been met.

c) The Clerk advised that the parish council had been awarded a grant under the New Homes Bonus for a new notice board and map display board in Plaistow, subject to accepting the terms of the Agreement dated 1st October 2015. The parish council resolved to accept the terms of the Agreement and authorised the Clerk to sign on behalf of the parish council.

Clerk

C/15/109

Correspondence

There was nothing to report.

C/15/110

Policies and Procedures

The following Draft Policies and Procedures, required to address issues raised by the Internal Auditor, had been circulated prior to the meeting and it was resolved that they would be adopted:

- Code of Conduct for Staff
- Data Protection Policy
- Equality and Diversity Policy
- Complaints Procedure
- Health and Safety Policy
- Information Security Policy
- Records Management Policy

In order to comply with the Model Publication Scheme, it was agreed that the policies would be put on the website. In order to have greater control and flexibility over the content of the website, it was agreed that the Clerk would proceed to produce a new website. It was agreed that once the new

Clerk

website is up and running, the Clerk will brief Mr Reynolds so that he would have access to the website to make changes if necessary in the absence of the Clerk.

Clerk/P Reynolds

C/15/111

Next Meeting

Tuesday 17th November, 7.30pm, Full Council at Winterton Hall

There being no further business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 21:30.

Presentation regarding aircraft noise:

Firstly thanks to the PC for giving us an opportunity to raise this issue again. We are here tonight to ask the PC to consider adding their voice of objection to the current changes in aircraft flight patterns which are resulting in increased noise levels over Ifold and Plaistow. When we first started to become concerned about the change in aircraft noise in the spring of 2014, we were faced with two problems. The first was a blanket assertion from bodies associated with aircraft movements that NOTHING HAD CHANGED, this despite the evidence of eyes and ears. The difference of opinion here seems to hinge on what constitutes a "change"

The second problem was that replies and responses from these organisations are full of technical terms and acronyms which mean little to the average lay person. It is also somewhat confusing to be sure who is responsible for what, particularly when the CAA and Ministry of Transport are approached.

Forgive me if I run through what you already know but I think it does no harm to be reminded.

Nats (NATIONAL AIR TRAFFIC SERVICES) are the main air navigation service provider for the UK. and a letter dated October 2014 to Andrew Tyrie our MP, stated that there had been no changes to the airspace or air traffic control procedures in the vicinity of his constituency. They state that before making any changes to airspace they must have approval from the CAA following a consultation. There was a consultation earlier in the year with Gatwick Airport Ltd (GAL are responsible for airspace below 4000ft, NATS above 7000 ft and between 4 and 7000 there is joint responsibility) In the event apparently GAL decided not to progress lower level changes so proposals were deferred.

However we finally got acceptance that noise levels and aircraft overflying had changed over this area for the following reasons . When the prevailing wind is from the east planes will approach Gatwick from the south west . Air traffic controllers have few restrictions on how they direct aircraft through the airspace between the mandatory notified points The join point to the ILS ,which is the straight approach path to the runway. has been moved a further two miles out from the runway to stabilise the approach and so that more planes can land at Gatwick enabling the runway to be more efficient This has led to a concentration of the turn, vectoring, on to the ILS..To stabilise the aircraft, NATS brings them down lower and they have to be slower to join ILS. The aircraft are therefore flying level (thus using power) rather than a low drag Continuous Descent Approach which reduces noise. It's actually probably quieter closer to Gatwick when they are descending ! We are under the turn which is noisy and as it has been concentrated and narrowed noise levels are even higher. The "no change" stance results from the fact that the planes remain in the Radar Manoeuvring area. However the position of the pinch point where they join the approach path has changed and increased traffic means that to maintain acceptable separation of aircraft practically every plane turns over our area, even in the small hours. So the responsibility is put on Air Traffic Control..

When the wind is from the west aircraft take off towards the west. The "no change" stance results from the fact that the noise preferential routes have not been changed for many years but the method of navigation has. New technology called P-RNAV was made mandatory for all departing aircraft from May 2014. This has resulted in the concentration of aircraft tracks within the parameters of all but one of the noise preferential routes (the westerly 26 LAM/CLN/DVR with no effect to East Grinstead) I wonder who lives there? This was implemented after consultation and a full Airspace Change Proposal was submitted to the CAA who approved it. You may remember I said a few minutes ago that according to NATS there had been no airspace changes.....This concentration , affecting allegedly fewer people but inflicting much more noise on those under the route is in line with government policy of concentration versus dispersal. Local communities have said this stance should be reviewed by the government.. This concentrated track again appears to be centred over our area.

CAGNE (Campaign against Gatwick Noise and Emissions) have been very active in objecting to these changes and have received support from many PCs around Gatwick. Their advice is that PCs should be involved. Regarding approaches from the west they are proposing the join to ILS be moved out a further 2 miles and dispersed so that the centre of the concentration will not be over such populated area. They are also looking for height to be included in the review: this is paramount as the continuous descent approach needs to be set at a height that is as high as possible which is not the current case. Gatwick and Nats continue to maintain that they are doing all they can to address noise levels and community concerns so we feel it is vital to continue to remind all parties involved in aircraft movement that we are unhappy. We cannot use our gardens peacefully, particularly during the busy summer months and are being kept awake by incoming aircraft every few minutes well into the early hours. There have been several studies into the health problems associated with continual sleep disturbance.

And if you are still not convinced that this is a concern you might look at the websites that report house price trends and compare what is happening to Ifold and Plaistow values compared to the rest of West Sussex.

This is not strictly within the normal remit of the PC (if it was a proposal for a new motorway or railway line it presumably would. Amazingly there is no democratic process for approving changes such as these) However the effect it is having on residents and the potential threat of increasing noise as Gatwick continue their proposed expansion, with or without a second runway, makes us feel that, along with other PCs, you should consider formally raising objections again. We understand that Ifold and Plaistow PC have raised an objection to Gatwick changes in the past so you obviously must have felt that you should have some involvement. There is currently a review, focussing primarily on westerly arrivals and commissioned by Gatwick's chairman Sir Roy McNulty in response to community feedback. This is being led by Bo Redeborn, an independent member of Gatwick's Environment, Health and Safety and Operational Resilience Committee. We do need to feed into this

There are various options. We could do nothing. The risk here is that other areas who are raising objections may be favoured when decisions are made.

We could continue to object on a piecemeal individual basis. It is surely obvious that although better than nothing, this lacks impact.

We can form a village based protest group

Or, best option in our opinion, we should form the above group but also be able to count on the support of our PC. This is very much what we would like you to commit to, for the sake of the future of our village.

.We do need to keep objecting. We intend to move forward with this protest group but PC support, as encouraged by CAGNE, is vital.