



MINUTES of Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council Extraordinary Meeting held on **Wednesday 23rd November 2016**, in Winterton Hall, Plaistow.

Present: Sara Burrell (Chairman); Sophie Capsey; Phil Colmer;
Paul Jordan; Alan Pearson; Paul Reynolds; David Ribbens;
Beverley Weddell (Clerk)

Eight members of the public were in attendance.

Apologies: Apologies had been received from Vivien Forwood, Nick Whitehouse and Sallie Baker. The Chairman advised that Mr Dormon had resigned from the parish council.

ACTION

C/16/132 **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest pertaining to agenda items.

C/16/133 **Representations from Members of the Public**

A member of the public asked that if the CDC Site Allocation DPD goes ahead, how would it affect the Neighbourhood Plan. The Chairman responded that the parish council would be running the Neighbourhood Plan process in parallel with CDC, and that the CDC DPD would go for examination 1 July, by which time the Neighbourhood Plan should have proceeded further and carry more weight so that the CDC proposed site may be withdrawn at the examination. Further questions were asked about the SEA process, which was explained by the Chairman. A member of the public commented that AECOM had not used correct information and the parish council needed to ensure that the company that carries out the SEA does have correct information, such as the availability of Bililinks. It was agreed that this information would be incorporated into the plan. A member of the public queried the provision of a school bus from Ifold to Plaistow with no provision elsewhere in the parish. The Chairman explained WSCC had agreed to provide a bus from Ifold as they considered that the road between Ifold and Plaistow was too dangerous for children to walk.

C/16/134 **Neighbourhood Plan**

- a) Advancement of the Neighbourhood Plan following the Screening Opinion. A report including the Options for proceeding with the Neighbourhood Plan had been circulated with the agenda (copy appended to these minutes. After a full discussion, The Chairman proposed proceeding with Option 1. All members voted in favour of the proposal, with the exception of Mrs Capsey, who voted for Option 3, therefore it was agreed to proceed with Option 1 by majority vote. It was noted that the parish council would proceed with an SEA regardless of any revised Screening Opinion of the revised draft plan.
- b) CDC Site Allocation DPD. All members agreed to accept the fee quote from Colin Smith Planning to produce the parish council representation to the DPD consultation.

- c) Arboriculture Assessment. All members agreed to accept Martin Dobson's fee quote for producing an arboriculture impact assessment of the allocated site and immediate surroundings.

C/16/135

Next Meeting

Full Council Meeting 17th January, 7.30pm at Kelsey Hall.

There being no further business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 20:25

Report on the Neighbourhood Plan for Parish council EGMeeting 23 Nov 2016

Following the decision of the Parish Council on 28th September the approved pre-submission draft of the Neighbourhood Plan was submitted to CDC for a Screening Opinion from the statutory bodies the EA, Natural England, Historic England (HE) and the SDNP to determine whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) would be required on The Plan. CDC have advised that all have responded and have concluded that an SEA would not be required, with the exception of HE.

Historic England initially considered the need for an SEA was unlikely but on further consideration following identification of the boundary of the Conservation Area and receipt of the AECOM report they have concluded that it is likely an SEA will be required. In their response they have highlighted a number of matters:- 1) there has been no HER search relating to archaeological information on the site (a procedural matter). 2) The Plan did not explain why the AECOM preferred site, Land adjacent to Todhurst, had been discounted. 3) Impact on the Conservation Area had not been fully assessed, as part of the site falls into the Conservation Area. (HE letters 19th and 26th October attached)

To date we have only had informal correspondence from CDC and copies of the letters from the statutory bodies. The Neighbourhood Plan Officer has advised that we could amend the report to address the issues raised by HE but in her opinion she considers that it is still likely an SEA will be required; particularly in view of recent High Court challenges to Neighbourhood Plans. We have yet to have formal confirmation of the screening opinion from CDC and this will be made available to Parish Councillors when it is available , hopefully by the end of the week.

Colin Smith Planning has been consulted regarding the outcome of the 'informal' Screening Opinion and have advised that we could address the issues that have been raised by Historic England and amend the pre-submission draft . The issues are not insurmountable. It would however require that the amended report is put before the Parish Council again for ratification and then sent back to CDC for a further Screening Opinion to determine whether the amended plan requires an SEA. In all likelihood and SEA is still going to be required however, both Historic England and CDC consider that this should be regarded as a positive matter which allows for a thorough examination of the Neighbourhood Plan and the methodology used for site selection, and would be to the benefit of the whole Parish and ensure a well founded Plan.

An SEA will need to be funded by the Parish Council but we can apply for grant aid to cover the cost.

In the meantime Chichester District Council will still continue with their Site Allocations DPD as we have yet to complete our pre-submission stage. It is therefore necessary for the Parish to make representation to the next round of consultation on this document which runs from 1 December for 6 weeks. Colin Smith Planning has been asked to undertake this submission work where representation will be made on the soundness of allocation of Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm in the Site Allocations DPD. This follows on from PC representation on this matter in February and also further evidence through our Neighbourhood Plan process relating to sustainability under the NPPF ,the Appeal Decision on Little Springfield Brown field site and the AECOM report. A copy of his quote is also available this evening and this requires approval from the Parish Council. You will note that it is in two parts to cover representation of a written nature to the consultation and also allows for representation to the planning inspector next July, when the entire Site Allocations DPD will be

examined by the Inspectorate. It is however possible that the neighbourhood plan will have reached referendum before the July date and therefore further representation may not be needed. (copy of quote attached)

Colin Smith Planning have advised that we have a good case on the basis of soundness. Having determined through our Neighbourhood Plan process that this site selection is unlikely to meet the NPPF 'test' on sustainability we must present this to CDC and the Planning Inspectorate and in doing so , if the Planning Inspectorate conclude that we are correct, the lack of sustainability of Ifold will be recognised and therefore strategic planning could then come forward to address this issue. The presence of the DPD site allocation has always and continues to have a negative impact on our Neighbourhood Plan process.

Therefore we have 3 Options before us to consider and determine which one we proceed with:-

Option 1) We amend the plan to address the issues raised by Historic England relating to the site allocation (this is not changing the site identified for allocation) and take it back to the Parish Council for ratification and then go for a further screening opinion. But in all likelihood there will still be a requirement to have an SEA. There may then be further amendments arising. The Parish continues to make representation to CDC on the DPD allocation.

The benefit of this option is that we can address in the draft plan the comments received from HE on the Dairy site allocation and we are aware there are some grammatical / spelling errors and other minor areas where the wording of policies could be strengthened. We are also advised by Colin Smith Planning that this would allow further review of the Local Green Space allocations by them. Therefore a 'cleaner tidier' Plan. This is the route recommended by the Parish Council consultants, Colin Smith Planning

The downside is that this will lengthen this stage of the process by an approximate further 3 months , the next PC meeting is January, and then it will need to go back to CDC for screening and it may still result in an SEA being required. But an SEA should be seen as a positive matter ensuring a more robust Plan. It will consider site selection across the Parish and consider the Parish sustainability.

Option 2) In the light of the informal response from CDC on the Screening Opinion and the statutory bodies response and in particular Historic England (HE) , we opt to go straight to an SEA on the current pre submission plan. Following the SEA we make any modifications to the Plan as required by the SEA. The Parish continues to make representation to CDC on the DPD allocation.

The benefit of this option is that we move forward to the next stage. An SEA gives us useful feed back and ensures the Plan is robust, it will consider site selection across the Parish and consider the Parish sustainability. The downside is that we know that there are areas that could and should be improved in the Plan and these will be picked up. But we will be able to amend the Plan, as a consequence.

Option 3) We amend the plan and remove any housing allocation and just retain all the other policies (making any other adjustments as outlined above) , the revised plan goes back to the PC for ratification and back to CDC for another screening opinion. Without housing allocation its likely no SEA would be required and we move forward

from there. The Parish continues to make representation to CDC on the DPD allocation.

The benefit of this option is that it streamlines the NP and we can bring forward the other policies in the Plan more speedily, once we have dealt with further ratification and screening. It probably removes the need for an SEA, as there is no housing allocation and accordingly we are likely to get to referendum more quickly. The current housing allocation to this Parish will remain and the site allocation moves back to CDC to make.

The downside is that it will cause an initial delay of about 3months , as for 1 above. We lose control of the housing allocation and site selection to CDC. There is no guarantee that on review CDC may allocate more housing and we will have less control over allocation and sites in the future. The other issue is that if we do not have a strong evidence base for removing the housing allocation, ie weak justification for this action, the land owner of the currently selected site could potentially take legal action against our removing the site from the plan. Therefore this potentially is the most risky option.

Additional Matter

One aspect which has been raised by Historic England verbally is the presence of the trees on the Dairy site and therefore Colin Smith Planning has advised that we should obtain an arboricultural impact assessment (AIA) report on the site. Three companies have been asked to provide a quote to date, we have one returned from M Dobson. An AIA is recommended if we move forward with Option 1 or 2 above. For further discussion and approval as determined by the PC