

9th November 2017 10.30-12.00

Meeting at CDC

Attendees: A Frost & M Allgrove. CDC

S Burrell, B Weddell, C Gibson-Pierce, D Knightley. Plaistow NP

Brief notes from meeting

Initial discussion about 'Service Village' designation and definition with particular focus on 'reasonable access'

Ref; CLPKP Page 38 5.1

Re: SEA/AECOM Report Not 'fit for purpose' and liable to challenge by landowners as not all assessed sites are included in latest report. Required amendments would likely indicate returning to Reg 14

Comment from CDC that report was received 21/08/17. If they had been given more time to consider the report's contents they could've advised above amendments prior to Reg 14 phase

Ref to case law (Henfield) and ref to JR at Loxwood

Discussion of DPD site vs NP allocated site and 'sustainability' and 'reasonable access' to services and amenities

M.A. comment that NP allocated site needs to be properly evidenced to show that proximity to amenities, services etc has been balanced against proximity to listed buildings, Conservation area etc to show that it is 'more sustainable in all senses' than alternatives, incl DPD site

It was pointed out by B.W/S.B that, amongst other consultees, Historic England have no issues with above 'balance' and allocated site fulfils NPPF guidelines much more fully than any assessed alternatives

Discussion of Settlement Boundaries Plaistow/Ifold and why there is no SB around Plaistow and thoughts on changing SBs. Clarification on SB on Service Villages. SB is placed around individual villages as required/desired and not around the entire Service Village where this includes more than one village. CDC have no thoughts to change the status quo for Plaistow/Ifold at this time. No evidence that residents of Ifold would want the SB to be changed or removed at this time

Discussion regarding inclusion/exclusion of Brownfield site Policy

CDC and SDNP planning authorities advise removing the policy

CDC advise that it would ultimately be the examiner's decision if Policy EE4 is left in the NP however M.A feels that NP Draft has not evidenced the Policy sufficiently with regard to 7.20 page 28 and the mix of uses.

What evidence do we have to support B1(c) light industrial/ A1 retail/C3 residential?

Returning to a 2nd round of Reg 14 would allow collection of evidence if the Policy is to remain in NP

Discussion on collation of Public Comments from 1st and potentially 2nd Reg 14.

Reference to Loxwood JR but this was post Reg 14 so no issue with additional Reg 14 comments

Returning to Reg 14 would also allow other fundamental changes to Draft NP including the omission of a Policy for Ifold Public Open spaces

CDC anticipate a decision regarding the DPD site in a few weeks not months. They will receive the examiner's comments and amendments first which they will have the opportunity to consider and potentially make amendments prior to re-submitting to the examiner. Her final decision on the 'soundness' of the DPD site will then follow and that decision will then be made public.

Unsure of timescale for this

Discussion of minutiae of CDC comments on Draft NP incl adoption of SDNP night skies policy etc

NP group to consult with CSP/AECOM/SDNP etc on other aspects of Draft NP and whether it is necessary to revisit Reg 14 etc

Meeting closed approx 12.00