

PLAISTOW & IFOLD PARISH – NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

REGULATION 14 Public Consultation: REPRESENTATIONS

Regulation 14 (6 week) Public Consultation – Started at 9am, Friday, 8 September 2017 and Ended evening of Friday, 20 October 2017.

GLOSSARY

CDC	Chichester District Council
CIHT	Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation
CLPKP	Chichester Local Plan Key Policies 2014 to 2029
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government (now known as MHCLG)
ISB	Ifold Settlement Boundary
LGS	Local Green Space
MHCLG	The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government's (formerly the <i>Department for Communities and Local Government</i>)
NP	Neighbourhood Plan
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
PCA	Plaistow Conservation Area
PCACAMP	Plaistow Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposals (2013)
SA DPD	Site Allocation Development Plan Document
SDNPA	South Downs National Park Authority
The Plan	Plaistow & Ifold Parish - Neighbourhood Plan

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
1	C. Gibson-Pierce	7.21	EE4	28	The Conformity Reference: European Directive EIA directive 85/337/EEC is no longer in force. Change to the updated EIA Directive 2014/52/EU Ref: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/review.htm	Amend. The EU conformity reference has changed, amend to most up-to-date EU directive.	Change to the updated EIA Directive 2014/52/EU Reference: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/review.htm
2	C. Gibson-Pierce	4.25 – 4.28	EH4	12	The 3 area maps of Local Green Spaces: (Ifold, Plaistow and Shillinglee) missing in The Plan.	Amend. Local Green Space (LGS) maps omitted in printed copy and had to be stapled in.	Insert the 3 LGS (Ifold, Plaistow, Shillinglee) maps into The Plan – Environment and Heritage section – Local Green Spaces.
3	S. Bowman				The lack of infrastructure in Ifold, (including unadopted roads, no shop, school, church,) means that to increase the housing within the Ifold boundaries seems to be very unsuitable. To increase the boundaries of Ifold would not add to the characteristics of the settlement. I therefore agree with the proposal that the additional housing is located in Plaistow. I believe that the process already actioned has led to identifying the most suitable site.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
4	S. East	4.10	EH a [EH2]	10	I would strongly support the position taken on the protection of the natural environment which is an issue that has been shown on many occasions to be of great importance to residents of the Parish. In particular the retention of trees and hedgerows is of vital importance. Although much of this has been removed in recent years with a corresponding reduction in wildlife, there are still significant areas which need protection.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
5	S. East	4.33	EH5	13	I would strongly support the control of excessive lighting on structures within the Parish. Although controls have featured for some time in Chichester District Council Planning Policy, there has been little effective work done to control the spread of additional lighting within the Parish. It would be hoped that by including this within the NP will refocus attention in this area which will benefit both residents and nocturnal wildlife. Policy EH6 also supports this for public installations.	No change, supports 'The Plan'. Refer to the response to Comment ID.: 73.	No change required.
6	S. East	5.6	CL1 [C11]	16	I would strongly support the minimisation of new hard-surface run off. The Parish has suffered for many years from the effects of the removal of water absorbing surfaces which have been widely replaced with both the roofs of new buildings and associated driveways. This, in combination with the failure to adequately enhance the existing surface water drainage system has resulted in frequent flooding. The provision of improved	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
					drainage along with controls of new hard surface development will hopefully mitigate these effects to a certain extent.		
7	S. East	6.8	H1	20	I would strongly support the development of the land opposite The Green in Plaistow. The site would appear to be [ideal] for the provision of the housing required as it is well situated with easy access to services within the village and if well designed, will not contribute to the current parking problems such as those seen in Nell Ball. The extensive research carried out by the Parish Council in the drafting of this plan has also demonstrated that this is the most suitable location for the required housing within the Parish as a whole.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
8	S. East	8.9	T1	29	I would strongly support the provision of off-street parking and landscaped verges within the Parish. In particular, in the context of new developments, appropriate access should be provided which enables the increasing number of vehicles (growing with increasing car ownership) to be parked safely off-road. Landscaped verges should be retained where they already exist and also incorporated into the design of any new development in order to enhance the local environment for the community.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
9	Featherstone	8.20	AIM T4	32	I object to further traffic calming measures if they are large/high humps in the road. These can cause great discomfort to sufferers of back and/or neck pain, and can damage cars. If 'humps' are really necessary then they must be wide/long and not too (unable to read) to minimise discomfort and damage. The existing speed limit is low enough in Ifold and the pinch points are effective at slowing traffic without the need for further measures.	No change. The Parish Council will seek advice from Highways Authority for any proposed traffic calming methods on adopted highways. References to Ifold speed limit (20MPH) and pinch points, relate to the private unadopted roads within IfoldEstate, which are not within the remit of this NP.	No change required.
10	Rupert Nathan	Not specified			Plaistow village has, to date, escaped the scale of recent developments of neighbouring villages such as Loxwood and Kirdford. The addition of eleven houses on the proposed site would not 'destroy# the village as we know it yet every avenue should be explored to avoid developing on a greenfield site next to a conservation area in the village. I understand selection of the site was based on necessary criteria but I personally believe the site north of Little Springfield Farm the score seems excessively low on the comparative analysis.	No change. Refer to Site Analysis (12 Sep 2016). https://plaistowandifoldparishnp.files.wordpress.com/2016/05/site-analysis-from-steering-group-meeting-12sep2016.pdf	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
11	Mrs Audrey Fox	Not specified			I oppose the planning application for the building of 10 houses in the centre of Plaistow village. Plaistow is one of a very few villages unspoilt in both Surrey and Sussex and the development situated immediately opposite the village green and conservation area will completely change the look of the area to its detriment. The field designated is significantly higher than the road and the green and any development will dominate the surrounding area. At present, the green is encircled by Grade II dwellings, many very old and picturesque. The majority of the houses in Plaistow are already two and three bedrooms, plus several one bedroom flats.	No change. The draft NP has had consideration to the sensitivity of the site, refer to Housing Policy H1. The proposed site size is sufficient to allow design of a scheme to reduce impact. Final design is a matter for the CDC planning application process. See response to Comment ID 231. The identified Parish Housing Need was determined through a Parish-wide survey: NP Household Survey and Housing Needs Assessment (Mar 2016)	No change required.
12	Harries	Not specified			We vote against your proposal. Your box ticking exercise is noted, but future residents of this village will have to live with the consequences of your recommendation, when XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX [redacted] [Land opposite The Green] is covered in housing.	No change. The commenter has made no recommendations nor proposed amendments regarding The Plan.	No change required.
13	Clare Haddad	4.4	EH1	9	SUPPORT: Encourage proposals that actively enhance the heritage asset.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
14	Clare Haddad	4.10	EH2	10	SUPPORT: Protect and enhance the natural environment.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
15	Clare Haddad	4.18	EH3	11	SUPPORT: Discourage Leylandii fir planting at household boundaries which deprive neighbours' gardens of light.	No change. Local councils have powers to deal with complaints about hedges over 2 metres high under Part 8 of the Anti-social Behaviour Act 2003 ('the Act) and the High Hedges (Appeals) (England) <i>Regulations</i> 2005. Please also reference the MHCLG 'High Hedges' guidance: www.gov.uk/government/collections/high-hedges Policy EH3 and the emerging Village Design Statement, encourage planting of native species.	No change required.
16	Clare Haddad	4.25-4.29	EH4	12	SUPPORT	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
17	Clare Haddad	4.38,34 & 40	EH5	13	SUPPORT: Enforce down lighting and light sensor lighting on OLD and new dwellings.	No change. The NP Policy EH5 can only apply to new development and extensions, or redevelopment. However, the Aim EH1 is directed at existing properties.	No change required.
18	Clare Haddad	4.41	AIM - EH1	9	OPPOSE WORDING: Would like to see "Consider" x 3 and have "Installation", "Install" and "shielding" as first word of sentences.	No change.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
						The Parish Council can only make this advisory and has no powers to enforce beyond encouraging residents to follow the Aims.	
19	Clare Haddad	5.6 & 5.13	CI, CI2	16-17	SUPPORT	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
20	Clare Haddad	6.8	H1	20	SUPPORT	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
21	Clare Haddad	6.14	H2	22	SUPPORT	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
22	Clare Haddad	6.20	H3	23	SUPPORT	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
23	Clare Haddad	6.26	H4	24	SUPPORT	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
24	Clare Haddad	7.7 & 7.12	EE[1], EE2	26 - 27	SUPPORT	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
25	Clare Haddad	7.2	EE4	28	SUPPORT	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
26	Clare Haddad	7.16	EE3	27	SUPPORT: Reopening of Ifold shop. Approve community run concept and would offer to volunteer. SUPPORT: Little Springfield Farm being used for retail, e.g. Farm shop.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
						The shop is in private ownership. For a community run initiative, please contact the owner and CDC (who hold the asset register for the Parish which includes the shop).	
						Policy EE3 refers to reinstatement of Ifold shop premises.	
27	Clare Haddad	8.9	T1	29	SUPPORT: Footpaths: The cut through between The Drive, Ifold and Chalk Road should be surfaced and managed for walkers.	Refer to Transport AIM Objectives in paragraph 8.16	No change required.
28	Clare Haddad	Not specified [4.26]	[EH4]	12	Loxwood Hills Pond: All avenues should be investigated over time to establish public ownership and use (no dogs) of this site. It has great potential as a community meeting place and a place where Ifold residents can enjoy its beauty without needing to look through a fence. Thanks to all who worked to produce this most excellent draft plan. Brilliant!	No change. This land is in private ownership with a PROW on one boundary. Refer to Policy EH4 which confers LGS status due to the historic significance of the site but LGS provides for no additional public access.	No change required.
29	David Lugton	Whole document			I think it is an excellent document and I do not disagree with any of the aims, objectives or proposals.	Thank you. No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
30	David Lugton	1.7		4	Strongly support that Ifold settlement boundary should be retained and not extended.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
31	David Lugton	2.1-2.7		5-6	Agree	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
32	David Lugton	4.4	EH2 [EH1]	9	Agree	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
33	David Lugton	4.6	EH2	9	Agree	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
34	David Lugton	4.10	EH2	10	As Tree Warden strongly support comments.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
35	David Lugton	4.12-4.20	EH3	11	Fully support. We need to protect the trees and insist on replanting if any removed. Too many trees, particularly in Ifold, have been removed which has exacerbated the flooding/sewage problems.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
36	David Lugton	4.26-4.29	EH4	12	Agree and fully support proposed Local Green Spaces.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
37	David Lugton	4.33	EH5	13	Agree	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
38	David Lugton	4.38	EH6	14	Agree not compatible with local environment to expand street lighting.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
39	David Lugton	5.3	CL1 [C1]	15	Agree we must update local infrastructure due to flood and sewage problems in Ifold.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
40	David Lugton	5.6	CL1 [C1]	16	Excellent proposal.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
41	David Lugton	5.9 & 5.13	CL2 [C2]	17	Excellent proposals. Increasingly people want to work from home and this should be facilitated.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
42	David Lugton	5.19	CL3 [C3]	18	Agree as for too long development allowed in Ifold when drainage/sewage infrastructure inadequate.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
43	David Lugton	5.22	CL4 [C4]	18	Agree	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
44	David Lugton	6.8	H1	20	Fully support recommendation. When I was Chairman of PC we discussed parameters for social housing with CDC. The only sustainable location in the parish was Plaistow, with proximity to school, church, shop and pub, none of which exist in Ifold. If we want to meet the obligation of up to 11 units in one location with social housing, it must be in Plaistow. If the independent experts recommend Land Opposite the Green, it should be supported. Unfortunately, there are some people in Plaistow who are against any development therefore ignoring sustainability criteria.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
						Comments Noted.	
45	David Lugton	6.10 & 6.11	H2	21	Fully support. Ifold has had significant development over recent years (103 new homes in 15 years) and presumably will still have some windfall.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
46	David Lugton	6.14	H2	22	Agree	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
47	David Lugton	6.20	H3	23	Agree	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
48	David Lugton	6.26	H4	24	Fully support principles	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
49	David Lugton	7.19	EE4	28	Agree	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
50	David Lugton	8.16-21	T1-5	31-32	Fully support aims	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
51	M & S Leighton	Not specified			We are happy to support the Plan as detailed in Kelsey Hall on 16/9/17	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
						Commenter refers to a public consultation held in Kelsey Hall, Ifold Sep 2017.	
52	B. Gravestock	Not specified			As an Ifold resident for many years, have seen substantial development in Ifold. During this time, Plaistow unlike all surrounding villages has been in a 'time warp'. As above development in Plaistow for a number of reasons is the appropriate way forward.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
53	Keith Lawrence	6.8 [6.5]		20	I support the Neighbourhood Plan proposed site for development reference the Land Opposite the Green, Plaistow as it has schools, shops, church, post office, village hall, childrens' playground and public house. Ifold has no such facilities and infrastructure and anyone without transport would have to walk 1.7km along roads with no pavements or street lighting.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
54	Jeremy Mudford	4.27		12	The Green space in front of Todhurst and owned by the National Trust should be listed as a local green space. The site chosen for development will impact on the visual aspect of Plaistow as a rural village and being the highest point in the centre of the village is visually unsuitable. The increase in traffic is not appropriate for our narrow country roads.	No change. This is freehold land owned and maintained by the National Trust and is accordingly protected for future generations. Reference response to Comment ID: 11 regarding the proposed housing development.	No change required.
55	Jeremy Mudford	5.6		16	Rainwater flow will cause problems for nearby properties which are all lower than the proposed site. I oppose the proposed site.	No change. Your comment is noted. However, this is matter for the CDC planning application process.	No change required.
56	Carolyn Mudford	4.27		12	Why is only part of Plaistow Recreation Ground included in LGSP1? Why is the green space in front of Todhurst owned by the National Trust not listed as a Local Green Space?	No change. The recreation ground (the lower green) is not included in LGSP1 as this land is owned and maintained by the National Trust and is accordingly protected for future generations.	No change required.
57	Carolyn Mudford	5.6, 5.16-19		16 18	Very important to ensure water run-off from the site does not cause excess water to flood Stone House, Rumbolds Lane and into Todhurst - need drains to stop this.	No change. Noted. This is matter for the CDC planning application process.	No change required.
58	Carolyn Mudford	6.13, 6.26		21 24	Very important to make sure density is kept low - also building height. Probably all houses should be bungalows - one storey only.	No change. The Plan policy H1 addresses housing density and the Village Design Statement provides guidance on maximum building height.	No change required.
59	Carolyn Mudford	8.3, 8.9		29 30	Important not to allow street lighting in Plaistow in accordance with Dark Skies policy.	No change. Refer to the Plan policy on Light Emissions	No change required.
60	Carolyn Mudford	6.26		24	Will residents and Parish Council have an opportunity to scrutinise and amend the developer's plans?	No change. Yes. This is matter for the CDC planning application process.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
61	Alastair Trainer	Not specified	Policy H1	20	<p>Building on this site will ruin the character of the village. It will block the lovely distant views of the downs from the village green.</p> <p>Points below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Brownfield sites to be used before greenfield. 2) If this site is built on then any greenfield site in and around the village can have houses built on it at a future date. 3) This site is capable of having many more houses built on it. We have no guarantees that this will not happen to the detriment of the village. 4) Just because this site is in the centre of the village and near amenities now does not mean that those amenities will always be there. In recent times Kirdford school closed, Dunsfold school closed, Ifold shop closed. Once this field is built on it is lost to further development of housing forever! Please reconsider another alternative site, and not the site by the south side of the village green. 	<p>No change.</p> <p>There is no significant view of the South Downs from the village Green. Blackdown can be viewed to the west over Todhurst and will continue to be seen.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There is no suitable brownfield site in the parish to meet our housing allocation. 2 & 3) Plaistow village remains in the countryside and has no settlement boundary, therefore housing development can only proceed if allocated through the NP or CLPKP. 4) A Site Options and Assessment (AECOM 2016) concluded that a site in Plaistow would take much better account of relevant national and local sustainability criteria, reflecting the fact that Plaistow has the local facilities/amenities (shop, pub, primary school) and is therefore a more sustainable location for growth. The proposed site has been allocated where new housing will be within walking distance, with positive implications for the future of these three vital services. 	No change required.
62	Mrs Jennie Trainer	Not specified	Policy H1	20	<p>I strongly oppose any building on this site as:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) It is a 'greenfield site'. b) The character of the village will be ruined. c) Because there are 'brownfield sites' that would/could be used instead. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Once houses are built on this site in any number, being such a large plot it lays itself open to the potential escalation to 'an estate'. 2. The site is on the junction of two roads, one very narrow one already a traffic hazard for pedestrians, horse riders etc. because of speeding. 3. This site may be in the centre of the village now but this predisposes that the present amenities will always be there. <p>Several local schools have closed as has Ifold shop. Loxwood shop is on the market. I would urge you to consider an alternative site and not this site alongside the village green.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Refer to the responses to Comment ID: 11 and 61.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2). WSCC (the Highways authority) response to the Reg 14 Consultation notes: "The Strategic Transport Assessment indicates that there will be no severe impacts on the transport network that cannot be mitigated to a satisfactory level." This is also a matter for the CDC planning application process. 3) The NP as written has been developed as per the services and amenities that currently exist. The NP is reviewed with each CLPKP review. <p>The proposed site has been carefully assessed and there is no other reasonable alternative.</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
63	Mr & Mrs Robin Del Mar	Sections 1, 5 & 6			All references are for 10 dwellings to be built. Where has the figure for 11 dwellings come from?	No change. 10 units is the 'Indicative Housing Number' for the Parish as per CLPKP. The identified Parish housing need requires some affordable units. CDC can allow developers to pay a commuted sum for developments of 10 or less units rather than providing affordable units on site. Hence 11 units have been proposed on one site which will ensure delivery of the affordable units in the Parish.	No change required.
64	Mr & Mrs Robin Del Mar	8 [6.5 – 6.8]	H1	20	Regarding access to the site, we feel strongly that this should be in The Street and NOT common road which is too narrow to support any increase in traffic from additional residences.	No change. Incorrect para no. quoted. This is matter for the CDC planning application process. WSCC Highways response to the Reg 14 Consultation notes: "The Strategic Transport Assessment indicates that there will be no severe impacts on the transport network that cannot be mitigated to a satisfactory level."	No change required.
65	Mr & Mrs Robin Del Mar	6.25	H4	24	There is a contradiction in policy here re the mention of the fact that Plaistow "is entirely reliant on motor cars in order to live and work here". And yet it has been stated that the housing must be built within easy walking distance of village amenities. The site should be on the outskirts of the village and NOT right in the centre where it will have the greatest visual, practical and irrevocable adverse impact.	No change. It is acknowledged parishioners are largely dependent on car-usage but it is still a requirement of the NPPF to minimise car usage where possible; and the ability to access services, leisure facilities and social interaction by reasonable walking distance must be considered. The Parish Housing Need identified a need for suitable housing for older members of the parish within reasonable walking distances to services & facilities. Reference NPPF Para: 37.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
66	Mr & Mrs Robin Del Mar	7.19	EE4	28	If part of the site at Little Springfield Farm is suitable for 3 residential dwellings, then surely it would be better to divide the 10 dwellings between Plaistow and Ifold. Thus reducing the inevitable adverse impact on the centre of the village of Plaistow.	No change. The Planning Application was refused by CDC in 2015 for 3 dwellings and refused on Appeal by the Planning Inspectorate (2016). The site was assessed in the NP process and discounted. 10 units is the 'Indicative Housing Number' for the Parish as per CLPKP. Refer to response to Comment ID: 63 which explains why 1 large site is necessary. The site at Little Springfield Farm is not large enough for all 11 units without impacting on the adjacent Ancient Woodland and surrounding countryside and part is in flood zone 2 & 3. Ifold is not a sustainable location therefore unsuitable for affordable housing. Also, private drainage system and private access road would not be acceptable to housing association managing affordable housing.	No change required.
67	Mr & Mrs Robin Del Mar	8.16	AIMS Objectives	31	How can links to public transport in the parish and adjoining parishes be improved without adding to the volume of traffic already using the narrow country lanes. Regarding the improvement of safety on the roads, speed limits should be strictly enforced but NO introduction of 'traffic calming', i.e. speed humps which are inappropriate in a country village.	No change. Refer to response to Comment ID: 9. The Parish Council would seek advice from WSCC the Highways Authority for any proposed traffic calming methods on adopted highways. Reference to Ifold speed limit (20MPH) and pinch points relates to the private roads within Ifold Estate which are not within the remit of this NP. Improved public transport reduces car usage.	No change required.
68	Sarah Seager-Thomas	7.14, 7.15, 2.1, 2.5, 6.1		25 5 6 19	VERY pleased to see that the SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY is to be retained. Ifold would lose its uniqueness if it was allowed to expand beyond this boundary. It is VERY IMPORTANT to Ifold residents that the countryside is on our doorstep in PERPETUITY.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
69	Sarah Seager-Thomas	2.6, 7.1	EE3	6 25 27	Interested to see that the shop premises in Ifold is to be reinstated - quite how this will be achieved under present circumstances remains a mystery to everyone. A take-away would be brilliant - there used to be a fish and chip shop there, but f&c is a once a week thing, a takeaway (chinese/indian) would have a good variety and can be for any day of the week. Not sure that residents close to it would welcome the smells though!	No change. Policy EE3 supports the continued use of those premises as a shop. The Parish Council does not have the power to enforce reinstatement.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
70	SarahSeager-Thomas	2.7, 8.1		6 29	If a cycle route could be installed on the route from Plaistow to Ifold then could this also be used as a footpath too? A safe, non-muddy walking/cycling route directly between our two main parish settlements is DESPERATELY NEEDED.	No change. Refer to AIMs T1 – Public Footpaths and other Rights of Way; and T2 - Cycle Routes.	No change required.
71	Sarah Seager-Thomas	8.1, 8.2		29	Reducing the speed limit to 30mph on the stretch of road between Ifold Cottage and Oak Tree Stores would be WELCOMED, especially as it has 3 drop-off points for school children.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
72	Sarah Seager-Thomas	4.23		12	Green Spaces in Ifold within the settlement boundary are to be applauded and must be retained BUT LGS i7 is a mystery to Ifold Residents, and most if not all are unaware of it. If it is to fulfill the criteria - HOW DO WE ACCESS IT? Yes, it is special and holds particular significance for the wildlife it no-doubt supports, but Ifold is crying out for a green space where children can safely play football, go on the swings etc. Our pre-school at Kelsey Hall has to make do with artificial surfaces and a small space for their limited outdoor activities! (there is a long-abandoned development of 1 part-built house behind Kelsey Hall - if cleared this would be a great space for children to play in, it being on the doorstep of Kelsey Hall!)	Amend. LGSi7 adds to the visual amenity and character of the settlement and its biodiversity, consequently it was proposed for designation. LGS designation does not give any rights to public access.	Amend plan additional Community Infrastructure : AIM Ci5 Ifold settlement has no public open space or play ground provision within or adjoining the settlement boundary for residents to use for leisure and social interaction. Through consultation with residents it has been identified as a need. Provision and financing of such space requires the co-operation of landowners , developers and the Local Authority . Accordingly this can only be identified at this time as an AIM. AIM Ci5 The Parish will work with landowners , developers and the Local Authority toward provision of suitable public open space and childrens playground for the benefit of Ifold settlement.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
73	Sarah Seager-Thomas	4.31, 4.41	EH5 & AIM EH1	13 14	Light Pollution - how will this be enforced? - many Ifold residents seem to have very bright outside lights burning well into the night.	<p>No change.</p> <p>Policy EH5 and AIM EH1 seek to address Light Pollution. The Parish Council can only make the AIM advisory and has no powers to enforce beyond encouraging residents to follow Aim EH1. However, Light Pollution: light trespass (Incorrectly set lighting causing intrusion of overbright or poorly directed lights onto neighbouring property); glare (Incorrectly set lighting - an overbright light source against a dark background causing dark shadows reducing a persons ability to view the area); or Skyglow (Poorly designed lighting such as street lights or outdoor sports facilities that do not direct light onto areas they're designed to illuminate, allowing light to escape into the sky); can be dealt with as a complaint to CDC. Ref: www.chichester.gov.uk/pollutioncontrol#lightpollution</p> <p>As noted in the Conformity Reference for Aim – EH1: The Clean Neighbourhoods & Environment Act 2005 gives powers to the local authority to deal with light pollution under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in much the same way as noise is currently controlled. Under this Act any artificial lighting identified as a statutory nuisance will be subject to restriction or abatement with fines for non-compliance.</p>	No change require.

74	Sarah Seager-Thomas	4.4	EH1	9	<p>Heritage Assets. There are 4 properties in Ifold which are listed with English Heritage:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hogwood Farm, Forestry Road, Ifold; 2. Keepers Cottage, Plaistow Road, Ifold; 3. The Gatehouse, Plaistow Road, Loxwood (but is almost on the Ifold boundary); 4. Foxbridge Farm, Foxbridge Lane, Kirdford (but close to Ifold). <p>HOWEVER, THERE ARE 6 OTHERS IN IFOLD WHICH MERIT INCLUSION IN THE NHP AS HERITAGE ASSETS; in no particular order:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Ifold Cottage, Loxwood Road, Ifold; 6. Southlands, Ifold Bridge Lane, Ifold; 7. Butlers (formerly Alpine Cottage), Hogwood Road, Ifold; 8. Hogwood House, Hogwood Road, Ifold; 9. Trelayne, Chalk Road, Ifold; 10. The Lodge, The Drive, Ifold; 11. The Olde Garden, The Lane, Ifold. <p>All of these are illustrated in the very popular local history book 'Ifold, Loxwood and Plaistow, Forgotten Border Villages', by C H Bayley. Illustrated by P Harman. PLEASE CAN THESE PROPERTIES BE ADDED TO THE NHP LIST?</p>	<p>Amend.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hogwood Farm due its proximity to the Ifold boundary it is commonly thought of as being within Ifold it is however within Plaistow. It is a listed building and already noted in Appendix 1: Listed Buildings. 2. Keepers Cottage is a listed building and already noted in Appendix 1: Listed Buildings. 3. The Gatehouse is located in Loxwood Parish and not within this Plan area. 4. Kirdford is the postal address for Foxbridge Farm, it is within the Plaistow area. Foxbridge Farmhouse, Foxbridge Lane, Plaistow is a listed building and already noted in Appendix 1: Listed Buildings. 5. Ifold Cottage is not a listed building but is already noted in Appendix 2 - Historic Buildings of Positive Merit. 6. Southlands is not a listed building. But the NP will be amended to include as a Building of Local Historic Merit. 7. Butlers is not a listed building but is already noted under its original name of Alpine Cottage in Appendix 2 - Historic Buildings of Positive Merit. 8. Hogwood House is not a listed building but is already noted in Appendix 2 - Historic Buildings of Positive Merit. 9. Trelayne is not a listed building but is already noted in Appendix 2 - Historic Buildings of Positive Merit. 10. The Lodge is not a listed building but is already noted in Appendix 2 - Historic Buildings of Positive Merit. 11. The Olde Garden is not a listed building but it's historic garden wall is already noted in Appendix 2 - Historic Buildings of Positive Merit. <p>Amend Section 4.1 Objectives to reference both designated and non-designated heritage assets as identified in Appendices 1 & 2.</p> <p>Amend Policy EH1 to include both designated and non-designated heritage assets in the Parish.</p> <p>Anyone can apply to have a heritage asset considered for designation. The Parish Council would support an individual who would want to take this forward.</p>	<p>Objectives – CHANGE FROM: to protect the area's valuable heritage and historic assets;</p> <p>CHANGE TO: to protect the area's valuable heritage and historic assets (designated and non-designated) as identified in Appendices 1 & 2;</p> <p>Policy EH1 – CHANGE FROM: Development of, within the boundary of, or within the setting of heritage assets will be supported</p> <p>CHANGE TO: Development of, within the boundary of, or within the setting of heritage assets (both designated and non-designated) will be supported.</p>
----	---------------------	-----	-----	---	--	--	---

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
75	Mrs Diane Townsend	Not specified			<p>My general view is that the Neighbourhood Plan as currently drafted, is ideally suited to the needs of the Parish, given that it would seem that we are obliged to accommodate at least 10 new houses for the current Chichester District Council Local Plan.</p> <p>With regard to the location of the proposed strategic development and having read most of the considerable information contained on the Parish website, the most logical choice of location has been made.</p> <p>The constraints on the sustainability aspect of strategic development in Ifold and the more sustainable location proposed in Plaistow, particularly in regard to its accessibility to the near-by services and facilities, all of which are within walking distance, is clearly the correct decision.</p> <p>I strongly believe that even though the draft Neighbourhood Plan clearly states that the majority of residents in Ifold wish to retain the Settlement Boundary, it is important that the Settlement Boundary is retained in its present form and location without deviation or extension, in order to mitigate the serious issues with surface water drainage, foul water drainage and flooding which persists in Ifold with no apparent plans for significant improvements or upgrading of these Utilities.</p>	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
76	Maralyn Del Medico	Not specified			<p>I do believe that Plaistow is more suitable for the proposal of building ten new houses. It is more accessible to local amenities and is therefore the right thing to do. The current level of building by developers in Ifold has now reached capacity. To reduce the very real threat of drainage and further flooding, the Neighbourhood Plan is correct in locating the proposed ten houses in Plaistow.</p>	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

77	R Luck	6.4		<p>I oppose the proposal to build 11 units on the land opposite the Green Plaistow as it does not fulfil any of the aims and objectives in that it:</p> <p>A. Does not provide affordable housing (a bungalow of similar size was sold recently for £550,000 with work needing to be done to it within 50 meters. 3 bedroom properties in Nell Ball currently go for around £300,000. Similar housing in Ifold would go for £450,000. The restrictions and covenants placed on the developer would make profitable developing unviable).</p> <p>B. Destroys an area of valuable biodiversity and habitats.</p> <p>C. Destroys a valued natural environment and ecology.</p> <p>D. Puts at risk trees hedges and natural vegetation.</p> <p>E. Impinges on areas identified as Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>F. Has not used a brownfield site.</p> <p>G. Would result in potential harm to many significant trees (if they would only be left to grow) and hedges adjacent to the verge and have an impact that would be harmful to the setting the conservation area.</p> <p>H. Fails to maintain the character. Also it changes, for the worst, the look of the village from a uniquely open and rural feel with far reaching views that extend to Blackdown to the west and the Sussex Downs at Bedham and the South Downs to the south. It affects people and properties in The Street, Rumbolds Lane, the Green and Rickmans Lane, many of whom have paid higher than average prices for their properties to live in a rural village rather than a housing estate. It affects anyone using the green and it affects anyone coming in or through the village especially those who have respect and pleasure in the countryside.</p> <p>The land opposite the Green, Plaistow is rich in flora and fauna due to its use over many years. The land is good quality farmland although it is not farmed extensively. The land has not been subjected to fertilisers nor insecticides. In the 20 years I've lived in the village the land has been used to graze cattle and latterly sheep. The grasses and wild flowers are allowed to grow long before it is cut and baled. Probably more than 90 percent of all animals found within the parish can be found there during the year. Birds like the declining sparrows feed off the seeds, you'll find most British garden birds present including Greenfinch, Blue</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>A: The proposed housing provides for affordable housing in line with CLPKP policy. B, C, D: The proposed housing development site has been reviewed three times to-date by Natural England (a statutory consultee) as part of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Opinion: [Natural England's comments were "Based on the scale of housing proposed and environmental constraints, we do not feel that the plan has the potential to give rise to significant effects for areas within our remit."] 2) a subsequent SEA; and 3) Regulation 14 Consultation: Natural England ' We have reviewed the attached plan, however Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft NP. If the NP changes and there is the potential for environmental impacts, Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening exercises may need to be undertaken.' <p>E: The proposed housing development site does not impinge on the adjacent proposed LGSP1 as a recreational space. F: There is no suitable brownfield site to take the housing allocation in the Parish. See response to Comment ID: 66 G: There are no significant trees on the site. H: See response to Comment ID: 11.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
----	--------	-----	--	---	--	----------------------------

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
					Tit, Chaffinch etc. Sparrowhawks will take a small bird like Goldfinch and also Field Mice as will Little Owls, Tawny and Barn owls. Jackdaws, that roost less than half a mile away will feed there as will wood pidgeon and collard dove. Pheasants can be present. Swallows, House Martins and swifts will take insects in the air as will Pippestrelle Bats. Robins, Blackbirds and Song Thrushes will sing in the hedgerows as do Nightingales on summer evenings. The field is home to Field Mice, Stoats and Weasels. Foxes and Badgers will patrol there at night and in the day too. On rare occasions Roe Deer will jump the gate. Toads and Slowworms live amongst the wild flowers and grasses. Birds will nest in the varied hedgerow bordering the field. Hedgerows filled with Oak, Ash and Hazel, Blackberry and Black thorn. And all this is just a fraction.		
78	R Luck	2.1			Building on land opposite the Green loses the main character of the village	No change. See response to Comment ID: 11	No change required.
79	R Luck	2.3, 4.6			Building on the land opposite the Green destroys the very rich biodiversity and habitats of that piece of land and has repercussions for the land around it.	No change. Refer to response to Comment ID: 77. The Plan has policies in place to minimise the impact of development on surrounding properties and countryside. Potential repercussions to land around the proposed site are a matter for the Chichester District Council planning application process.	No change required.
80	R Luck	5.1, 5.4, 5.16			The parish council needs to look into the funds held by Ifold Freeholders and Residents association to see if they can help with any sewerage and drainage problems which surely must be more important than new kerbstones.	No change. The Parish Council is not responsible for the function or accounts of a private limited company. Sewerage is provided by Southern Water.	No change required.
81	Richard Wyatt	1.6			No mention that original AECOM report was the caveat that the outcome was dependent on information supplied by the NP Steering Group, which has never been made public.	No change. This is incorrect. All evidence provided to AECOM for the Site Options and Assessment are acknowledged in the report and are publicly available online via the Parish Council's NP website: www.plaistowandifoldparishnp.com	No change required.
82	Richard Wyatt	2.1			2nd point 'protect and maintain the character etc.' The proposed site of land opposite the green in Plaistow does not comply with this stated objective.	No change. Refer to the response to Comment ID: 11.	No change required.
83	Richard Wyatt	2.3			The proposed site of land opposite the green in Plaistow does not comply with this stated objective.	No change. Refer to the response to Comment ID: 11.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
84	Richard Wyatt	2.7			No mention of the subsidised transport available in 4 sites in Ifold - Billilinks.	No change. Billilinks is a partly subsidised service (by WSCC) but not a scheduled service, therefore no different to any mini-cab or taxi service that may be operating in the Parish, apart from the fact that residents must pre-register to use the Billilinks service.	No change required.
85	Richard Wyatt	6.2			The quality of the AECOM report is questionable and its 3rd recommendation for a building site next to the conservation area should be ignored and either the brownfield site or the site chosen by the CDC Local Plan chosen for this year's housing requirement.	No change. The Parish Council applied for a technical grant from Locality, a programme partner of MHCLG. AECOM were appointed by Locality and are a professionally accredited planning organization with considerable experience. The 3rd recommendation for a housing site (Land opposite The Green) was based on assessing sites against the NPPF and putting them in order of those meeting most of the sustainability criteria. Subsequent assessments (eg. to ascertain access to the site, Arboricultural Impact Assessments, ...) discounted the preceding sites for reasons as stated in the site evidence. The brownfield site was discounted for the reasons as stated in the site evidence: - predominantly because of a 2016 Planning Inspectorate Appeal Decision where the Inspector deemed the site to not be sustainably located; - the site is not suitable to take all 11 units without impact on the countryside; - the site is not sustainably located for affordable housing and has unadopted private access and drainage, not suitable for affordable houses; - the site is not located where the need to use a motor car is lessened (as per the NPPF).	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
86	Richard Wyatt	Section 6		19	<p>Within the Parish the small village of Plaistow has provided all the small houses/flats that have been provided in the Parish for decades. Surely the benefits of this kind of housing should be spread over the whole Parish. The Parish as a whole is described as unsustainable, not just Ifold and in the opinion of many the subsidised transport the reopening of the village shop and the opening of a new Co-Op store nearby suggest that Ifold is more sustainable than most other parts of the Parish. The use and requirement of a car is consistent throughout the Parish.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The Parish is predominantly dependent on cars. The NPPF requires that housing development should be sustainably located to minimise the need to use a motor car. The proposed site in Plaistow has facilities and services within easy walking distance. see Response to Comment ID: 65.</p> <p>The co-op referred is proposed for Loxwood Parish (outside of this Parish) and yet to be built. Loxwood is approx. 1.2 miles from Ifold.</p>	No change required.
87	Mrs Christina Wyatt	2.3, 4.4, 8.9, 7.2,6.4	EH1	9	<p>The adjacent paragraphs set out arguments that contradict each other and moreover are flawed in their objectives. The site in Plaistow identified would contravene the stated heritage aims of the surrounding listed buildings by nature of the lay of the land - namely it sits higher and would contravene and interfere with the privacy of the listed buildings surrounding it. Moreover the vehicular access would contravene Highway requirements due to the lay of the road and the inability to provide safe pedestrian way to the local amenities.</p> <p>The land at Little Springfield being brownfield would be the only option.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Policy H1 has been carefully written to respond to the sensitive nature of the site. Refer also to the response to Comment ID: 11.</p> <p>Re: Brownfield site: Refer to response to Comment ID: 85.</p>	No change required.
88	Alan Dormon	6.8	H1	20	<p>Whilst the objectives in Para 6.5 and the criteria in Para 6.8 are sensible and should be implemented on the site chosen, it is the allocated site itself that I object to. The site will dominate the village green and destroy forever the open rural view from the green which is the heart of the village. Any development on the edges of Ifold will have no such similar impact as Ifold is already a sprawling settlement.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Refer also to the response to Comment ID: 11 and 87.</p> <p>The site is enclosed by hedging; and the trees on the village Green will remain as screening.</p>	No change required.
89	Alan Dormon	6.2		19	<p>Sustainability should not be a pre-cursor to choosing a site for development in such a rural area as this. Nobody would move to Plaistow or Ifold or the surrounding area if they did not possess a car, therefore the ability to walk to a shop, church or school, although nice, is not a requirement or necessity.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The Steering Group have meticulously followed National and Local planning policy and proposed a site that best meets sustainability criteria.</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)	
90	Alan Dormon	6.4			The site chosen for development - The Green, Common House Road, Plaistow, is in the heart of the village. It is a raised piece of land which means the dwellings would tower over the village green and change forever the rural and unspoilt centre of our village. The impact on the pretty village green would be devastating.	No change. Refer to the responses to Comment ID: 11 and 88 and 231.	No change required.	
91	Carolyn Morgan-Welker		LGPS6		We write to submit objections on behalf of our client, Mr Lionel Cozens-Smith to the Draft Plaistow and Ifold Parish Draft Neighbourhood Plan for Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2017-2029 (August 2017) (The "Draft Plan!"). Mr Cozens-Smith owns the land identified in the Draft Plan as "LGSP2: Nell Ball Hill and Trig Point, Dunsfold Road, Plaistow" (the "Land") which is currently identified for designation as Local Green Space under Policy EH4 of the Draft Plan. Our client objects to this designation in the Draft Plan and request that the Land be removed from the Draft Plan. The Land is part of our client's working farm which is known as Nell Ball Farm, Plaistow. Our client and his wife operate a farming business which is the largest employer in Plaistow. Our client is opposed to the designation of the Land on the grounds listed below. 1. The criteria for para 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") are not met. 2. Abuse of process for inappropriate objectives. 3. The Land is already designated under an Article 4 Direction. 4. Land does not contain Ancient and Semi-Natural Woodland. We write to register the following objections to the Draft Plan. 1. Para 77 of the NPPF. The designation of the Land does not meet the criteria required for designations under paragraphs 77 of the NPPF. Paragraph 4.23 "Justification" in the Draft Plan specifically states that "a number of parcels of land have the land identified as Local Green Space in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 76-78 of the NPPF. And that they "have been identified as they meet the criteria in the NPPF". This is not correct in respect to the Land. The Land does not qualify for designation under the criteria of paragraph 77 of the NPPF. Paragraph 77 of the NPPF provides that £designation should only be used" where the following criteria are met: where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field) tranquility or richness of its wildlife; and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land. The Land does not meet the above criteria for the reasons explained below. It should therefore not be designated as Local Green Space in the Draft Plan. <u>Reasons why Paragraph 77 of the NPPF is not met.</u> a) <u>Recreational Value:</u> The Land cannot be said to be of recreational value for local use. The Land is private agricultural land and has been historically. It is used as grazing land by our client. It is not used for recreation or enjoyment of the local community. Our client has owned the Land since 7 October 2009. He can say explicitly that the Land has not been used by the public for any recreational purpose (that he is aware of) over the past 8 years. Any recreational use of the Land has been limited to use by his friends and family and only with his permission. There is a Public Right of Way (Bridleway - Path Number: 636) which runs alongside the Land. Public use of the Bridleway does not amount to recreational use of the Lane. b) <u>Historic significance.</u> The Land does not have particular historical significance. The statements made in the final section of the Local Green Space Assessment for the Land ("Plaistow LGS ID: LGSP6") (the "Assessment") are fanciful. Our client vehemently disputes the assertion that the Land "is an important historic landmark" as explained below. The Assessment bases its assessment of the Land as a historic landmark merely on: (i) tenuous and fanciful local legends and folk law stories; (ii) existence of the unexceptional trig point (such trig points can be found all across the country and no explanation is given why this one is considered a historic landmark); (iii) fact that the local housing development has been named "Nell Ball" (which is irrelevant); (iv) the claim that it has been used as a beacon site for special occasions (also referred to in paragraph 3.11 of the Draft Plan) - such use has not occurred in the past 8 years at a very minimum	No change. The Parish Council has assessed the Local Green Space as meeting the necessary NPPF criteria.	No change required.	

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
					<p>since our client has owned the Land; (v) significance of a tree which is no longer in existence on the site because it was blown down in the 1987 Great Storm. The "significance" therefore appears to be somewhat lost in its current context. The Parish Council is trying to prescribe particular importance to the Plaistow Mount trig point on the Land by referring to it as an "unscheduled monument" in the Draft Plan (Appendix 2 "Historic Buildings of Positive Merit"). This is wholly inappropriate. The trig point is in no way exceptional or unusual. It does not have any special qualities. No explanation has been provided to establish why the trig point should merit the status of an unscheduled monument in either the assessment or the Draft Plan. (c) <u>The Land is an extensive tract of land.</u> The Land is a total of 2.95 ha in size. 2.95 ha is undeniably a large tract of land. By way of illustration, the Land is the largest of the 6 green spaces that are proposed for designation in Plaistow. The Land is therefore unsuitable for designation in accordance with the guidance in paragraph 77 of the NPPF which specifically states that land should only be designated as local green space where it "is not an extensive tract of land". In this case it is an extensive tract of land. The Land should therefore not be designated because it is an extensive tract of land. (d) <u>Richness of wildlife.</u> The Land is not a habitat for rare and protected wildlife species. It is agricultural grazing land. The Assessment gives the misleading impression that the Land has rare and protected species using it, under the 'Site description' (section 6) which refers to rare and protected species using Nell Ball Copse and Berry Field Copse for foraging and in their flight lines. To be clear, Nell Ball Copse and Berry Field Copse do not form part of the Land. Nell Ball Copse and Berry Field Copse (which are Ancient and Semi-Natural Woodland) have not been proposed for designation as local green space under the Draft Plan. Designation of the Land on account of the richness of wildlife which is not on the Land but in the Ancient & Semi-Natural Woodland would be wholly inappropriate. 2. Abuse of process for inappropriate objectives. We submit that the Parish Council is pursuing an agenda to protect the sites surrounding the village from future development. The parcels of land identified for designation are all (with the exception of the pond) the most suitable sites for development in the village. In this connection, we note that the proposed designations effectively creating a ring around the built-up area of the village, protecting it from future development. This is an abuse of process for inappropriate objectives. The designation of local green space should not be used for the purpose of achieving a new area of Green Belt. The NPPF guidance notes further provides that: "Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making". (Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 37-007-20140306). The Draft Plan appears to be trying to allocate all the land within the village which could potentially be appropriate for future development as local green space thus protecting it from development. The effect of which would be to achieve a new area of Green Belt around the village. This is contrary to the intention of paragraph 77 of the NPPF. NPPF guidance notes make clear that designation should not be a "back door" way to achieve Green Belt. "There are no hard and fast rules about how big a Local Green Space can be because places are different and a degree of judgement will inevitably be needed. However, paragraph 77 of the NPPF is clear that Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green area concerned is not an extensive tract of land. Consequently blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate. In particular, designation should not be proposed as a 'back door' way to try to achieve what would amount to a new area of Green Belt by another name" (Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 37-015-20140306). It is therefore inappropriate to designate the Land as local green space as doing so would amount to an abuse of process for inappropriate objectives. 3. The Land is already designated under an Article 4 Direction. The designation of the Land is not necessary or appropriate because the Land is already designated land under an Article 4 Direction (dated 5 March 1985). Permitted development rights have been restricted for the Land under the Article 4 Direction. The effect is that building operations on the Land are only allowed for the purposes of agricultural. Further protection of the Land (from development) by way of designation as local green space is not appropriate. NPPF guidance notes provide us with guidance on this point as follows: "Different types</p>		

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
					<p>of designations are intended to achieve different purposes. If land is already protected by designation, then consideration should be given to whether any additional local benefit would be gained by designation as Local Green Space." (Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 37-011-20140306). The designation would therefore only be appropriate if brought 'any additional local benefit' as explained above. There is no discernible additional local benefit that designating the Land (which is used for agriculture) as local green space would bring. (Unless that benefit is for the Parish Council to achieve a new area of Green Belt around the village - which as explained above would be an abuse of process for inappropriate objectives.) As the Land is already protected by way of an Article 4 direction it would not be appropriate to also designate it as local green spaces. 4. Land does not contain Ancient & Semi-Natural Woodland. The Land itself does not contain any Ancient & Semi-Natural Woodland. It does not therefore require any further protection. Only a small section of the Land (to the south east) adjoins Nell Ball Copse and Berry Field Copse is Ancient & Semi Natural Woodland, which has not been identified for designation. Summary. Our client objects to the designation of the Land for the reasons explained above. The Land does not meet the prescribed criteria for designation in the NPPF. It is therefore not appropriate for designation as local green space. Doing so would be contrary to the intentions of the NPPF and may well represent an abuse of process for inappropriate objectives. We therefore request on behalf of our client that the Land be removed from Policy EH4 and therefore not designed under the Draft Plan.</p>		
92	Mr Lionel Cozens-Smith (Landowner; Business Owner)	3.11			<p>Opposed to the wording in paragraph 3.11. This paragraph states that "Nell Ball has been used, even recently, as a beacon site for special occasions." This is not true. I own the land at Nell Ball. I purchased it on 7 October 2009 and can say that it has not been used as a beacon site during the period that I have owned it. Any use as a beacon site has not taken place in the last 8 years. Any recreational activity at Nell Ball has been by my friends or family and has only taken place with my express permission. I am not aware of any public recreational activity taking place at Nell Ball during the period when I have owned it.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>A beacon was lit for the Millenium and another lit for the Queen's Jubilee. The latter by invitation from the current owner, however visible from Nell Ball housing area and Foxfields (football ground).</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
93	Mr Lionel Cozens-Smith (Landowner; Business Owner)	4.25	EH4		I am opposed to the designation of the land identified as "LGSP6: Nell Ball Hill and Trig Point, Dunsfold Road, Plaistow" as Local Green Space in the Neighbourhood Plan under Policy EH4. Paragraph 4.25 states that the locations listed under paragraph 4.27 are designated as Local Green Spaces under Policy EH4 (as shown on the Policies Map) and paragraph 4.27 identifies my land "LGSP6: Nell Ball Hill and Trig Point, Dunsfold Road, Plaistow". I am opposed to the designation of my land as local green space. My land does not meet the required criteria set out in paragraph 77 of the NPPF to enable it to be designated as Local Green Space. I therefore request that both policy EH4 and the Plaistow Local Green Spaces Map should be amended to remove the designation of my land which is identified as "LGSP6: Nell Ball Hill and Trig Point, Dunsfold Road, Plaistow". I refer you to the attached letter from my solicitors dated 19 October 2017 which sets out why my land (LGSP6) does not meet the criteria of paragraph 77 of the NPPF.	No change. The Parish Council has assessed the Local Green Space as meeting the necessary NPPF criteria.	No change required.
94	Mr Lionel Cozens-Smith (Landowner; Business Owner)	4.27	EH4 LGSP6		Please see comment above in respect of paragraph 4.25 above. The land identified as "LGSP6: Nell Ball Hill and Trig Point, Dunsfold Road, Plaistow" (which I own) does not meet the required criteria set out in paragraph 77 of the NPPF to enable it to be designated as Local Green Space. I therefore request that the reference to my land, as shown below, be removed from paragraph 4.27: " - LGSP6: Nell Ball Hill and Trig Point, Dunsfold Road, Plaistow". I also request that both policy EH4 and the Plaistow Local Green Spaces Map should be amended to remove the designation of my land (identified as LGSP6: Nell Ball Hill and Trig Point, Dunsfold Road, Plaistow"). Again, I refer you to the attached letter from my solicitors dated 19 October 2017 which sets out why my land (LGSP6) does not meet the criteria of paragraph 77 of the NPPF.	No change. The Parish Council has assessed the Local Green Space as meeting the necessary NPPF criteria.	No change required.
95	Mr Lionel Cozens-Smith (Landowner; Business Owner)		LGSP6		I object to the representations made in the local green space assessment for the reasons detailed in the attached letter from my solicitors dated 19 October 2017 which details my objections and sets out why my land (LGSP6) should not be designated as local green space in the Draft Plan.	No change. The Parish Council has assessed the Local Green Space as meeting the necessary NPPF criteria.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
96	Mr Kenneth Walter Dorling	Not specified		19	<p>I wholeheartedly AGREE with the decision of the 'Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council' in proposing that the 'Land Opposite the Green, Plaistow' (at the junction of The Street and Common House Road) is the only sustainable settlement in this Parish for the building of up to 11 units. Our Parish Council, have thoroughly looked into and researched the 'potential areas in teh Parish' that have a sufficient area to build, either all, or some of the 10 or 11 dwellings which the Chichester District Local Plan indicated we shall be required to build. They have listened and taken into account the views of the residents of the parish, to enable them to prepare the Neighbourhood Plan to protect our 'sense of community, the 'safety and rural tranquility' that we all value. The Object being, to blend in sympathetically, the 'new expansion' of the parish, as well as protecting our environment and quality of life for all members of the parish for generations to come. The Parish Council recognises that it is essential to build 'affordable housing' particularly to enable young families to remain and work in the area. But also to provide 'smaller dwelling' for the elderly - to both enable them to remain in the area where they have brought up their families and have a circle of family, friends and neighbours that can assist with transport, shopping, appointments etc. to avoid having to go into long term care; BUT also to free up larger properties that can 'in turn' accommodate growing families. Several other sites were originally considered but subsequently discounted by the Parish Council for various reasons; One of these sites was at Little Springfield Farm, Plaistow Road, Ifold, which was found to be unsustainably located in relation to its access to other facilities. Ifold has only the Village Hall - the Village shop having closed for redevelopment a couple of years ago, and has not reopened as yet, and may not do so. The proposed site in Plaistow Village, being more sustainable, due to the village facilities; A Church, a Primary School, a Village Shop with post office facilities, a Pub, a Village recreation Green with childrens' playground and a Pavilion, the Village Hall and Youth Club, and a Football club. There is also a bus stop positioned opposite the shop. Most of these facilities are well used by all of the surrounding villages, not just the residents of Plaistow, by residents ranging from 2 years to 92 years. I consider that we're terrifically lucky living in this area with all of the footpaths and bridleways. You can walk for hours in our woods and across the fields. From Ifold, if you're just reasonably fit, at whatever age, you can walk across the fields and along by the canal to reach the Doctors' Surgery at Loxwood, which many residents to, there's also a Post Office in Loxwood. This negates the need to always use a car which is more environmentally friendly, as well as a more healthy option. Ifold is defined by a Settlement Boundary, which we wish to retain, yet nevertheless, Ifold has absorbed the majority of the housing requirement over the past 15 years. I consider that with the problems endured in Ifold in regard to surface water flooding together with effluent discharge from sewage access chambers during periods of prolonged and high levels of rainfall, which are exacerbated by additional 'in filling'; that it will become difficult to keep our 'sense of community' as well as ensuring our 'safety' on our footpaths and bridleways with such limited facilities in this particular settlement. Ifold is not suitable to have tarmac pathways around the internal roads of the settlement as they are too narrow in many places, with very little view of oncoming traffic. But a proper tarmac pathway along one side of the Loxwood/Plaistow Road running alongside Ifold would make this considerably safer for pedestrians. A large part of the pleasure of living in this area is the peace and quiet whilst walking around particularly once it's dark enabling residents to both see and hear the nocturnal wildlife. This feeling would be completely destroyed if Ifold had 'street lighting' as well as contributing to more light pollution.</p>	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)	
97	Mrs Cabrina Dorling	Not specified			<p>I wholeheartedly AGREE with the decision of the 'Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council' in proposing that the 'Land Opposite the Green, Plaistow (at the junction of The Street and Common House Road) is the only sustainable settlement in this Parish for the building of up to 11 units. Our Parish Council, have thoroughly looked into and researched the 'potential areas in the Parish' that have a sufficient area to build, either all, or some of the 10 or 11 dwellings which the Chichester District Local Plan indicated we shall be required to build. They have listened and taken into account the views of the residents of the parish, to enable them to prepare the Neighbourhood Plan to protect our 'sense of community, the 'safety and rural tranquility' that we all value. The Object being, to blend in sympathetically, the 'new expansion' of the parish, as well as protecting our environment and quality of life for all members of the parish for generations to come. The Parish Council recognises that it is essential to build 'affordable housing' particularly to enable young families to remain and work in the area. But also to provide 'smaller dwelling' for the elderly - to both enable them to remain in the area where they have brought up their families and have a circle of family, friends and neighbours that can assist with transport, shopping, appointments etc. to avoid having to go into long term care; BUT also to free up larger properties that can 'in turn' accommodate growing families. Several other sites were originally considered but subsequently discounted by the Parish Council for various reasons; One of these sites was at Little Springfield Farm, Plaistow Road, Ifold, which was found to be unsustainably located in relation to its access to other facilities. Ifold has only the Village Hall - the Village shop having closed for redevelopment a couple of years ago, and has not reopened as yet, and may not do so. The proposed site in Plaistow Village, being more sustainable, due to the village facilities; A Church, a Primary School, a Village Shop with post office facilities, a Pub, a Village recreation Green with childrens' playground and a Pavilion, the Village Hall and Youth Club, and a Football club. There is also a bus stop positioned opposite the shop. Most of these facilities are well used by all of the surrounding villages, not just the residents of Plaistow, by residents ranging from 2 years to 92 years. I consider that we're terrifically lucky living in this area with all of the footpaths and bridleways. You can walk for hours in our woods and across the fields. From Ifold, if you're just reasonably fit, at whatever age, you can walk across the fields and along by the canal to reach the Doctors' Surgery at Loxwood, which many residents to, there's also a Post Office in Loxwood. This negates the need to always use a car which is more environmentally friendly, as well as a more healthy option. Ifold is defined by a Settlement Boundary, which we wish to retain, yet nevertheless, Ifold has absorbed the majority of the housing requirement over the past 15 years. I consider that with the problems endured in Ifold in regard to surface water flooding together with effluent discharge from sewage access chambers during periods of prolonged and high levels of rainfall, which are exacerbated by additional 'in filling'; that it will become difficult to keep our 'sense of community' as well as ensuring our 'safety' on our footpaths and bridleways with such limited facilities in this particular settlement. Ifold is not suitable to have tarmac pathways around the internal roads of the settlement as they are too narrow in many places, with very little view of oncoming traffic. But a proper tarmac pathway along one side of the Loxwood/Plaistow Road running alongside Ifold would make this considerably safer for pedestrians.</p> <p>A large part of the pleasure of living in this area is the peace and quiet whilst walking around particularly once it's dark enabling residents to both see and hear the nocturnal wildlife. This feeling would be completely destroyed if Ifold had 'street lighting' as well as contributing to more light pollution.</p>		No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
98	Mr A. Pierce	1.5			<p>It should be clearly stated that the Parish Council disagreed with the CDC Site Allocations DPD site proposed (reference their submission) for Plaistow & Ifold Parish: Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm; and has made representations against the soundness of that allocation at the DPD examination. Add a Conformity References: * Planning Inspectorate 2016 decision on the Brownfield at Little Springfield Farm - a planning application refused on appeal because Ifold is not deemed to be sustainable. & Minutes 02 August 2016 Steering Group discussion with AECOM consultant; * Site Options and Assessment (2016 AECOM). Justification: This is due to Ifold not conforming to NPPF sustainability criteria and is deemed to be unsustainable for housing as per the conformity references noted.</p>	<p>Amend. To reflect up-to-date situation.</p>	<p>The CDC Site Allocations Preferred Approach Development Plan Document (SA DPD) is intended to deliver the housing numbers and employment as set out in the adopted CLPKP.</p> <p>The SA DPD identifies that Plaistow & Ifold Parish should deliver an indicative housing number of 10 units to meet the identified housing requirement on a site: Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm which is contrary to the site allocated in this Neighbourhood Plan. The SA DPD was the subject of a public examination in September 2017.</p> <p>The planning consultancy, AECOM (appointed by Locality, a partner organization of the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government - MHCLG) conducted a Site Options and Assessment (August 2016) of the proposed housing sites to be considered for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan. Their study concluded that the CDC SA DPD site had a high probability of being considered less sustainable in terms of national planning policy at Examination, than the alternative sites in Plaistow, given there are very few services and facilities in the Ifold settlement. As a result, the findings of the Site Options and Assessment were brought to the attention of CDC by the Parish Council in September 2016, with a view to CDC revising their allocated site for development. The Parish Council made representations against the soundness of the CDC SA DPD site allocation for this Parish in the September 2017 public examination. The Parish Council considers that Policy H1 in this Neighbourhood Plan, allocates a site that best meets sustainability criteria in this Parish.</p>

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
99	Mr A. Pierce	1.7			CHANGE from 'Residents' preference and evidence suggests, that the Ifold Settlement Boundary be retained and not extended'. CHANGE To: 'Residents' preference and evidence suggests, that the Ifold Settlement Boundary be retained in its present form and not be extended.' Justification: Because the question in the parish-wide Neighbourhood Plan Household Survey and Housing Needs Assessment was very clear and the response from residents more so.	Amend. As per a parish-wide Neighbourhood Plan Household Survey and Housing Needs Assessment.	CHANGE FROM: Residents' preference and evidence suggests, that the Ifold Settlement Boundary be retained and not extended. CHANGE TO: Residents' preference and evidence suggests, that the Ifold Settlement Boundary be retained in its present form and not extended.
100	Mr A. Pierce	Section 1			SECTION 1 - Add hyperlink and a References section (like Conformity References) at the end of the section: Neighborhood Plan Household Survey and Housing Needs Assessment (2016). Justification: Because a survey is referenced in the paragraph 1.7 but doesn't clearly state what survey nor provide a hyperlink to it.	Amend. Hyperlink to the referenced document is missing from online version of The Plan.	Insert hyperlink.
101	Mr A. Pierce	2.1			Insert hyperlink to CLPKP. Justification: Hyperlink missing.	Amend. Hyperlink to the referenced document CLPKP is missing from online version of The Plan.	Insert hyperlink.
102	Mr A. Pierce	2.1			CHANGE from : Retain the Settlement Boundary for Ifold; CHANGE to: retain the existing Settlement Boundary for Ifold; Justification: Because that is correct, as per the Neighbourhood Plan Household Survey and Housing Needs Assessment. Residents stated do not change the existing Settlement Boundary.	Amend. Correct, as per the Neighbourhood Plan Household Survey and Housing Needs Assessment	CHANGE from: Retain the Settlement Boundary for Ifold; CHANGE to: retain the existing Settlement Boundary for Ifold;
103	Mr A. Pierce	4.3	EH1		CHANGE from: The Parish has more than 40 Grade II Listed buildings. CHANGE to: The Parish has more than ?? Grade II Listed buildings. Justification: Correct this number as per the appendix of Listed Buildings.	Amend. Change number to conform with Appendix (Listed Buildings).	Change to: The Parish has more than 80 Grade II Listed buildings.
104	Mr A. Pierce	4.22	EH4		Include hyperlinks and include the maps of Local Green Spaces per each settlement. Justification: The maps are missing from the document.	Amend. Hyperlinks to referenced maps are missing from the online version of The Plan.	Change to include the 3 LGS Maps within the Section Local Green Spaces.
105	Mr A. Pierce	4.35	EH5		Include link to the SDNPA Dark Skies Status accreditation. Justification: Missing from the Conformity References.	Amend. Hyperlink to the referenced report is missing from online version of The Plan.	Insert hyperlink.
106	Mr A. Pierce	4.35	EH5		Include hyperlink to the SDNPA Scoping Report. Justification: Missing from the paragraph.	Amend. Hyperlink to the referenced report is missing from online version of The Plan.	Insert hyperlink.
107	Mr A. Pierce	4.39	EH5		Include hyperlink to the SDNPA Scoping Report. Justification: Missing from the Conformity References	Amend. Hyperlink to the referenced report is missing from online version of The Plan.	Insert hyperlink.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
108	Mr A. Pierce	6.2			Include hyperlink to the Site Options and Assessment by AECOM (15 Aug 2016). Justification: Missing from the paragraph.	Amend. Hyperlink to the referenced report is missing from online version of The Plan.	Insert hyperlink.
109	Mr A. Pierce	6.2			Include hyperlink to the CDC Housing Needs report. Justification: Missing from the paragraph.	Amend. Hyperlink to the referenced report is missing from online version of The Plan.	Insert hyperlink.
110	Mr A. Pierce	6.3		19	CHANGE from 'Land Adjacent to the Dairy' CHANGE to: 'Land Adjacent to The Dairy' Justification: Capital missing.	Amend. Typographical error.	CHANGE FROM: 'Land Adjacent to the Dairy' CHANGE TO: 'Land Adjacent to The Dairy'
111	Mr A. Pierce	6.3		19	This paragraph needs revision to note the description given on the NP website which explained that the steering group ascertained that the National Trust own land that could be traversed for a secondary access point next to Mission Hall on Rickmans Lane. That delay in the landowner of the site negotiating with the National Trust for cross-over, delayed delivering on the site within the plan period. The secondary access was not discounted for any other reason. The site is still viable for future housing consideration. "The Landowners of The Dairy site advised that there is a potential alternative access further South, although the land over which they have private access rights (for field maintenance) is not in their ownership and is also a Public Right of Way (Path Number: 633; Type: Restricted Byway). The possible secondary access point is located between two properties (Mission Hall and Chumleigh - formerly known as Kimbers) on Rickmans Lane. Therefore the Parish Council agreed that it was for the landowner to demonstrate viability of the site in relation to access and they would be given the opportunity to provide this information by the end of January 2017. This was extended as a courtesy into February. It has since been confirmed that the land needed for access into The Dairy site is owned by the National Trust. This therefore becomes an issue of whether development of the site is achievable as The Dairy site landowners must obtain agreement from and then negotiate with the National Trust for access over that land and in a timely manner to permit the Parish to deliver on its housing allocation according to Chichester District Council's Local Plan, their Site Allocations DPD and to meet their five-year housing supply. Consequently, there are doubts over the deliverability and achievability of The Dairy site. Therefore with reference to the Parish Council's	Amend. As per evidence on the Neighbourhood Plan website https://plaistowandifordparishnp.com/site-land-adjacent-to-the-dairy/	CHANGE FROM: It was recognised that parking and traffic issues in the adjacent Nell Ball housing area would be exacerbated by additional housing. CHANGE TO: It was also recognised that parking and traffic issues in the adjacent Nell Ball housing area would be exacerbated by additional housing. Move this sentence up to join with previous paragraph. CHANGE FROM: ...setting of the Conservation Area. CHANGE TO: insert below that sentence: The landowners of the Dairy site advised of a potential alternative access, although the land over which they have private access rights is not in their ownership and is also a Public Right of Way. The Parish Council agreed that it was for the landowner to demonstrate viability of the site in relation to the secondary access. It has since been confirmed that the land is owned by the National Trust and the landowners must obtain agreement from and negotiate with them. Consequently, with reference to the Parish Council's decision, NPPF paragraphs 021 and 022 and Planning Practice Guidance, there were doubts over the deliverability and achievability of The Dairy site in this plan period and the site was discounted.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
					decision, NPPF paragraphs 021 and 022 and Planning Practice Guidance, the achievability of this site could not be considered deliverable over the plan period and the site was discounted. Justification: As per evidence on the Neighbourhood Plan website https://plaistowandifoldparishnp.com/site-land-adjacent-to-the-dairy/		
112	Mr A. Pierce	6.5	H1	20	Add an objective and insertion into the policy to allow for additional car parking that could be used by parents picking up/ dropping off children at the primary school to lessen the traffic bottle necks at the narrow road junction.	No change. The site as identified is not physically large enough, it would burden development with further planning obligation which may impact on delivery of affordable housing. Parents are unlikely to park that distance from the school.	No change required.
113	Mr A. Pierce	6.8	H1	20	I support the selection of Land Opposite The Green Plaistow because it meets the requirements of sustainability as per the NPPF and as Plaistow village has the most services and facilities it is the logical site out of all the sites that were identified and assessed. Future residents who live at that location will be able to easily walk to the services and facilities in the village and lessen the need for driving. The site cannot be seen from the centre of the village and is screened all around by hedging. There is a listed building nearby but sufficiently distanced by the two-lane highway and its own high hedging to lessen the impact on that property. The site is not in the Plaistow Conservation Area and this needs to be clearly stated at all times as some people dissenting against that site being developed have incorrectly stated that the site is in the conservation area. It should be noted that any scheme allow for access to the adjacent green fields alongside the site.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
114	Mr A. Pierce	6.10	H2	21	CHANGE Objective From: to retain the Settlement Boundary for Ifold; CHANGE to: to retain the existing Settlement Boundary for Ifold; Justification: Consistency, if amended in previous paragraphs. Because the question in the parish-wide Neighbourhood Plan Household Survey and Housing Needs Assessment was very clear and the response from residents more so.	Amend. For consistent approach.	CHANGE FROM: to retain the Settlement Boundary for Ifold; CHANGE TO: to retain the existing Settlement Boundary for Ifold;

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
115	Mr A. Pierce	6.14	H2	22	This policy isn't clear enough that permitted development rights (for extensions and going up a storey) are to be retained. Also that redevelopment of a site that has an old bungalow by adding an extension or going up a storey WILL change the site coverage in respect of built form, massing, building line to adjacent houses. This policy also needs a Waverley Borough Council type policy inserted of not expanding the footprint of the house beyond x% of the original. Knocking down a 2000sqft bungalow and replacing with a 20000 sqft mansion is not acceptable nor considered like-for-like.	Amend. The Parish Council has no mandate in which to impose % restrictions on development size, however note the amendment to Policy H2. This could be considered in a future review of The Plan.	Policy H2 has been amended to note 'the quantum of development and site coverage will not be an over-development of the site in relation to the existing characteristics of neighbouring sites in respect of built form, massing and building line;'
116	Mr A. Pierce	6.14	H2	22	There is no mention that as Ifold Estates Limited own most of the roads, verges and ditches in Ifold, and request that residents refrain from parking on all verges 'and' roads. Therefore, there needs to be inclusion in this policy to ensure that sufficient land in any new or redevelopments, be set aside to allow not only for off-road car parking for residents but their visitors' cars.	Amend. Correct position for accuracy and justification of policy	Amend. Policy H2 justification.
117	Mr A. Pierce	6.14	H2 last bullet point		CHANGE from: Plaistow & Ifold Village Design Statements. CHANGE to: Plaistow & Ifold Village Design Statement. Justification: It is a singular document with sections for each settlement.	Amend. Correct position for accuracy and justification of policy	CHANGE FROM: Plaistow & Ifold Village Design Statements. CHANGE TO: Plaistow & Ifold Village Design Statement.
118	Mr A. Pierce	6.21 [6.2 & 6.8]	[H1]	19-20	Insert link to the CDC Housing Register for Plaistow & Ifold Parish. Conformity Reference.	Amend. Conformity Reference: Insert CDC Housing Register	Conformity Reference: Insert CDC Housing Register
119	Mr A. Pierce	7.3	EE1		Plaistow village and settlement of Ifold are classified as a combined 'Service village'. The Local Plan review has seen representations against this service village 'convenience' for District Council planners. Ifold is approximately 1.7km walking distance from Plaistow village, which has all the services and facilities in the Parish. This is not 'reasonable access' as the road is 40mph then 60mph with no pavements. It is too dangerous to walk. This policy needs amending to insert this information and note that the Parish Council also made representations on this 'service village' point in the CDC Site Allocations DPD.	Amend.	Policy EE1. Use CDC wording for Srvce Village definition.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
120	Karen King-Wilson (parish resident, landowner and business owner)	1.2 and 2.1			<p>I agree with the sentence at 1.2 "There is a desire to meet local housing needs and the sustainable concept of utilising brownfield sites as a matter of priority".</p> <p>I disagree with the statement at 2.1 "retain the settlement boundary for Ifold". Its existence has resulted in extensive overdevelopment in a concentrated area and the creation of an eclectic mix of homes on ever-decreasing plot sizes that in many cases do not sit well with neighbouring properties, nor in their semi-rural setting. The district council's Policy No. 2 in their Adopted Local Plan 2014-2029 states that there is a presumption in favour of development within settlement boundaries so that means that, in its present form, the Ifold settlement boundary encourages even more overdevelopment in an area that is now the subject of regular flooding. If the Ifold settlement boundary remains as is, the area will continue to be filled in, thereby eroding the rural character of the village, contrary to Policy 3.1.2 of the Adopted Local Plan. In my opinion, the Ifold settlement boundary should either be removed altogether (thereby removing the 'presumption in favour of development' so that future applications can be decided on their own merits), OR it should be extended, as I suggest in my comments on 6.1 and 6.9 below, OR settlement boundaries should also be created around Plaistow, Durfold Wood and Shillinglee in order that future development in the Parish is spread more evenly throughout the villages that all share the same services, rather than encouraging yet more development in an already overdeveloped area.</p>	<p>No change. Comment noted.</p> <p>The Ifold Settlement Boundary has been designated by the CLPKP and cannot be removed by the NP.</p> <p>Policies H2 and H4 are written to ensure that over-development and loss of settlement character does not occur.</p> <p>With regard to flooding: refer also to the AIMS Ci1, Ci2, Ci3 – drainage, etc....</p>	No change required.
121	Karen King-Wilson (parish resident, landowner and business owner)	2.3			I support the principle of the Vision to consider an appropriate re-use for an identified Brownfield Site in order to ensure appropriate and sustainable development. Further comments below.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
122	Karen King-Wilson (parish resident, landowner and business owner)	2.6			I would suggest adding - To retain Foxbridge Golf Course, club house, bar and restaurant in order to protect a valuable resource for the local economy and employment.	No change. Refer to response to Comment ID: 168.	No change required.
123	Karen King-Wilson (parish resident, landowner and business owner)	4.1 - 4.37		9 -14	I fully support polices EH1 to EH6	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
124	Karen King-Wilson (parish resident, landowner and business owner)	5.5		16	Policy CL1 - I agree with this policy, to reduce the risk of flooding, especially within Ifold, since further windfall development is inevitable. I would suggest a new pumping station should be built within the village since the pumping station at Loxwood, into which all foul waste water from Plaistow and Ifold flows, has, I understand, reached capacity.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
125	Karen King-Wilson (parish resident, landowner and business owner)	6.1 and 6.9			If a Settlement Boundary is to remain around Ifold, then in my opinion extending it to include Tawbrook and Little Springfield Farm would appear to be a sensible option. Magic maps, a partnership between key central government departments - DEFRA, the Environment Agency, the Forestry Commission, Marine Management Organisation, as well as Natural England and English Heritage, produces the maps that are used to identify the environment, including settlements, and both Tawbrook and Little Springfield Farm are included in the 'built up area' designation. It is within the Neighbourhood Plan's remit to alter a settlement boundary to facilitate development that would allow a settlement to grow naturally. (Chichester Local Plan Key Policies 2014-2029 - 5 Development and Settlement Hierarchy, Policy 2 - Settlement Boundaries - Methodology 'There is a presumption in favour of sustainable development within Settlement Boundaries which will be reviewed throughout the preparation of Development Plan Documents and/or Neighbourhood Plans)	No change. Retention of the existing Ifold Settlement Boundary with no extension has been determined through public consultation.	No change required.
126	Karen King-Wilson (parish resident, landowner and business owner)	6.7			Policy H1 - Land opposite the Green, Plaistow - I suggest that Land at Little Springfield Farm should be added as a reserve site to this policy, in the event that the Plaistow site does not pass Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Plan, since it could accommodate the 10 dwellings required by the District Council. (The DPD outcome may supersede this).	No change. The site: Land at Little Springfield Farm is not large enough to accommodate the total indicative housing allocation. The density of 11 units would be impactful on the countryside location and proximity to Ancient Woodland. It not suitable for affordable housing as it includes a private drive and requires an on-site foul drainage system. Regarding the CDC SA DPD: refer to response to Comment ID: 98.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
127	Karen King-Wilson (parish resident, landowner and business owner)	7.17		28	Policy EE4 - Brownfield Site - I am in support of the principle of this policy, i.e. that the brownfield site should be redeveloped. However, as mentioned above, I suggest that the allocation of 10 houses required for the Parish would be better placed on the redundant Brownfield site at Little Springfield Farm since the Inspector at the Planning Appeal decision (Ref APP/L3815/W/15/3129444) stated that 'there is a good degree of community support for the redevelopment of the site, and the provision of housing in the immediate area.... and the community support may well also assist in the preparation of the allocations plan for this area and the identification of an appropriate site to accommodate housing through the plan making process'. I interpret this as an intention to let the plan making process, i.e. the Neighbourhood Plan, allocate the brownfield site for the housing need in the Parish (Paras 21 and 23 of Hearing Decision).	No change. Refer to response to Comment ID: 26.	No change required.
128	Karen King-Wilson (parish resident, landowner and business owner)	7.19		28	Policy EE4 - Brownfield Site - Regarding the above Appeal, the Council and the Appeal Inspector both accepted that there would not appear to be a viable redevelopment for commercial business use after viability studies had been carried out on a number of redevelopment scenarios for industrial, office and mixed use, with the conclusion that residential appeared to be the only redevelopment option for the Brownfield site. The Appeal failed on the specific proposal of three large houses, not for houses in general. The Inspector suggested the community support could assist in meeting the housing needed, i.e. 10 houses.	Amend. Refer to response to Comment ID: 172.	Refer to response to Comment ID: 172.
129	Karen King-Wilson (parish resident, landowner and business owner)	7.2	EE4	28	Policy EE4 - Brownfield Site - I support encouraging the use of Live/work units at Little Springfield Farm if this proves to be viable. There does not appear to be guidelines in development terms for live/work units but more and more people are working from home, which supports the rural economy, reduces the need for travel, whilst encouraging sustainable development.	No change. See Policy EE1 -Live/work facilities	No changed required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
130	Karen King-Wilson (parish resident, landowner and business owner)	8.1 & 8.14	T1	29 31	Policy T1 - Ensuring Highway Safety - I agree with these objectives, particularly with regard to speed limits - Ifold should have a 30mph speed limit the length of Plaistow Road between the village signs and a pavement should be constructed along Plaistow Road in Ifold to give pedestrians safe access to the bus stops, shop and post boxes. To improve links to public transport, I suggest an additional AIM that reads: The Parish Council will promote and encourage the use of the WSCC subsidised transport service, Billilink, that links the four settlements in the Neighbourhood Plan area to shops, services and rail connections from Billingshurst to Gatwick, London, Portsmouth, etc. and beyond, by providing a pre-booked, fully scheduled, shared taxi service for £2 a trip 7 days a week.	No change, supports 'The Plan'. Billilinks – refer to the response to Comment ID: 84.	No changed required.
131	Richard & Sal Grier	Not specified			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We do support the Neighbourhood Plan. 2. We agree with the proposed housing development site: Land opposite The Green, Common House Road, Plaistow. 3. We are happy to be guided by the Parish Council on whether or not the Ifold Settlement Boundary should be extended. 4. We do query why Plaistow has no Settlement Boundary when it has so many facilities and services. 5. We do query why Ifold has 'no services or facilities' to make it sustainable, given its growth in recent years. 6. We absolutely support the demand for better and more sympathetic town planning for this Parish from the District Council in Chichester. 	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No changed required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
132	Malcolm Frost	Not specified			In general I do not support the Plaistow & Ifold Neighbourhood Plan as it does not adequately emphasise the need to improve Parish infrastructure and thereby sustain housing development of any magnitude. That inadequacy particularly applies to Ifold for the following reasons: a) Inadequate foul water (sewage) drainage systems, which have resulted in flooding and discharge of effluent on numerous occasions. Foul water from Plaistow and Durfold Wood discharges into Ifold's piped network, and thereby increases Ifold's vulnerability of effluent discharge from development in those outlying Parish areas. That coupled with surface water infiltration which occurs during periods of high or prolonged rainfall, is predominately as a failure of outlying infrastructure exacerbated by the elevated topography. b) Total lack of assessment, or insistence thereof, in respect of existing surface water drainage capacity to sustain further housing development. c) Inadequate private access road network that was not constructed to sustain high levels of vehicle traffic, which has resulted from housing development over the past 10 or more years. Increased road usage leads to ever increasing maintenance costs that are directly borne by road charge paying residents in Ifold. d) Total inadequate BT Broadband provision for current and future Parish residents.	A) Refer to Policy Ci1 – reducing and Avoiding Flood Risk. B) Assessment of surface water drainage capacity is a matter for the Planning Application process. C) It is noted that apart from the adopted Highway - Plaistow Road; Ifold consists of a private, unadopted, road network that is maintained by residents who pay an annual road charge. Recommend amendment to Policy H2. D) Refer to Policy Ci2 – Connection to Broadband.	a); b); d) - No change required. c) Amend Policy H2 justification to note The principle road network within the Ifold settlement are bridleways, unadopted and privately maintained by Ifold Estates Limited, who require that residents do not park on roads or verges.
133	Malcolm Frost	Not specified			Ifold has borne the brunt of housing development in the Parish and is far beyond its capacity. Consequently any further enforced development should be undertaken in outlying Parish area, although only when previously highlighted infrastructure inadequacies have been addressed.	No change. As a result of the significant levels of development that has occurred within the Ifold Settlement Boundary in the past 15 years (in excess of 103 houses), there were no plots of a sufficient size to take the indicative housing number.	No change required.
134	Malcolm Frost	Not specified			Ifold does not meet, in any way, the sustainability criteria set by Government.	No change. Correct. This has been noted in the Site Options and Assessment (AECOM Aug 2016) and the Strategic Environmental Assessment (Aug 2017).	No change required.
135	Malcolm Frost	Not specified			Failure of CDC Planning Department to properly assess sustainability and/or suitability of housing planning submissions. CDC seem to pay little or no credence to planning concerns submitted by residents of the Parish and particularly where infrastructure is concerned.	No change. The comment does not relate to The Plan.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
136	Ceri Evans	4.1 ???			I strongly support the removal of the site CDC have chosen due to the lack of amenities and services the site provides for any development, as well as the destruction of a greenfield site and the inevitable destruction of natural hedgerows and trees that would take place in order to provide access to such a site.	No change. Your comments regarding the CDC SA DPD site are noted. Refer to the responses to Comment IDs: 77 and 98.	No change required.
137	Ceri Evans	1.7		4	Of the 5 sites the Parish Council proposed, the site CDC is proposing was considered the least suitable by the residents of the Parish.	No change. Correct, the CDC SA DPD site was considered the least preferred in a parish-wide survey (2016)	No change required.
138	Ceri Evans	2.1		5	I strongly support retaining the settlement boundary for Ifold and object to using Greenfield sites that are outside the settlement boundary, particularly when there are Brownfield sites that could be developed (and indeed for which planning has been applied) for housing, but is being refused by CDC.	No change. The Plan as written states there is no change to the existing Ifold Settlement Boundary. Regarding brownfield sites, refer to the response to Comment ID: 298.	No change required.
139	Ceri Evans	2.4		6	I am highly concerned about the extra sewerage burden any development at the CDC's proposed site will put on an already overloaded system currently in place in Ifold.	No change. Foul water drainage has been noted on all site assessments and within the Housing section and policies in The Plan.	No change required.
140	Ceri Evans	2.5		6	I strongly support the Parish Council's site proposal based on the fact that, for the residents the housing is being built for (elderly/affordable housing), the Plaistow site provides easy access to the shop, café, schooling and play area. The CDC;s site has none of these and will simply increase traffic movements on a busy road in order to get to any of the above mentioned amenities.	No change, supports 'The Plan'. Your comments regarding the CDC SA DPD site are noted.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
141	Dr Richard Ely	Not specified			<p>I support the Neighbourhood Plan as currently drafted, as it is my understanding that it is necessary to accommodate at least ten new houses by the Chichester District Council Local plan. I do, however, feel that ANY development in Ifold should be restricted, as the village has been considerably enlarged over the last few decades by building on gardens as so-called 'brownfield sites'. Adjoining properties have been purchased, bulldozed, and a greater number of larger houses built in their stead, placing greater strain on the services and infrastructure available in Ifold. Effective sewage and surface water disposal have been stretched to the limit by the building of multiple-occupancy houses on small plots, our 'roads' (which are paid for and maintained by residents, with NO support from the Council) are mostly single-carriageway, and therefore very congested as increasing numbers of cars and delivery vehicles travel in and out of, and around, the village. Note also that the 'roads' are actually designated footpaths and bridleways. Plaistow has a range of services and amenities available. Church, schools, shop, post office, pub, large village green, with children's play area, council-maintained roads for easy access. Ifold has none of these, and I question why Plaistow has no Settlement Boundary when its services and facilities make it a far more suitable candidate for development. I therefore support the proposed site in the Plan for the imposed allocation of 10 houses at the junction of The Street and Common House Road, Plaistow.</p>	<p>No change, supports 'The Plan'.</p> <p>Your comments about the over-development within the Ifold Settlement Boundary have been noted.</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
142	Stephanie Ely	Not specified			I support the Neighbourhood Plan as currently drafted, as it is my understanding that it is necessary to accommodate at least ten new houses by the Chichester District Council Local plan. I do, however, feel that ANY development in Ifold should be restricted, as the village has been considerably enlarged over the last few decades by building on gardens as so-called 'brownfield sites'. Adjoining properties have been purchased, bulldozed, and a greater number of larger houses built in their stead, placing greater strain on the services and infrastructure available in Ifold. Effective sewage and surface water disposal have been stretched to the limit by the building of multiple-occupancy houses on small plots, our 'roads' (which are paid for and maintained by residents, with NO support from the Council) are mostly single-carriageway, and therefore very congested as increasing numbers of cars and delivery vehicles travel in and out of, and around, the village. Note also that the 'roads' are actually designated footpaths and bridleways. Building of houses in Ifold should therefore be restricted to the minimum number as legally required, and NO more. Plaistow has a range of services and amenities available. Church, schools, shop, post office, pub, large village green, with children's play area, council-maintained roads for easy access. Ifold has none of these, and I question why Plaistow has no Settlement Boundary when its services and facilities make it a far more suitable candidate for development.	No change, supports 'The Plan'. Your comments about the over-development within the Ifold Settlement Boundary have been noted.	No change required.
143	Richard Smith	5.4	CL1 [Ci1]	15	There are 3 places where surface water drainage does not 'work reasonably well' in Shillinglee. Two are on Shillinglee Road between Tower Farmhouse and Pound Cottages and the third is by the Home Farmhouse. I believe these are caused by blocked and broken culverts that were originally provided when Shillinglee Park was a private entity. No modern maintenance is carried out on them by WSCC Highways. Could this be recorded in the NP please?	No change. The comment relates to a matter not relevant to the Neighbourhood Plan.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
144	Simon & Kirsten Barrow	Not specified			<p>I would like to register our total opposition to the plan which recommends a site for 11 plus houses in what is colloquially known as XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX [redacted] [Land opposite The Green] as we believe that this will tear the heart out of the village and will totally alter its character. We do not accept that Plaistow rather than Ifold is the only location for such a development and, if a site in Plaistow must be chosen, then it is recommended that this was on the opposite side of The Street and in the field behind The Mission house.</p> <p>Access could be achieved by acquiring and knocking down the cottage which is in the same ownership as that particular field, and may be the nearby oak tree, if necessary and, while such a site would obviously not appeal to the various adjacent houses, it would hardly be noticeable within the village as a whole and should meet all the criteria for sustainability.</p> <p>However, we much prefer the partial brownfield site in Ifold which has been recommended by the Chichester District Council. It should be a cardinal rule that no development should take place on any greenfield site when there are any brownfield sites available within the parish boundaries which argues strongly against any other site within those boundaries and particularly in Plaistow.</p> <p>There is also the question of why any such development should be on a single site, except in relation to the question of affordable housing, which should never be a determining factor.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>A site (P8 – Land Adjacent to The Dairy) was assessed behind Mission Hall Plaistow but discounted due to issues identified from an Arboricultural Impact Assessment impacting the proposed primary access point and also ownership and rights of way over a proposed secondary access point caused doubts to the deliverability and achievability of the site. This information is publicly available in the Parish Council meeting minutes of that decision and on the NP website.</p> <p>The cottage (The Dairy) is noted as a building of historical merit in the Plaistow Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposals (May 2013).</p> <p>Brownfield: There is no brownfield site in the parish which conforms to the requirements of the NPPF.</p> <p>A brownfield site available at Little Springfield Farm, Ifold, does not meet the above criteria on grounds of sustainability all as identified in the Site Options and Assessment Report (AECOM Aug 2016) and a recent dismissed Planning Appeal for housing at that site.</p> <p>Allocation proposed for a single site: The Plan must also meet the identified Parish housing need and that includes an element of affordable housing. Sites of 10 houses or fewer are not required to deliver affordable housing according to CDC, therefore the plan as drafted will deliver 11 houses on one site to ensure this need is met.</p>	No change required.
145	Mr & Mrs P Falconer		H2	22	We support this policy which seeks to preserve the character and amenities of properties in Ifold.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
146	Mr & Mrs P Falconer	6.18		23	We support the justification for Policy H3. Villages need to bring in new people, provide a range of dwellings for all ages, to allow residents to downsize and stay here, in order to survive and thrive. There are very few smaller houses in the Neighbourhood Plan area to allow for downsizing.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
147	Mr & Mrs P Falconer		EE1	25-26	Support this policy in relation to live/work facilities. This will become more common and the welcome upgrade to superfast broadband makes this more practical.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
148	Mr & Mrs P Falconer		EE3	27-28	Strongly support the need to retain and support the local shop in Plaistow. Also strongly support whatever attempt can be made to reopen the shop in Ifold and the resistance to change its use to anything other than A1 retail. Fully understand that Local and Neighbourhood Plans can't be expected to support unviable businesses, but there must be irrefutable proof given that this shop is no longer a viable business.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
149	Mr & Mrs P Falconer	8.16		31	Support the objectives for new provision of footpaths and safe cycleways, particularly between Ifold and Plaistow. Also strongly support any measures to improve safety for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians by reducing speed through the Parish through enforcing and lowering traffic speed limits and traffic calming, and to improve the safety of road-side bus stops in particular for the improved safety of children waiting for the school bus and crossing the main roads in the evenings at all stops along the main road.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
150	Campling	7.19	EE4	28	Replacing housing on a Brownfield site is most suitable as whilst this is without the Ifold Settlement Boundary it is brownfield and there is no real evidence to say a hard boundary line exists due to the existing developments to the north along Plaistow Road. All arguments therefore relating to the boundary are not relevant to this site as appear inconsistent.	No change, supports 'The Plan'. Regarding the brownfield site, refer to the responses to Comment IDs: 298 and 63.	No change required.
151	Campling	6.18	H3	23	Ifold is the least diverse settlement within the Parish as clearly defined in this document. Please clarify whether the retention of this exclusive and non-diverse housing stock is intentional for the foreseeable future. I would support development of C3 housing on this site.	No change. Ifold is unsustainable in NPPF terms therefore housing diversity to include affordable within the Ifold Settlement Boundary is not appropriate in that location. There are also no sites large enough to accommodate 11 units within the Settlement Boundary which encompasses private roads which require an annual residents charge not suitable for affordable housing. Refer also to the response to Comment ID: 144.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
152	Campling	7.17	EE4	28	Employment opportunities as they currently stand are no different in Ifold or Plaistow. The potential development of space is not relevant and should be discarded as reasoning. No positive decision can be made when based on taking into consideration the known unknowns.	No change. As noted in Policy EE4 - Brownfield Policy the Parish Council is keen to see this particular site utilised due to the experiences of Crouchland Biogas and its inappropriate traffic movements along the Plaistow Road. The current B2/B8 Use of the site make it incompatible to residential homes across the barrier of Plaistow Road where it adjoins the Ifold settlement.	No change required.
153	Campling	6.8	H1	20	How does building anything on the high point of the land opposite the Green protect the setting. It is indisputable that any development there will be a compromise and therefore by definition not protecting.	No change.	No change required.
154	Campling	4.10	EH2		This clause suggests that the protection of the conservation area is paramount. Building on land with a shared border with the Conservation Area on 3 sides seems to do the opposite of protect. This development will completely nullify the Conservation Area and make its relevance meaningless which is clearly inappropriate.	No change. There has already been development in and adjacent to the Plaistow Conservation Area over recent years with Mission House, Sherwoods and Forge Cottage, which haven't 'nullified' the Conservation Area.	No change required.
155	Dave Jordan	Not specified			My personal preference would be to build on a brownfield site first (Springfield) rather than a green field site (opp green).	No change. The brownfield site at Little Springfield Farm, Ifold, does not meet NPPF sustainability criteria.	No change required.
156	Lawrence Clark	Not specified			I agree with the Plaistow and Ifold Parish Neighbourhood Plan and the proposed housing development land opposite the Green in Plaistow. Plaistow is ideally equipped with family and residents' facilities close by, including shop, café, school, church, pub, village green, community hall, floodlit games area - all within walking distance. Ifold has only a community hall with nursery - not much else, not even a shop! It has also been developed more recently out of proportion with neighbouring areas, which lie outside its Settlement Boundary. Ifold's infrastructure cannot sustain any more development. Excessive traffic, safety of all road users, light pollution, and flood risk are all areas of concern. Plaistow however has no Settlement Boundary and has not suffered the same amount of over-development. The site opposite the Green in Plaistow is an obvious choice and most suitable for the new housing development of 10 houses.	No change, supports 'The Plan'. Your comments about the over-development within the Ifold Settlement Boundary have been noted and the lack of a Settlement Boundary around Plaistow have been noted.	No change required.
157	Sara Burrell	1.6			Paragraph requires updating with current position.	Amend.	Introduction amended to reflect current position.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
158	Sara Burrell	3.2			Typo – fall should be falls	Amend. Fix Typo.	CHANGE FROM: fall CHANGE TO: falls
159	Sara Burrell	4.2	EH1	9	This should be extended to refer to retention and conservation of non-designated local history buildings of positive merit identified in appendix 2 (grade II listed could be said to already have adequate protection). Need to include Wephurst House has been delisted.	Amend. Further clarifies the objectives extends to designated and non-designated.	CHANGE FROM: to protect the area's valuable heritage and historic assets CHANGE TO: to protect the area's valuable heritage and historic assets (designated and non-designated) CHANGE FROM: within the setting of heritage assets will be supported CHANGE TO: within the setting of heritage assets (both designated and non-designated) will be supported Remove Wephurst from the Appendix: Listed Buildings.
160	Sara Burrell	4.10	EH2	10	Should be extended to include – does not conserve valued undesignated landscape and scenic beauty in the Parish. Also refers to ancient woodland twice, possible to say hedgerows and historic shaws. Also has AIA reference but should this not be under EH3 and a broader ecological survey eg. Phase 1 Habitat survey under this policy.	Amend	EH2 amend wording -The rural areas of the Parish' amend to ' <i>The Parish will be protected</i> ' Also add <i>'-does not conserve our valued non-designated landscape'</i> <i>Amend '-results in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats ,such as Ancient wood lands and trees'</i> To'-results in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats ,such hedgerows and historic shaws '
161	Sara Burrell		EH4	12	Needs maps. Ancient woodland to the south of Loxwoodhills Pond should also be included in Green space designation as it is equally deserving of protection as LGSi7.	Amend	Amend plan Add LGS maps
162	Sara Burrell	6.3	H1	20	First sentence needs to be moved to 6.2 above. Add – adheres to the conservation area appraisal May 2013 and good practice guide.	Amend. Refer to the response to Comment ID: 111	Amend Plan
163	Sara Burrell	6.12	H1	20	Need to make clearer that densities at the higher end of 12/h and 13 6/h have led to loss of spacious verdant character and removal of trees and hedges.	Amend Plan wording 6.13	Amend Plan wording to para 6.13 , see 164
164	Sara Burrell	6.13	H1	20	Final sentence needs to make clear that density in excess of the established settlement density will significantly alter....	Amend Plan wording 6.13	Amend Plan wording to para 6.13 add final sentence. ' <i>Recent development over gross density of 12 units per hectare have resulted in loss of the settlement character and adverse impact on trees and vegetation</i> '

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
165	Sara Burrell	6.25	H1	20	Justify minimum car parking provision by reference to our stats on car ownership in the parish.	Amend plan wording	Add stats on car ownership in Parish, 77.9% of residents own 2 or more cars , and 99.63% use a private car as their means of transport. (Aires report Village Design and Housing needs survey sept 2012)
166	Sara Burrell		H4	24	New housing development should demonstrate that it meets the Parish defined housing need, currently identified as 1, 2 and 3 bedroomed properties and properties suitable for the elderly to downsize. Housing need will be subject to review.	Amend Plan wording paragraph 6.1	Amend Plan wording paragraph 6.1 for objectives: <i>'New housing development should demonstrate that it meets the Parish defined housing need, currently identified as 1, 2 and 3 bedroomed properties and properties suitable for the elderly to downsize.'</i>
167	Sara Burrell	7.3		25	Last sentence missing the word 'reasonable access', if this para is quoting the Local Plan doc.	Amend. Use CLPKP wording for service village definition.	CHANGE justification: "Service Villages (local centre for services providing for villages and parishes): Villages that either provide a reasonable range of basic facilities (e.g. primary school, convenience store and post office) to meet the everyday needs of local residents, or villages that provide fewer of these facilities but that have reasonable access to them in nearby settlements."
168	Sara Burrell	Section 7		25	Additional policy or add to EE3 to retain the public house in Plaistow – resist change of use.	No change. The Parish intend to follow up this matter with the next review of The Plan after the upcoming Local Plan review.	No change required. Parish Council have noted this for the next review of The Plan after the next Local Plan review.
169	Sara Burrell	Additional section health wellbeing?			We have no stated aim to facilitate creation of public open space for Ifold – identified as a need in public consultation. We could also have aims to retain community halls, support scout hut, plaistow village green, sports facilities – tennis court, football pitch.	Amend. Ifold settlement has no public open space or playground provision within or adjoining the settlement boundary for residents to use for leisure and social interaction. Through consultation with residents it has been identified as a need. Provision and financing of such space requires the co-operation of landowners, developers and the Local Authority . Accordingly this can only be identified at this time as an AIM.	Amend. Insert additional AIM Ci5 The Parish will work with landowners, developers and the Local Authority toward provision of suitable public open space and childrens playground for the benefit of Ifold residents and future generations.
170	Sara Burrell	Additional section Action Plan			Need an action plan section to determine what needs to be done, who is going to do it and a timeframe.	Amend. Include action plan / table to be added to Plan	Monitoring and Delivering inserted into The Plan
171	Thomas Bushell	6.8	H1		I disagree with the allocated Plaistow site as I feel it is the wrong location and will change the feel of the village close to the heritage assets. I also feel	No change. Please see the responses to Comment IDs: 11 and 231.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
					that the new houses will sit too high in the field and dominate the skyline especially after dark.		
172	Thomas Bushell	7.19	EE4	28	<p>I don't agree that a mix of uses is necessary at this brownfield site as I think it is unlikely that A1 retail use will be successful at this location due to the off-road site. Even the village shop on the main road could not survive and has closed.</p> <p>I support residential development of this brownfield site in order to protect neighbouring people from possible future Industrial use, unrestricted traffic and unrestricted working hours (as is currently possible with the existing use class B2; a use which could intensify with a new owner)</p> <p>I would prefer that this brownfield site is used for the parish housing allocation prior to the development of any greenfield site.</p>	<p>Amend.</p> <p>Brownfield site: see Response to Comment IDs: 11 and 61.</p> <p>Policy EE4 has also been amended according to comments received from statutory consultees. Refer to Statutory Comment ID: 21.</p>	Policy EE4, amended to ensure proposed mixed use subject to viability studies.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
173	Gregory & Carolyn Osborne	6	H1, H3 and H4	20-24	<p>We are fully in support of this proposal. The Plan throughout has shown an sensitivity to the need for retention and where possible the improvement not only of the rural character of the area but of the limited facilities which we have as a community. Plaistow is unquestionably a wonderful example of a broadly unspoilt rural village. Its beauty is something from which all of us in the parish derive pleasure but what worries us is that it increasingly becomes thought of and treated as a gem, beautiful to look at but functionally useless save as an ornament for those fortunate enough to be able to see it.</p> <p>We have lived in the parish 25 years and with a fair wind will live here for another 25. The facilities in Plaistow were and are very important to us because Ifold is little more than a large rural housing estate. It's a great place to live (so long as you're prepared to drive if you want anything at all, but there is very little here other than houses, and by the nature of the growth pattern of the settlement both in the past and in the foreseeable future as in-fill in back plots continues, it will never develop a heart and consequently it's difficult to see how any facilities beyond those that currently exist will ever be available in Ifold.</p> <p>Consequently it seems to us that the parish must focus on ensuring Plaistow continues to thrive. The key to this it seems to us is to permit carefully planned extremely well designed housing in Plaistow which is the heart of the parish providing a wider mix of accommodation and thus increasing the use of the shop, the pub and providing further take up of the range of facilities in our Parish. The key though is the quality of the design of the housing which we note is catered for in the Plan (Policy H5). In this generation we have an opportunity to enhance the architectural merit of Plaistow and in the process benefit everyone in the Parish.</p> <p>As we age it seems likely that we shall need to move within walking distance of a shop, a church, places where we can view live sport and places have a drink. In other words where we can socialise. Plaistow would be our ideal choice but without more development there there's little chance of that.</p>	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
174	Gregory & Carolyn Osborne	7	EE4	28	We fully support this proposal. Development of the site is important purely on amenity grounds and there is a proven need for small business premises. Would it be possible to explore the possibility of combines workshop/home units which might open up the possibility of attracting younger people to the Parish?	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
175	Gregory & Carolyn Osborne	6	H2	21	It seems to us that Ifold is a perfect example of how not to do Town and Country Planning. The Plan describes the housing stock in Ifold as 'eclectic' perhaps eccentric would be a better way to put it - certainly far too many houses show the imprint of the developers' plan book and have no architectural merit at all. So too had Ifold been well planned in a way which retained it's wooded and still surprisingly peaceful character whilst providing a 'hub' on which to centre community assets then limited expansion outwards could make sense. Had there been a network of public footpaths/cycleways across the estate linking with the existing network of footpaths to the open countryside then perhaps the original sense of community which marked the early years of Ifold might have been retained. As it is though, Ifold needs to be contained so that there is a limit to the growth of this 'experiment'.	No change.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
176	BW & JC Smart		H1		<p>We feel the chosen site, opposite the village green, to be used for housing to be flawed in a number of ways.</p> <p>The historic centre of Plaistow would be changed visually, with the green becoming surrounded by housing. The bright open space it is now would be lost forever. How can this possibly be acceptable?</p> <p>The land proposed is clearly the highest point in the centre of Plaistow and no reassurance has been given that it is likely to be levelled to its immediate surroundings. There have been a number of precedents set in recent years where replacement dwellings have had a height restriction placed on them to not exceed adjacent housing.</p> <p>Any housing proposed on The Street side would have an elevation in which the ground floors would be level with the bedrooms of the houses opposite. This would not be acceptable.</p> <p>An agreement to excavate the proposed land would mean an unbearable amount of lorry movements. The number of vehicle journeys required to move the soil would run into many hundreds. This, along with the time and associated noise in excavating, is not acceptable.</p> <p>The reasons given for the site being suitable include being close to amenities. What is the proposed housing to be? Single storey units for our local elderly folk to downsize to would be more appropriate. Larger, family accommodation, drawing people in from far and wide would not be. Any new dwellings have to be used for local people as far as possible.</p> <p>The field is currently a haven for wildlife. Badgers, deer, foxes and many birds, including barn owls, use the field for hunting and as a gateway across The Street. The field is used occasionally for grazing sheep and is cut once a year for hay. It is not sprayed with chemicals and as such is becoming a rarity even in our rural area.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>See response to Comment IDs: 11 and 231.</p> <p>Regarding biodiversity please refer to the response to Comment ID: 77.</p> <p>Construction period will be for a limited period of time and operations can be conditioned as part of the planning consent and this is a matter for the CDC Planning Application process.</p>	No change required.
177	BW & JC Smart	3			We would agree with what is being said here which supports our comments above.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
178	Victoria Bickerton	Plaistow and Ifold			I support it.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
		Parish Plan					
179	Victoria Bickerton	Housing development site			I support it.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
180	Victoria Bickerton	Settlement boundary			Why do we have no settlement boundary in Plaistow	No change. Historically none has been defined by CDC in their Local Plan.	No change required.
181	Victoria Bickerton	Ifold			Why does Ifold not have any services or facilities to make it sustainable	No change. Poor town planning and planning decisions have been made by CDC planning officers.	No change required.
182	Victoria Bickerton	Planning			Why do we not have better planning for this parish from Chichester District Council	No change. This is a matter for CDC Planning Department.	No change required.
183	Naomi Garbett	Not specified			I would like to object to the development of the site on Common House Lane in Plaistow. The addition of 11 houses would excessively add to the traffic in this area to what is already quite a tricky corner to turn right from. The area is also used for parking when there are central village events that attract cars. The development of Spring Field farm which is currently an unattractive brown field site would be a much better solution. Should the houses be on the brownfield site it would also add substance for the shop in Ifold to re-open. At the moment we have to drive to a shop. I understand that there was an application for some executive homes which may not be as suitable as some smaller dwellings. This proposed development overlooks a number of grade II listed properties which will disrupt the conservation area of the village. We need to protect the heritage of such pretty villages.	No change. See response to Comment IDs: 11 and ID 231. Regarding Little Springfield Farm brownfield site, see the response to Comment ID: 66. WSCC Highways - Refer to response to Comment ID: 64.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
184	Nicholas Taylor	1.2			The Draft NP states that "access between the settlements can only reasonably be achieved by motor car". This is incorrect insofar as it ignores the possibility of walking and cycling (for able bodied residents) and the existence of school buses, local buses and the Billilink service. This is important because the statement is used to support the unfounded argument that of the four settlements in the Parish, only Plaistow is 'sustainable' from a transport point of view. The fact that this argument is baseless undermines the Draft NP's housing site selection.	<p>No change.</p> <p>There are no pavements between the settlement of Ifold to Plaistow village which has the services and facilities; nor Shillinglee to Plaistow village or Durfold Wood to Plaistow village.</p> <p>The road connections are dangerous for pedestrians being 40MPH and 60MPH speed zones.</p> <p>Public transport links in the Parish are poor and special arrangements are required for use of taxis-share such as Billilinks – refer to the response to Comment ID: 84.</p> <p>The NPPF aims to minimise the requirement to use a car, Plaistow village has the most services and facilities in the Parish. Residents located in homes on the proposed site can walk to those services and facilities thus minimising the use of a motor car.</p>	No change required.
185	Nicholas Taylor	1.5			As stated, "the [Chichester] DPD identifies that Plaistow & Ifold Parish Council should deliver about 10 units to meet the identified housing requirement on a site: Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm". The PC has rejected this site despite it being clear from the CLPKP (Paragraph 1.6) that "once adopted, the Local Plan takes primacy" over the NP. This makes the PC's housing site selection worthless.	<p>No change.</p> <p>The CDC Site Allocations DPD examination is not yet complete and the SA DPD has not yet been adopted. Refer to the responses to Comment IDs: 77 and 98.</p> <p>Reference: CLPKP.</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
186	Nicholas Taylor	1.6			This paragraph would appear to contain contradictory statements. On the one hand "it is ... expected that the District Council will remove the site: Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm from their draft DPD upon receipt of the draft Neighbourhood Plan for pre-submission consultation". On the other, such removal would only be contemplated "if a Neighbourhood Plan ... was progressed to Pre-Submission consultation by March 2016". This deadline has clearly been missed and yet, according to the draft NP, "it is understood, through discussions the Parish Council has had with the District Council, that the Neighbourhood Plan should be the mechanism for allocating sites in this Parish." Please provide evidence for that understanding - for example by providing minutes of the relevant "discussions" that have given rise to it. Without such evidence, the statement is worthless, since it is clearly contradicted by the statement in the CLPKP (Paragraph 1.6) that "once adopted, the Local Plan takes primacy" over the NP.	Amend. To be amended to reflect the current position.	Amend 'The Plan': Paragraph 1.6. Reference: CLPKP.
187	Nicholas Taylor	1.7			The DPD has allocated 10 houses to the Parish. The PC appears to have opted to provide more than 10 houses "to ensure that 30% affordable housing is delivered in the Parish". Please explain the rationale for that decision. The PC will know that a developer's obligation to provide affordable housing need not be met in the same locality as the main development.	No change. It is the CLPKP that has allocated the indicative housing number of 10 units on the Parish. Refer to the response to Comment ID: 144	No Change Required.
188	Nicholas Taylor	1.8			Please provide residents with an estimate of the total value of the CIL revenues arising from the proposed development of 11 houses in Plaistow. The implication of the statement is that such revenues would be substantial enough to fund significant investment in Parish infrastructure. This is misleading and, left uncorrected, may persuade residents to support a development that they might otherwise reject.	No change. CIL payments cannot be determined until the development floor space is known and this is a matter for the CDC Planning Application process. CIL is currently set, by CDC, at £200/m sq. for net additional floor space for new residential development. The Parish will receive 25% of CIL payments for the Parish if an NP is adopted and 15% if no NP is adopted.	No Change Required.
189	Nicholas Taylor	1.9			The Draft NP states that "the Neighbourhood Plan will attain the same legal status as the adopted CLPKP". It is worth clarifying that, as stated in the CLPKP (paragraph 1.16), "once adopted, the Local Plan takes primacy".	No change. The NP must be in conformity with the CLPKP and NPPF. When the NP is adopted it will sit alongside, but will not replace the Local Plan (para1.18 CLPKP) Reference: CLPKP.	No Change Required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
190	Nicholas Taylor	2.1			The Draft NP includes the aims of protecting "the rural environment and tranquility ..., the character, built heritage and rural setting of each part of the Parish". To these aims should surely be added protecting the BEAUTY of our built and natural environment.	No Change. The wording 'protect and maintain built heritage' is considered sufficient. Beauty is subjective.	No change required.
191	Nicholas Taylor	2.1 and elsewhere			The aim to "retain the Settlement Boundary for Ifold" is repeated throughout the document and yet there is no analysis of why this is desirable. Indeed, in order to redress some of the difficulties faced by Ifold (e.g. a history of ad hoc rather than planned development, a lack of community facilities, infrastructure that has not kept pace with growth) an expansion of the settlement boundary might surely provide a solution. At the same time, an expansion of the settlement boundary would help to relieve the "pressure for infill and backland development [in Ifold] ... [which has] ... resulted in a gradual erosion of the character of the area" (Draft NP Paragraph 6.11) which Draft Policy H2 "is seeking to redress". An expansion of the Ifold settlement boundary sufficient to accommodate the DPD's housing requirement for the Parish, as well as having the potential to enhance Ifold (by supporting Draft Policy H2), would have no deleterious effect on "the more built up character of the settlement" (paragraph 6.11). This is in marked contrast to the impact that development of the site opposite the Plaistow Village Green would have on Plaistow.	No change. Specific questions were asked in a 2016 parish-wide Neighbourhood Plan Household Survey and Housing Needs Assessment questionnaire, about the Ifold Settlement Boundary and improved facilities. It was not supported by a majority of residents. Also in a 2013 Public Consultation (Ifold Exhibition) a similar response was obtained. We have no mandate to make a change to the Ifold Settlement Boundary.	No change required.
192	Nicholas Taylor	2.1			By imposing a new housing development on an elevated site in the historic centre of Plaistow, overlooking the village green, the selection of the Land Opposite the Green for housing development directly contradicts the stated aim to protect "the rural environment and tranquility that we value" and to "protect and maintain the character ... of each part of the Parish".	No change Refer to the responses to Comment IDs: 11 and 231.	No change require

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
193	Nicholas Taylor	2.1			By ignoring the proposal for residential development at Foxbridge golf course, the PC is acting against the stated aim to protect "the amenities of local residents" since the Foxbridge development would lead to the re-opening of a shop in Ifold. The Chairman of the PC's argument, stated at the PC meeting on 29 August 2017, that the PC could not give consideration to the proposal since no planning application had been received, simply does not stack up in the context of the NP, since no planning applications have been made for any of the sites. The reluctance of the PC to consider the Foxbridge golf course site would appear to be self-defeating insofar as it constitutes a refusal to consider a proposal that would lead directly to an increase in local amenities for Ifold residents.	<p>No change.</p> <p>The Foxbridge Golf Course site was assessed and discounted for allocation to take the indicative housing number in the NP. The reasons are as stated in the site evidence, available for public viewing online on the NP website.</p> <p>It is not in the remit of the NP to comment on any specific planning application. That is a matter for the Parish Council planning committee and the CDC planning application process.</p> <p>In January 2018 a planning application for 10 houses on part of Foxbridge Golf Course was refused by CDC, as it is contrary to CLPKP policies.</p>	No change required.
194	Nicholas Taylor	2.3			The aims of the Draft NP include considering "an appropriate re-use for an identified brownfield site in order to ensure appropriate and sustainable development" and yet the option of using this site to meet the Parish's housing allocation are rejected out of hand, in defiance both of the principle of favouring brownfield over greenfield sites for development and of specific guidance from CDC.	<p>No change.</p> <p>Refer to the response to Comment ID: 66.</p>	No change required.
195	Nicholas Taylor	2.4			The idea that by building additional houses in Plaistow rather than Ifold, we can avoid adding to the 'sewerage problems' in the latter is spurious, since sewerage from Plaistow flows into the Ifold system.	Amend.	Amend Community Infrastructure section justification for PolicyCi1. Note that currently the Brewhurst Mill pumping station in Loxwood as at over-capacity (as noted on the site assessments); and that Brewhurst also receives effluent from Loxwood Parish and Alfold Parish in Surrey.
196	Nicholas Taylor	2.5			The proposal to build 11 houses on an elevated site in the historic centre of Plaistow, overlooking the village green and several listed buildings, runs directly counter to the stated aim to "protect the built heritage and rural setting of the Parish".	No change.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
197	Nicholas Taylor	2.6			There is a proposal - for residential development of Foxbridge golf course - that would lead directly to the stated goal of reinstating A1 shop premises in Ifold, and yet the PC has refused to consider it as part of the NP drafting process. The Chairman of the PC's argument, stated at the PC meeting on 29 August 2017, that the PC could not give consideration to the proposal since no planning application had been received, simply does not stack up in the context of the NP, since no planning applications have been made for any of the sites.	No change. Refer to response to Comment ID: 193.	No change required.
198	Nicholas Taylor	3.5			Expanding the Ifold settlement area would provide a direct way to redress the problems faced by a settlement that "has grown in an ad-hoc, unplanned manner", and yet rather than being sensibly considered, the idea is dismissed out of hand in the stated - and yet unsubstantiated - aim "to retain the Settlement Boundary for Ifold". The fact that there is no attempt to justify this aim belies the bias that has permeated the Neighbourhood Planning process.	No change. Refer to response to Comment ID: 191.	No change required.
199	Nicholas Taylor	3.6 & 3.7			The Draft NP correctly states that "much of the area around the [Plaistow Village] Green has remained unchanged" (3.6) and that "part of Plaistow [including the historic centre] is a designated Conservation Area". Further, "located on the road junction of The Street and Dunsfold Road and around the village green there are approximately 30 listed buildings" (3.7). Recognition of those facts and of their centrality to the unique character of Plaistow is incompatible with considering the site opposite the Green to be a suitable place for a modern housing development.	No Change. Refer to responses to Comment IDs: 11 and ID 231.	No change required.
200	Nicholas Taylor	7.4			The PC, supported by AECOM, have argued that because Plaistow has more amenities than the other three settlements in the Parish, it is therefore sustainable. This is faulty logic and it sits at the heart of the rationale for selecting Plaistow as the only suitable place for non-windfall housing development. As stated here, 51.6% of economically active residents travel to work, the majority by car. That makes a car no less necessary in Plaistow than it is in Shillinglee, Durfold Wood or Ifold.	No Change. Refer to response to Comment ID: 65 sustainability/car use.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
201	Nicholas Taylor	4.1			The selection of an elevated site on the one remaining undeveloped side of Plaistow Village Green for a modern housing development is incompatible with the stated objective "to protect the area's valuable heritage and historic assets". As stated elsewhere in the Draft NP, "much of the area around the [Plaistow Village] Green has remained unchanged" (3.6) and "part of Plaistow [including the historic centre] is a designated Conservation Area". Further, "located on the road junction of The Street and Dunsfold Road and around the village green there are approximately 30 listed buildings" (3.7).	No Change. Refer to the responses to Comment IDs: 11 and ID 231.	No change required.
202	Nicholas Taylor	4.4	EH1		<p>Most policies in the Draft NP (e.g. EH2, EH3) are framed in terms of resisting development that does not meet certain criteria. Policy EH1 is notable in positively supporting certain types of development. As such it seems out of step with the other policies and this seems specifically designed to neuter opposition to development of the site opposite Plaistow Village Green. This is characteristic of the anti-Plaistow bias that has run thorough the Neighbourhood Planning process. To make this policy both more consistent in tone and more acceptable as a statement of policy, it should be reworded along these lines:</p> <p>"Development of, within the boundary of, or within the setting of heritage assets will be resisted unless it avoids or minimises ..." etc.</p> <p>In either formulation of the policy, it is clearly incompatible with the PC's support for the proposal to site a new housing development in the historic centre of Plaistow, overlooking some of the Parish's foremost heritage assets and the designated Conservation Area.</p>	Amend. Policies to be reworded to positive statements in line with SDNPA statutory Reg14 response.	Amend policies to be reworded to positive statements in line with SDNPA Reg14 response.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
203	Nicholas Taylor	4.16	EH3		<p>The Draft NP correctly states that the "variety in the structural landscaping within ... Plaistow village ... creates a rural environment, where landscaping dominates over built form. This contributes positively to the character of the settlements." However, in proposing to build a new housing development of 11 houses on an elevated agricultural site, which would dominate the village green, tower over several listed buildings and become the predominant feature of a villagescape that otherwise "has remained unchanged for more than half a century" (3.6) would be to reverse this important characteristic of our village and create a site at its very heart where the built form dominates over the structural landscape.</p>	<p>No change. Refer to responses to Comment IDs: 11 and 231 Plaistow village is inherently a place where people live and houses are grouped. The village character still remains that of a rural setting with landscape dominating over built form.</p>	No change required.
204	Nicholas Taylor	6.8	H1		<p>Given the restrictions listed as dash points in this paragraph, it is self-evident that no housing development of 11 houses on the site opposite Plaistow Village Green could be compatible with Policy H1. Such a development would also clearly be incompatible with the CLPKP's general stipulation that "for the North of the Plan area [which includes Plaistow and Ifold], the emphasis will be primarily on maintaining the rural character of the existing villages." and CLPKP Policy 47 in particular, which sets out the planning requirements to ensure that any development "conserves and enhances the special interest and settings of designated and non-designated heritage assets".</p> <p>This makes it all the more surprising that the Parish Council has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - rejected CDC's proposed selection of the Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm for the siting of 10 houses - chosen a greenfield site in the historic centre of Plaistow over a brownfield site that is (a) adjacent to the site favoured by CDC (b) sufficient to take the entire DPD allocation for the parish (CLPKP guidance on housing densities - paragraph 17.6) without destroying a single greenfield site and which - in contrast to the PC's current proposal - would be compatible with its stated desire (paragraph 1.2) "to meet local housing needs and the sustainable concept of utilising brownfield sites as a matter of priority" - ignored a more innovative proposal (at Foxbridge golf course) that contains specific 	<p>No change. Policy H1 recognises the sensitivity of the site adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings; and the need for care in any form of development is governed by this policy.</p> <p>Reference: CLPKP.</p> <p>Regarding the CDC SA DPD: refer to the responses to Comment IDs: 77 and 98.</p> <p>Regarding Foxbridge Golf Course - refer to the response to Comment ID: 193.</p> <p>Regarding Little Springfield Farm Brownfield site,-refer to the response to Comment ID: 66 and Policy EE4 which seeks to achieve appropriate redevelopment.</p>	No Change Required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
					<p>provisions to add to the amenities for Ifold residents</p> <p>- sought to 'protect' Ifold from further expansion while actually continuing to support the very policies (infill and subdivision) that have led to Ifold's problems (lack of infrastructure and amenities) and rejecting the one path (expansion of the settlement area) that might actually alleviate them.</p> <p>Furthermore, given that the Springfield Farm brownfield site is currently designated for B2 General Industrial and B8 Storage and Distribution use - with no restrictions on hours of operation - surely a residential development of the site would be preferable to all residents of the Parish than to see it sold and re-established as a full-scale industrial operation with unrestricted HGV movements? Witness the strength of feeling against the development of the biogas plant - and associated vehicle movements - at Crouchlands. Finally, given that (a) CDC has already allocated a site for development North of Little Springfield Farm and (b) also supports development at the brownfield site adjacent to it (at a meeting held on 5 September 2016), there must be a significant risk that if the PC persists with its flawed plan to allocate the site opposite Plaistow Village Green for development, CDC will simply go ahead and grant planning permission to develop both th Little Springfield sites AND IN ADDITION accept the PC's - in effect unnecessary - 'offer' of the land opposite Plaistow Village Green?</p>		

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
205	Nicholas Taylor	1.7			<p>The Draft NP states that "evidence suggests, that the Ifold Settlement Boundary be retained and not extended". And yet no such evidence is provided. Please provide evidence for this statement or remove t throughout.</p> <p>It also states that this stance is supported by residents. Please set out what information has been provided to residents to allow them to make an informed decision on this point. At the site selection phase of the Neighbourhood Planning process, the only sites put forward for consideration were in Plaistow. It may well be the case that, armed with reliable information and a realistic choice between development site locations, residents' preferences might be different.</p> <p>In reviewing the Draft NP, I hope and expect that CDC will bear in mind the fact that there are around twice as many residents in Ifold as there are in Plaistow. The PC's readiness to use this democratic imbalance to impose development on the smaller village is shameful.</p>	<p>No Change. Refer to the response to Comment ID: 191.</p> <p>The Parish Council has been meticulous in following national and local planning policies; and Neighbourhood Planning process in order to determine the most sustainable site to take the Parish indicative housing number and to develop the NP.</p> <p>Your comment about differences in population highlight that significant development has occurred within the Ifold settlement boundary. The NP is subject to the normal democratic process.</p>	No change required.
206	Nicholas Taylor	1.2 & 7.8			<p>How is the selection of a greenfield site overlooking the Conservation Area and listed buildings in Plaistow in preference to a brownfield site at Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm compatible with the PC's stated desire "to meet local housing needs and the sustainable concept of utilising brownfield sites AS A MATTER OF PRIORITY [my emphasis]"?</p> <p>The Draft NP, while rejecting the selection of the brownfield site for the parish's housing allocation, nonetheless supports its development. If the PC supports its development, why not use the site to meet the Parish's housing allocation? I understand that the stated arguments against the site on sustainability grounds were already discounted by CDC at a meeting with members of the PC held on 5 September 2016, at which a CDC planning officer said that CDC considered the Little Springfield Farm Brownfield site to be suitable for residential development.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Regarding brownfield, refer to the response to Comment ID: 66. It is preferred that brownfield should be developed before greenfield if suitable and sustainable. There are no suitable brownfield sites in the Parish to take the housing allocation of 10+ units, if there were then this would be selected over greenfield site.</p> <p>Policy EE4 proposed to allow for appropriate redevelopment .</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
207	Geoff Burrell	6.8	H1		I support the development of housing in the most sustainable part of the community and under the government guide lines for sustainability, this is clearly the site in Plaistow.	No change. Supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
208	Geoff Burrell	6.13	H2		I support keeping density low within the Ifold settlement area.	No change. Supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
209	Geoff Burrell	6.10	H2		Development should not go outside of the settlement boundary or be attached to the boundary to contain future development in rural Sussex.	No change. Supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
210	Alexander Evans	4.1			I strongly support the removal of the site CDC have chosen due to the lack of amenities and services the site provides for any development, as well as the destruction of a Greenfield site and the inevitable destruction of natural hedgerows and trees that would take place in order to provide access to such a site.	The CDC SA DPD site has been proven by the Parish Council to be unsustainably located hence it being discounted from the NP. The Parish Council have made representations at examination of the CDC SA DPD. Refer to responses to Comment IDs: 77 and 98.	No change required.
211	Alexander Evans	1.7			Of the 5 sites the Parish Council proposed, the site CDC is proposing was considered the least suitable by the residents of the Parish.	No change. Your comment is noted and you are correct that in the parish-wide survey the CDC SA DPD site was considered the least preferable. Refer to responses to Comment IDs: 77 and 98.	No change required.
212	Alexander Evans	2.1			I strongly support retaining the settlement boundary for Ifold and object to using Greenfield sites that are outside of the settlement boundary, particularly when there are Brownfield sites that could be developed (and indeed for which planning has been applied) for housing, but is being refused by CDC.	No change. Supports 'The Plan'. Regarding brownfield - Refer to response to comment ID: 85. Note Policy EE4 – Brownfield Site which is attempting to utilise this site.	No change required.
213	Alexander Evans	2.4			I am highly concerned about the extra sewerage burden any development at the CDC's proposed site will put on an already overloaded system currently in place in Ifold.	No change. Refer to the response to Comment ID: 132.	No change required.
214	Alexander Evans	2.5			I strongly support the Parish Council's site proposal based on the fact that, for the residents the housing is being built for (elderly/affordable housing), the Plaistow site provides easy access to a shop, café, schooling and play areas. The CDC's site has none of these and will simply increase traffic movements on a busy road in order to get any of the above mentioned amenities.	No change. Supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
215	Mrs Juliet Reynolds	6.8	H1		Through the neighbourhood planning process I note that the Parish Council has been tasked with identifying a site for about 10 houses. This allocation, in terms of number, feels about right to me. (10) However, I am aware that CDC are proceeding with an alternative site which is awaiting a decision from the Planning Inspector. Until that decision is known, I would not support the Parish Council proceeding with Policy H1 as this would essentially risk the doubling of the housing allocation in our Parish, which seems excessive development to me. Should the CDC site be approved by the Planning Inspector I would recommend that the Parish Council adopt the CDC site and drop the Parish Council's preferred site.	No Change. Refer to responses to Comment IDs: 77 and 98.	No change required.
216	Mrs Juliet Reynolds	7.19	EE4	28	I fully support the priority being placed by the Parish Council on the re-development of the brownfield site. I firmly believe that brownfield sites should take priority in terms of development over greenfield sites. I am not convinced by the need for light industrial development on the Brownfield site. I make this comment on the basis that the greater demand in our District is for housing stock rather than light industrial/retail units. My preference therefore would be for the brownfield site to be used for residential dwellings.	Amend.	Amend Policy EE4 amended to note viability assessment required for mixed use class prior to residential use class. As per discussions with CDC Planning Manager Andrew Frost.
217	Mr & Mrs R E Saunders	6.8			We are writing to confirm our support for the Plaistow and Ifold Parish Neighbourhood Plan, We agree with the proposed housing development site for 10 houses at Land opposite The Green, Common House Road Plaistow for the following reasons . Plaistow village has the facilities to sustain the development including a Church, School, thriving village shop and Cafe, Public House and Village Hall. A pre-school with its own dedicated outdoor playground, recreation ground with pavilion and an outdoor floodlit games area. The proposed development site is within easy reach and walking distance of the above facilities. The other areas within the Parish ieDurfold Wood, Ifold and Shillinglee have very limited facilities to ensure sustainability of further development.	No change. Supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

218	Stuart and Wendy Lockwood	Not specified		<p>I am writing to you as a concerned resident of Plaistow in relation to the proposed development of the land opposite the main village green, commonly known as XXXXXXXXXXXX [redacted] [Land opposite The Green].</p> <p>I share the concerns of my neighbours regarding its selection as the most appropriate site and the impact it will have on both local residents, the rural outlook of the village and traffic management . I would therefore like to set out my objections to the proposed plan for the following reasons.</p> <p>* My understanding is that the plan appears to discount the other proposed site within the parish in Ifold, which is a brownfield site. My understanding is that it is this site that has been identified as suitable for development by Chichester District Council? Surely it would be a better option to use up any available brownfield sites in the first instance rather than developing greenfield sites in the centre of an historic village.</p> <p>We were all encouraged at one of the recent PC meetings to identify green spaces in the parish so that they could be identified and protected from future development. It was stated how important it is to retain these green spaces in our rural community. Why then are we seeking to build over conservation land and rural green space when there are brownfield alternatives ?</p> <p>* This site is an elevated field which enjoys a prominent position in the centre of the village. Any development on this site would have a huge impact on the rural outlook of the village. Any proposed properties would naturally sit higher and overlook the existing houses nearby, some of which are listed buildings. There is no such impact in relation to the 'brownfield site' near to Springfield Farm due to its elevation and the fact that there are industrial units already occupying the site.</p> <p>* The proposed development on the Plsistow site would inevitably bring with it an increase of some 20-30 new residents vehicles into the village. This would have a profound impact on congestion in the centre of the village and implications for safety where residents, their children and dog walkers</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The site Little Springfield Farm brownfield has not been identified by CDC as suitable for development. CDC refused planning consent for development of 3 houses. Please see response to Comment ID: 66 setting out the situation on the site. There is no suitable brownfield site in the Parish to take the housing allocation.</p> <p>Assume refer to Land Opp. The Green covered by Policy H1. Site is not in Conservation Area but adjoins it. Cannot be designated as Local Green space as it does not meet specific statutory criteria for LGS.</p> <p>Refer to responses to Comment IDs: 11 and 231 regarding development of site H1.</p> <p>See response to Comment ID: 62 regarding impact on the highway.</p>	No change required.
-----	---------------------------	---------------	--	---	---	---------------------

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
					<p>are forced to walk in the road due to there being no pavements. Conversely the Ifold site would access directly the onto the main Loxwood Road with less congestion as a result.</p> <p>It is for these reasons that we would like our objections to be recorded.</p>		
219	Adrian Ruaux	6.2			Support – Plaistow ‘where an acceptable level of sustainability could be achieved.	No change. Supports ‘The Plan’.	No change required.
220	Adrian Ruaux	6.10			Oppose – Housing in Ifold would increase the settlement boundary in already overly dense area. This had led to a gradual erosion of the character of the area.	No change. Supports ‘The Plan’.	No change required.
221	Clare Ruaux	6.2			Support – Plaistow ‘where an acceptable level of sustainability could be achieved.	No change. Supports ‘The Plan’.	No change required.
222	Clare Ruaux	6.10			Oppose – Housing in Ifold would increase the settlement boundary in already overly dense area. This had led to a gradual erosion of the character of the area.	No change. Supports ‘The Plan’.	No change required.

223	Sophie Capsey	Not specified		<p>General comments of fact and points for consideration</p> <p>Ifold is predominantly the largest private housing estate in the region. I have extensively read local planning agents (and others) sustainability statements over the last 10 years and CDC committee reports. The sustainability has stayed the same apart from the current closure of the shop. Ifold currently has the most improved broadband within the parish.</p> <p>Durford Wood is a 70+ dwelling private housing estate.</p> <p>There are over 70 listed buildings within the parish.</p> <p>Dwellings fronting Plaistow Road within Ifold Estate SB are exempt from fees payable to Ifold Estates Ltd.</p> <p>Dwellings fronting Dunsfold/Dungate Road and part of Durford Wood (see CDC map) are exempt from fees payable to DW Ltd.</p> <p>Plaistow is the only location to currently provide affordable housing.</p> <p>Ashfield built 1997 and Cedar Terrace built 2008 - both have full rural exception site status.</p> <p>The core of Plaistow village is predominantly very historically sensitive. The highest density sites nearest to the core of the village are Nell Ball and Bushfield (see any map)</p> <p>Plaistow village has no formal village car park and most verges (particularly on Common House Road) are extremely badly damaged due to the near total reliance of the motor vehicle throughout the entire parish.</p> <p>Most of the pavements within Plaistow need remedial work.</p> <p>Ifold has no pavements. A pavement extension from Loxwood to Ifold stores site should be considered. A pavement along Plaistow Road from the Chalk Road point to the Ifold Stores site should</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Affordable housing: Refer to the response to Comment ID: 144</p> <p>Billilinks – refer to the response to Comment ID: 84.</p> <p>Policy H1 allows for mix of house types and sizes to meet identified housing need. Policy H1 designed to meet sensitivity of central village location.</p> <p>Amend housing section to state new housing should meet our the parish identified housing need currently 1, 2 and 3 bed units and units suitable for the elderly</p> <p>Footpath see AIM T1 and transport AIMS T1-T5</p>	<p>Amend 6.1 housing objective: to state new housing should meet the parish identified housing need currently 1, 2 and 3 bed units and units suitable for the elderly</p>
-----	---------------	---------------	--	---	---	---

				<p>be considered - reason safer bus stops and may increase pedestrian use.</p> <p>Density proposed on LOTG Plaistow at nearly 14 per hectare is too high. Propose if site is developed (at all) it should be 100% affordable - reason Plaistow is the only location providing affordable housing. If significant harm to the CA and nearby listed buildings is out weighed on need, rural exception site rules should apply even if this means removing the site from the nplan (as an exception site of any size cannot be designated via a n.plan - see CDC planning policy) and reallocated via another means. Plaistow village does not need 1,2 and 3 bed homes retailing at over 350k.</p> <p>To encourage a healthy mixed community Ifold Estate residents should consider redevelopment specifically targeted at older or disabled people. The private estate roads are perfect for mobility scooter/wheel chair users and a possible new pavement provision to Loxwood would enable a new freedom (or a swift half at the Onslow Arms pub). The reuse of large homes that struggle to sell should be able to convert to flats and apartments without unnecessary increases to building mass and bulk.</p> <p>The parish has 2 BF sites - LSF (near Ifold Estate) and FBGC (Plaistow). These should be developed first without unnecessary delay.</p> <p>Sustainability - all services within the parish are open to all. The most useful services are outside of the parish egdoctors surgeries, butchers, supermarkets etc - Loxwood will soon have all three. PlusBillingshurst has new town status. There is a near total reliance on car use, community bus, billilinks service and school buses to use facilities within the parish. There is currently no attempt to improve residents facilities in Ifold. Land outside of the SB should be identified and assessed to provide a recreation facility for Ifold. I suggest land near The Lane, Ifold.</p> <p>The buildings of positive merit within the parish but not currently worthy of listing - this should be regularly reviewed and updated.</p> <p>Wephurst House - delisted Feb 2017 remove from listed building list.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
					<p>Remove all ref to Crouchlands Farm</p> <p>Nell Ball Hill is visible from 3 rows within the parish see any map</p> <p>Although the parish has an ageing population there is an urgent need for more reasonably priced family homes to ensure the Plaistow and Kirdford school is well attended from children across the parish. There is a risk that the school could be predominantly attended only by Kirdford children unless the parish of P and I addresses the issue of more family orientated housing.</p> <p>If Ifold has its service village status removed via CDC local plan review it should be expected to accept a reasonable amount of new development nearby to fix both drainage, foul water issues and provide possible new facilities to prevent total isolation by design.</p> <p>Although I am a parish councillor I make this response to the reg 14 consultation as a member of the public.</p>		
224	Chris Ford	Not specified			<p>With reference to the above [Neighbourhood Plan Consultation] it would seem that Ifold should be on mains gas, also no further road calming measures needed I think what we have is enough. Also those with orthopaedic issues could find this a particular problem.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Ifold interest in gas was too low when last offered in 1990's, to many people with oil-fired central heating.</p> <p>Highway standards must be met regarding any future traffic calming.</p>	No change required.
225	Olivia Nicholl	Not specified			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opposed to any development within Plaistow village especially on the green field site facing The Green XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX [redacted] [Land opposite The Green]. 2. It's a raised site and would be too imposing, and impinge upon the surrounding Listed Buildings and the overall historic look and feel of the village. 3. Light pollution. 4. Noise pollution. 5. Traffic/parking issues. 6. Little Springfield and/ or Foxbridge would be much more suitable locations and appropriate sites. 	<p>No change.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2-5 This is a matter for the CDC Planning Application process. refer to responses to Comment IDs: 11 and 231 6. Regarding Little Springfield – If you refer to the brownfield, please refer to response to Comment ID: 85. <p>Regarding Foxbridge - refer to response to Comment ID: 193.</p>	No change required.
226	Oliver Lewsley	Not specified			<p>Why would you develop a greenfield site when a brownfield site is available and suitable? How can the Plaistow proposal make any sense?</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Regarding brownfield: refer to response to Comment ID: 85.</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
227	Jenny Lewsley	Not specified			<p>I am shocked that a greenfield site would even be considered when a suitable brownfield site is available.</p> <p>The Plaistow site is on an elevated position and would therefore have a very great negative impact on the surrounding area.</p> <p>The fact that the Plaistow site is close to the shop, school and playground is highly irrelevant as, in a rural area, everyone drives everywhere anyway.</p> <p>The fact that this proposed site is close to the playground and school is in fact a negative as the increased traffic that the site will create will be dangerous to pedestrians walking to school and using the playground.</p> <p>was shocked to learn that the proposed houses on the Plaistow site would be 8m high. The majority of new houses in Plaistow are 7m. These would be out of character in the village and as the proposed site is on an elevated position, have a hugely negative impact on the village.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Regarding brownfield: refer to response to Comment ID: 85.</p> <p>WSCC Highways - Refer to response to Comment ID: 183.</p> <p>The NPPF criteria for sustainability is about minimising the need for the use of a motor car. The proposed site in Plaistow is more sustainably located than any other assessed.</p> <p>Refer to responses to Comment IDs: 11 and ID 231 Building height is a matter for the CDC planning application process with guidance from the NP and emerging Plaistow & ifold Parish Village Design Statement. No height has been specified. Policy H1 written to ensure development is sympathetic to historic housing and Conservation Area.</p>	No change required.
227	Clarissa Bushell	6.25	H4		<p>This states that cars are totally necessary in order to live in the Parish. I question therefore why it is deemed necessary to allocate housing to Plaistow, rather than Ifold so that it is within walking distance to shop, pub, school etc. We are a Combined Service Village and have lived happily together I thought.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The NPPF criteria for sustainability is about lessening the need for the use of a motor car. The proposed site in Plaistow is more sustainably located than any other assessed.</p>	No change required.
229	Clarissa Bushell	7.17	EE4		<p>If the historic B2/B8 uses are said to be incompatible with the surrounding countryside – and residential development is not allowed at this site, what is stopping the owners selling up and a Crouchland-like set-up buying the site for B2/B8 use? As a parish we seem to be leaving ourselves open for industrial exploitation again.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>This is why the Parish Council have proposed Policy EE4 – Brownfield Site to allow for more appropriate use for the site given its proximity to residential housing across the barrier of the adopted highway, Plaistow Road.</p>	No change required.
230	Clarissa Bushell	8.1			<p>With the welcome suggested introduction of cycle routes within the parish and improvements to public transport and footpaths this also seems to diminish the apparent need for the housing allocation to be built exclusively in Plaistow because they need to be near shop, school, pub etc. We can all move between these settlements easily and always have done.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Cycle Routes and footways are an Aim and unenforceable by the Parish Council. The housing allocation is current Policy</p>	No change.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
231	Clarissa Bushell	6.8	H1		The main concern I have for the Land opposite the Village Green is the elevation. These buildings would probably be the highest buildings in the village, blocking views of the sky and trees around the village green. Light pollution would be substantial in all directions around the village and Plaistow would be more visible from a greater distance as a result.	<p>No change.</p> <p>It is recognised that this slightly elevated site is within the setting of some heritage assets and the Conservation Area, however it has been established that development at this location is unlikely to impinge upon the surrounding area sufficiently to obstruct its use as a future development site, all as indicated the response from Historic England:</p> <p><i>'The proposed housing site allocation at Land Opposite The Green is within the setting of the conservation area and there are a number of listed buildings within the wider vicinity. However, the site's exclusion from the conservation area suggests that it does not make a significant contribution to the special interest, character or appearance of the area'.</i></p> <p>The site is also deemed large enough to allow the design to position housing to reduce the impact further.</p> <p>Also it was recommended as the most suitable location when taking into account its more sustainable position in relation to other sites which have been considered. This view is further substantiated by the CACAMP.</p> <p>Policy EH5 and EH6 seek to control light levels from new development.</p>	No change required.
232	Clarissa Bushell	Not specified			Please could you consider whether houses could be built on the current football pitch and the football pitch moved to the Land opposite the Green, so that it is next to the other recreational facilities such as the Cricket pitch and the playground etc?	<p>No change.</p> <p>The Plan as written proposes designation of Foxfields (football ground) as a Local Green Space for the period of the Local Plan (2014-2029). The site presently is privately leased by Plaistow Football Club until 2025 and is considered a valuable community recreational facility.</p> <p>A housing allocation of 10+ houses does not provide sufficient funding to allow 'land swap'.</p>	No change required.
233	Clarissa Bushell	Not specified			An absolutely tremendous document. Sincere gratitude for the painstaking work to catalogue, research, present and produce this. We live in a beautiful location and this document will help protect both the people and the environment. Thank you.	<p>No change.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	No change required.
234	Clarissa Bushell	1.2		3	Agree completely with the concept of utilising brownfield sites as a matter of priority.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
235	Clarissa Bushell	1.5			If CDC have chosen Land north of Little Springfield Farm as their preferred site, then I struggle to see the argument of 'unsustainable' for Little Springfield Farm itself.	No change. Refer to response to Comment ID: 77 and 98.	No change required.
236	Clarissa Bushell	4.32	EH5	13	Should say; lights 'can' attract and disorientate wildlife.	Amend. Missing verb to indicate possibility.	CHANGE FROM: Lights attract and disorientate wildlife. CHANGE TO: Lights could attract and disorientate wildlife
237	Clarissa Bushell	4.37	EH6	14	Should say ;Both of these sites have been protected for, 'amongst other things, their rare bat species.' See http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/protectedsites/sacselection/sac.asp?EUCode=UK0012715	Amend. The web address for the Joint Nature Conservation Committee noted: http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/protectedsites/sacselection/sac.asp?EUCode=UK0012715 links to Joint Nature Conservation Committee site details for Ebernoe Common.	CHANGE FROM: protected for their importance to bats. Additional street lighting in particular can adversely affect and disorientate bats and will therefore not be permitted. CHANGE TO: protected for, amongst other things, their rare bat species. Additional street lighting in particular can adversely affect and disorientate bats and other wildlife; and will therefore not be permitted.
238	John Bushell	2.1			'The Vision' (2.0) and 'We want our Neighbourhood Plan to:' (2.1) is exactly how I envisage the Plaistow, Ifold, Shillinglee and Durfold Wood area developing. However, I do not agree that the Settlement Boundary for Ifold should be retained as currently (2.1). It should be extended to cover the Environment Agency's Magic Map (Defra, Department of the Environment, Environment Agency and Natural England accepted map usage for Planning) designated as a 'built up area' and encompass Tawlbroom, Little Springfield Farm and the surrounding area which would enable the use of a Brownfield Site in the creation of new housing.	No change . See response at Comment ID: 191. The Parish Council has no mandate to change Ifold Settlement Boundary.	No change required.
239	John Bushell	2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7			All agreed - other than in 2.5 where the housing should be considered outside the current Settlement Boundary of Ifold through extension of the boundary to the Environment Agency Magic Map (EA Magic Map) designated 'built up area'.	No change . See response to Comment ID: 191. The Parish Council has no mandate to change Ifold Settlement Boundary.	No change required.
240	John Bushell	4.1,4.4,4.6 ,4.7,4.12			The Objectives of the Environment and Heritage are excellent (4.1) - Protection of Heritage assets (4.4), Protection of Natural Environment (4.6) with the justification of the latter in 4.7. This includes Policy EH3 on the Protection of Woodlands and Natural Vegetation. .	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
241	John Bushell	4.31,4.32, 6.8			The Policy on Artificial Lighting Emissions (4.31) and the Justification of the policy (4.32) is very important for our community. I have concerns that the proposed site for the location of the 11 dwellings for Housing in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan is too elevated at the Land Opposite The Green, Plaistow (6.8) and creates the potential for light pollution from Artificial Lighting.	No change . Policy EH5 and EH6 seek to control light levels from new development.	No change required.
242	John Bushell	6.1,6.4,6.9 ,6.10,6.11, 6.16,6.17			<p>The Objectives for the Housing section are agreed – other than the suggestion and recommendation to extend the Settlement Boundary in Ifold - to retain the concept of a Settlement Boundary - but to include the land around Tawlbrook& Little Springfield Farm to be consistent with EA Magic Map 'built up area' designated zone. I disagree that the site selected (6.4) for inclusion in the draft Neighbourhood Plan should be the land opposite The Green, Common House Road, PLAISTOW. I feel this is inappropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is one of the highest points in the Village and is too exposed - Any developments will be visible from outside the Village area and would create 'Light Pollution' and go against the policy of the draft Neighbourhood Plan (4.31 & 4.32) - There is excellent brownfield site availability in the EA Magic Map defined 'built up[area]' at Lower Springfield Farm and adjacent to this site in Ifold; - The Lower Springfield Farm has established services to manage waste water / sewageetc which is a significant complexity and environmental issue in the development of the infrastructure for any new housing under 6.1. <p>The proposed rationale not to develop any housing in Ifold Settlement Boundary (6.9) due to the pressure on infill and backland development (6.11) could be addressed without impacting on overall building density if the Settlement Boundary was extended to 'Little Springfield Farm' and the surrounding and adjacent area. This would enable the housing development to take place on a Brownfield Site - a suitable alternative and with some existing facilities & services for the required Housing Development for the Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan. Adhering to Policy H3 - on Affordable Housing (6.16 / 6.17) including for older residents and first time buyers could be met through the creation of the housing</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Affordable housing: Refer to the response to Comment ID: 144</p> <p>Refer to the response to Comment ID: 241 re light</p> <p>Refer to the response to Comment ID: 66 LSF- Brownfield site</p> <p>Refer to the response to Comment ID: 191.</p> <p>The Parish Council has no mandate to change Ifold Settlement Boundary.</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
					in the brownfield site around and in Little Springfield Farm.		
243	John Bushell	7.9,7.10,7.11,7.12,7.14,7.15			<p>The objective to protect and avoid the loss of existing businesses and employment space is important (7.9), and the Justification (7.10) as a benefit to life in the Parish are correct. However, all businesses must have local planning permission and support the Rural Nature of the community. Hence, the correct decision by the Parish Council and the local community to oppose the Planning Application of Crouchlands Farm and Crouchlands Biogas.</p> <p>Otherwise, the protection of local businesses against loss of employment must be resisted. (7.12), and the protection of the village shops in Plaistow and Ifold (to be reinstated) should be encouraged (7.14, 7.15).</p>	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
244	John Bushell	7.17,7.18,7.19	EE4		<p>The Neighbourhood Plan recognises the need to consider an appropriate re-use for the identified brownfield site at Little Springfield Farm, Plaistow Road, Ifold.</p> <p>It is recognised that the buildings are obsolete and there would be no loss of employment if this site is redeveloped to provide the housing required in 6.1. Rather than a mixed use (7.18) where there appears to be no current interest in small, light commercial start-ups, there is an immediate solution and resolution for 'an appropriate reuse' of Little Springfield by putting this brownfield site forward as the proposed location for the Housing requirement in the Neighbourhood Plan (6.1). In 7.19 it is recognised that C3 Residential property would be an appropriate use of the land.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>The brownfield site identified at EE4 not suitable for parish housing allocation see response at Comment ID: 66.</p>	No change required.
245	John Bushell	8.0,8.1			<p>The Objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan for transport - and avoiding on street parking, improving links to Public transport would all be justified and met through the use of Little Springfield Farm for the proposed housing - which will have excellent access to the bus-stops on the Plaistow Road, to the Billilinks network, and could have off street parking for all residential properties built.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Refer to the responses to Comment IDs: 84. and 66.</p>	No change required.
246	Sarah Seager-Thomas	Not specified			<p>Sheet 3 : Statements not specifically made in sheet 1 or sheet 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I support the Plaistow and Ifold NHP 2. I agree that the Land opposite The Green, Common House Rd Plaistow should be where the proposed housing should be 	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
					<p>placed. Plaistow has a shop, school, village-green & play area, a church and pub. Ifold has none of these.</p> <p>3. I disagree to any extension to the Ifold Settlement Boundary – Ifold must not be allowed to expand any further, the countryside must remain as it is to preserve what we have left of a rural and tranquil community and the feel of the countryside being on our doorstep and with in easy walking distance. The settlement boundary must be retained but it must not be extended.</p>		
247	Stella Ribbens	2.2			Agree with the vision of the Neighbourhood Plan and its objectives.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No Change Required.
248	Stella Ribbens	4.2			Agree with the objectives of our heritage and historical assets	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No Change Required.
249	Stella Ribbens	4.6			Protection of natural environment is most important – hence agree with objectives.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No Change Required.
250	Stella Ribbens	6.8			I do not agree with the site proposed opposite the village green. I would prefer a brownfield site like Little Springfield [Farm].	No change. See response to Comment ID: 66.	No Change Required.
251	Stella Ribbens	8.1			Agree with objectives especially public transport for the young and older population plus reduce car use.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No Change Required.
252	Leslie David Ribbens	6.8			Housing opposite The Green – after taking part on the survey of areas, I fully support this location.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No Change Required.
253	Leslie David Ribbens	6.9			I appreciate the justification of the Ifold settlement policy areas and support the objection on density per acre increasing.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No Change Required.
254	Leslie David Ribbens	6.16			I agree that affordable housing should be supported. In fact, I think there should be at least 5 of the 11 houses proposed.	No change. Affordable housing: Refer to the response to Comment ID: 144	No Change Required.
255	Leslie David Ribbens	7.2			We need better broadband speeds in part of the parish to allow working from home.	No change. Refer to Policy Ci2.	No Change Required.
256	Leslie David Ribbens	5.3			Agreement on objectives sustainable drainage and infrastructure.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No Change Required.
257	David Brockhurst	2.6			Agree with shop being reinstated.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No Change Required.
278	David Brockhurst	2.7			Agree with all proposed improvements.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No Change Required.
279	David Brockhurst	6.4			Agree with suggested site in Plaistow.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No Change Required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
280	Mr Simon Hodgins (Landowner)	4.27	LGSP5		<p>The FW Gibbs Will Trust objects to 'Foxfields' Football field, Dunsfold Road, Plaistow being included in the Plaistow and Ifold Parish Neighbourhood Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The land in question has been in private ownership since 1899 and there has never been a right of access to it by the general public. 2. The Land is currently leased to a local Football Club. The lease is due to expire in 2025 and may not be renewable. 3. AS the land could well be needed for the next 'neighbourhood Plan' being close to the centre of the village and opposite a previous housing development by the Council, inclusion in the current Plan would prevent this. 	<p>No change.</p> <p>The Parish Council has assessed the Local Green Space as meeting the necessary NPPF criteria.</p> <p>Foxfields has a Public Right of Way (Path Number: 617) running inside the boundary and providing public access across.</p> <p>Members of Plaistow Football Club and their guests use the club as a valued community recreational facility.</p> <p>Refer to response to Comment ID: 232.</p>	No Change Required.
281	Rita Melcio	Not specified			<p>I do support the Plaistow and Ifold Parish Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>I agree with the proposed housing development site opposite The Green, Plaistow.</p> <p>I query why Ifold still has no services or facilities to make it sustainable.</p> <p>I demand better town planning for this Parish from Chichester District Council.</p> <p>I oppose any further development in Ifold.</p>	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No Change Required.
282	Iosold O'Brien	8.9	T1		<p>The provision of off street parking together with landscaped verges is really important to maintain the character of the area and I fully support this. Additionally, new developments should ensure there is enough off street parking to accommodate the increasing number of vehicles as car ownership appears to increase year on year.</p>	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
283	Iosold O'Brien	6.8	H1		<p>The extensive independent research that the Parish Council undertook in the drafting of this plan suggests that that the suggested site is the most suitable and I fully support the development of the land opposite The Green in Plaistow. It has the advantage of being easily accessible to village amenities such as the shop.</p>	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
284	Iosold O'Brien	4.33	EH5		<p>I strongly support the control of excessive lighting on structures within the Parish to the benefit of both residents and nocturnal wildlife. The fact that we live in an area where stars and the milky way can so easily be seen on a regular basis is very special when much of the UK suffers from so much light pollution.</p>	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
285	Iosold O'Brien	4.10	EHa		Protection of the natural environment is of great importance in the Parish and I strongly support the position taken. Hedgerows have been shown to minimise traffic pollution and provide habitats for many birds including Nightingales and other wildlife. It is therefore important to retain trees and hedgerows.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
286	Iosold O'Brien	5.6	CL1 [C1] [C1]		I strongly support this.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
287	Mrs Sophie Hambleton-Bradwell	Not specified			<p>1. I do not support the Plan</p> <p>2. I disagree with the proposed housing development plan opposite The Green , Plaistow for several reasons, two of them being :-</p> <p>a) Your apparent location of housing near 'Plaistow facilities' and 'Services' which significantly minimises the need to drive is laughable. Are you trying to tell us that the 10 houses that are being proposed are small and for single dwelling, non-driving occupants ? I don't think so, they are more likely to be, the largest houses the developer can fit on a plot, which will then be filled with families, both parents with 4x4s, and no doubt a teenager or two with cars/ or who need ferrying from place to place due to their busy social life ! Realistically the services and facilities in Plaistow (a church, a shop, a primary school, a football club), although very welcome cannot sustain any household .</p> <p>b) Infrastructure - can hardly cope now.</p> <p>3. I would be interested to know why Plaistow has no Settlement Boundry</p> <p>4. I strongly disagree with extending the Ifold Settlement Boundry</p> <p>5. Furthermore, an extended Ifold Settlement Boundry should not even be considered until someone at the Parish Council actually looks properly at the area. If they had already done so this they would see that, although around 100 houses or more have been built here in the last 15 years, we STILL have no services or facilities to make it sustainable in its current state let alone adding more properties to the area.</p> <p>6. The Town Planning for this parish is outrageously poor. It is an insult.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2(a) Policy H1 is specific about meeting the identified housing need for small 1-2-3 bedroom units. The NPPF criteria for sustainability is about lessening the need for the use of a motor car. Occupants of houses located on Land opposite the Green are able to walk to local village services and facilities.</p> <p>2(b): Plaistow village has better infrastructure than any other settlement in the Parish.</p> <p>3 Historically Plaistow has not had a settlement boundary. The burden of all housing development in the Parish has been borne by the settlement of Ifold which does have a settlement boundary and the premise of which is for development within. Due to the amount of development within the Ifold settlement boundary there are no sites large enough to take the indicative housing allocation and consequently all sites identified and assessed are in the countryside and outside a settlement boundary.</p> <p>4. The Plan as written notes that extension to the existing Ifold Settlement Boundary is not being recommended.</p> <p>5. The unsustainability of Ifold has been identified and recognized in the evidence base for the NP.</p> <p>6. Your comment is noted. Town Planning is a matter for the CDC planning department.</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
288	J E & G P Franklin	Not specified			<p>We support the Plaistow & Ifold Parish Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We agree with the proposed housing development site: Land opposite The Green, Common House Road, Plaistow because it has more facilities ie school, pub, shop and it would not detract from the beauty of the village.</p> <p>We strongly disagree to an extension of the Ifold Settlement Boundary as there are no facilities only the village hall. Ifold also has not got any infrastructure to support any new developments. The drainage and sewage system cannot cope now with the number of properties already built. If you are unfortunate enough to live on the Plaistow Road there are no pavements and the 40 mile per hour speed limit is far too fast for any pedestrians using the road, it is only a matter of time before there is a fatal accident on this road.</p> <p>Why has Ifold with over 100 houses built in the past fifteen years still have no services or facilities and has even lost its village shop. Can Chichester District Council help with this, surely with the number of houses in Ifold there should be more facilities, it hasn't even got a children's playground , we have more children living in Ifold than in Loxwood or Plaistow.</p>	<p>No change, supports 'The Plan'.</p> <p>Your comments regarding no extension to the Ifold Settlement Boundary are noted.</p> <p>Your comment regarding the lack of services and facilities in Ifold are noted.</p>	No change required.
289	Peter Seager-Thomas	4.12			<p>The present CDC TPO Policy seems at present to only protect trees under direct and immediate threat, rather than protecting the trees before any threat can be made.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>TPO designation is dealt with by CDC, where development threatens lone veteran trees a case may be made for a TPO assessment by the CDC tree officer.</p> <p>NP policy EH3 is for the protection trees and hedges with or without TPO.</p>	No change required.
290	Peter Seager-Thomas	7.1			<p>It is this residents view that due to the manner in which the Ifold 'shop' environment and status has been managed in the last couple of years, the shop, as it stands is no longer a viable proposition unless run on a subsidy.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Comment noted. Reinstatement of the local shop is sought Policy EE3</p>	No change required.
291	Peter Seager-Thomas	7.18			<p>The Little Springfield site is not suitable for anything other than residential or light industrial use due to its remoteness from the majority of Ifold residences and the occasional high speed/density of the traffic along the adjacent access road (Plaistow Road).</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Comment noted . Policy EE4</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
292	Peter Seager-Thomas	8.16			Unless the PC are able to implement the improvement of existing footpaths or the introduction of new footpaths (or indeed cycle tracks) Ifold must be considered unsustainable since neither the shop (or indeed other amenities) in Plaistow or Loxwood is accessible without transport.	No change. Comment noted.	No change required.
293	Mr Andrzej & Mrs Evelyn Omiljanczyk	Not specified			<p>We both support the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We agree with the proposed development site - land opposite the green, it follows the natural development into Rickmans Lane from the Street. It is close to local amenities.</p> <p>We disagree to an extension of Ifold settlement boundary because of sewage and flooding issues with an increased burden on already taxed infrastructure. There are no amenities in Ifold, no street lighting, no ability to walk to amenities safely. It would help destroy the spacious character of the settlement. The adjoining, only means of access, to and from the settlement is busy with speeding vehicles. It would need a lower speed limit or traffic lights for children crossing from the bus set down point. Over 100 houses have been built over the last 15 years.</p> <p>Plaistow does not need it's own settlement boundary as it is a much larger space without a discreet character.</p> <p>There is still no improvement in services or facilities in Ifold - especially, sewage , lighting, shops, local transport, cycleway and walkways leading to neighbouring settlements. There should be better planning from Chichester D.C. not just add on and make do. Current strategic building proposals are not sustainable. Suggest a new town in Shillinglee.</p>	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
294	Martin Robinson	Not specified			<p>I support the Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan as it is very thorough.</p> <p>The proposed housing development in Plaistow appears reasonable and modestly in keeping with the surrounding area.</p> <p>I believe that there is no need to consider an extension to the Ifold Boundary until services and facilities make it sustainable.</p> <p>A boundary for Plaistow is appropriate to allocate its facilities and services which will, in turn, help Ifold establish its own.</p> <p>There is no doubt that we deserve better town planning from Chichester Council considering the number of dwellings in Ifold.</p> <p>We certainly need traffic calming measures and more safety on the main road in Ifold.</p>	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
295	Deborah Lawrence	6.8	H1	20	I support the neighbourhood plan too many houses in Ifold only Plaistow has the sustainability with the school, shop, church, play area, pub, post office once a week and village green. Other parts of the parish are not as lucky and the closed shop in Ifold has been recently held to ransom.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
296	Deborah Lawrence	6.26	H4	24	Any further building should comply with what has been stated in the plan.	No change, supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
297	Deborah Lawrence	5.4	CL1 [C1]		Further building in the Ifold area would severely impact upon the sewage system that continues to be faulty and will not sustain more houses.	No change. Comments noted.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
298	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	1.2			<p>The neighbourhood plan states: "the plan must also reflect national and local planning policy in order to be recommended for referendum".</p> <p>In the National Planning Policy Framework the core planning principles state:</p> <p>To take account of the different roles and character of different areas protecting the Green belts around them, recognizing the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it</p> <p>To contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value</p> <p>Encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed ie. Brownfield land</p> <p>Conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations (heritage assets mean grade I and II listed buildings and their gardens)</p> <p>When considering the impact of a proposed development, the damage to the setting of any heritage assets should be considered - heritage assets are irreplaceable.</p> <p>Identify and protect areas of tranquility which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise.</p> <p>How does the site (field opposite the green) for proposed housing development contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment? It states that, "allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value" This site is not a brownfield site so how does this comply with the NPP framework which continues to say: "Encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed ie. Brownfield land" so why has a brownfield site not been selected?</p> <p>It says "Conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations" This is not in line with the housing proposal which is on the edge of the central village triangle and where the conservation boundary acts as a perimeter around the site.</p> <p>"When considering the impact of a proposed development, the damage to the setting of any heritage assets should be considered - heritage assets are irreplaceable" - I don't believe this has been considered? How can an elevated site that overlooks grade II listed buildings comply with this point?</p> <p>Again the following point shows the proposal is not compliant - "Identify and protect areas of tranquility which have remained relatively undisturbed "</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Refer to the response to Comment IDs: 11, 77, 144 and 231 relating to matters referred to the site at Land opposite the Green.</p> <p>There is no brownfield site suitable to take the housing allocation in Parish refer to response to the response to Comment ID: 66.</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
299	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	1.2	BE6		<p>This states: "special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area. Within designated conservation areas and their settings the District Council will seek to preserve or enhance the special architectural or historic character or appearance of the area and will refuse applications where:</p> <p>(i) They include new buildings or extensions or alterations to existing buildings (including shopfronts) which are of inappropriate height (PLEASE NOTE THE PROPOSED SITE IS AN ELEVATED SITE THAT WILL TOWER OVER A NUMBER OF GRADE II listed properties include Todhurst, Golden Cross Cottages, Stone House, Common House), scale, materials or design, to accord with the character of the conservation area;</p> <p>(ii) The proposals by reason of their bulk and height would obstruct or adversely affect views of buildings which are effective in helping to maintain the historic character of the conservation area;</p> <p>(iii) The proposals fail to respect the existing historic layout and street pattern of the conservation area and the surrounding settlement (including passageways, alleys and public open spaces);</p> <p>The proposed site for development does not respect the criteria above. I have made the above comments at a Parish Council Meeting and in writing. I have had no arguments to my points above. Why is this site continuing to be proposed when it clearly does not meet the requirements of National planning policy and conservation policy?</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>In evaluating the site, 'Land opposite The Green', due consideration has been given to the adjacent Conservation Area which is substantiated by the SEA Environmental Report (AECOM 2017), together with the Plaistow Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposals (May 2013). Although this site has slightly elevated terrain over some aspects of the surrounding area, that is a matter for the CDC planning application process.</p> <p>This process would also take into account the design criteria best suited to its location together with additional weight given to the emerging Plaistow & Ifold Parish Village Design Statement.</p> <p>Policy H1 has been specifically worded to address the site location in the village.</p> <p>WSSC Highways - Refer to response to Comment ID: 183.</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
300	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	1.6			<p>"The planning consultancy, AECOM (appointed by the qualifying body Locality, a partner organization of the Department of Communities and Local Government - DCLG) conducted a site assessment of the proposed housing sites, to be considered for inclusion in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Their study considered that the CDC Site Allocations DPD site (in Ifold) had a high probability of being considered less sustainable in terms of national planning policy at Examination than alternative sites in Plaistow, given the lack of services and facilities in the former settlement. As a result, the findings of the AECOM study were highlighted to the District Council by the Steering Group with a view to CDC revising their preferred location for development"</p> <p>This is contrary to CDC's views in respect to DPD (sept 2017) "document CDC/SAP/06MATTER 4 where it states:</p> <p>"At 1.79 The Council (CDC) accepts there are limited services in Ifold. However, in giving consideration to the various options for the site allocations to meet the parish requirements set out in the Chichester Local Plan Key Policies 2014-2029 (CLPKP) (CLP01) Policy 5, all the various elements of sustainable development have been evaluated. As a result the Council considers that the potential harm to the historic environment in Plaistow outweighs the relative ease of access to facilities and services from this site.</p> <p>On this basis the Council has allocated the land North of Little Springfield Farm in Ifold. Here the site is less constrained and development would result in the less adverse impact as it would satisfy the requirements of sustainable development better than a site in Plaistow. This is supported by the Sustainability Appraisal process".</p> <p>How can a sensitive site in Plaistow be put forward for development when the above view is so clear, is supported by the Sustainability Appraisal Process and adheres to the NPP and Conservation policy?</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Refer to responses to Comment IDs: 77 and 98.</p> <p>It has been established that the site Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm is not sustainable under the requirements of the NPPF and the CLPKP; and the site Land opposite The Green Plaistow is more sustainable due to its proximity to services and amenities.</p> <p>The sensitivity of this site Land opposite The Green, has been noted in the CACAMP.</p>	

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
301	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	2		5	<p>Vision: We care about where we live. We want to protect our sense of community, the safety and rural tranquility that we value. It's why we live here and why we choose to raise our families here, amongst generations of friends and familiar faces. Our four unique settlements will grow naturally; sympathetically blending new with old; respecting the character, natural boundaries and vistas of this special part of West Sussex; protecting our environment and quality of life for those living and working here today and for the generations to come.</p> <p>How can an elevated site ensure adherence to this vision with respect to maintaining character, natural boundaries and vistas?</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The site will appear slightly elevated when viewed from outside its southern and western boundaries, mitigated by trees and mature hedges particularly on the western aspect. Serious consideration was given to the CACAMP when allocating this site.</p> <p>The site is sufficiently large enough to allow the design to respond to the sensitive location and elevation and will be subject to detailed evaluation through the planning application process.</p>	No Change Required.
302	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	2.1		5	<p>"protect and maintain the character, built heritage and rural setting of each part of the Parish"</p> <p>How can a development of 11 houses amongst heritage assets protect and maintain the character and rural setting? Rather it will decrease the rural setting and will not protect and maintain the character but alter the character adversely</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>It is considered by Historic England that this location contributes little to the general ambience of the area in their statement '<i>The proposed housing site allocation at Land Opposite The Green is within the setting of the Conservation Area and there are a number of listed buildings within the wider vicinity. However, the site's exclusion from the conservation area suggests that it does not make a significant contribution to the special interest, character or appearance of the area</i>'</p> <p>The design of any future development is a matter for the CDC planning application process. With reference to the NP and the emerging Plaistow & Ifold Village Design Statement.</p>	No Change Required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
303	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	2.3		5	Environment and Heritage: to protect the area's valuable heritage and historic assets - to discourage loss of tree cover, hedges and natural vegetation, particularly within the settlement areas; to protect the areas identified as Local Green Spaces; to consider an appropriate re-use for an identified brownfield site in order to ensure appropriate and sustainable development. Doesn't the development of 11 houses within a green field site go against this?	No change. There are no trees on the site. Policy H1 requires that no hedging will be removed in the development of the site save for that involved in providing an appropriate access point. But this is a matter for the CDC planning application process. Brownfield - Refer to response to Comment ID: 66. No suitable Brownfield site is available in the Parish to meet the requirements of the NPPF and CLPKP for a development of 11 units.	No Change Required.
304	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	3.7			Part of Plaistow is a designated Conservation Area, which focuses on a triangular street pattern, enclosing buildings as well as large open areas of green space. The proposed planning is at the edge of this triangle, where the conservation boundary is the perimeter of the proposed site and also overlooks grade 2 listed buildings. How does this comply with conservation policy?	No change. It complies with the conservation policy by adhering to the requirements and recommendations of CACAMP. See response to Comment ID: 302.	No Change Required.
305	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	3.12			There is a much smaller proportion of young adults - doesn't this demographic rule out the majority of first time buyers when the average price of a house in the South-East is £276,773, which means raising a deposit of £50,144. The average first time buyer is aged 30. So is there really a need in the parish to provide housing for first time buyers?	No change. When taking into account the CDC ruling that any development in excess of 10 units must provide 30% of those units as affordable housing, this equates to 3 units of the proposed 11 dwellings as being affordable homes. These would not only be available to first time buyers but also to retired residents wishing to down-size and those on lower incomes seeking residence in the Parish.	No Change Required.
306	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	3.13			Ref to an increase in people over the age of 60 The nearest hospitals are The Royal Surrey County Hospital in Guildford (16.5 miles away) and St Richards in Chichester (22 miles away). There is no doctors surgery in Ifold or Plaistow. Therefore a car is needed to access these services. Is this area really a sustainable option for an aged population which is reliant on cars to get to any essential services? Therefore is it sensible to suggest a provision of houses for the retired?	No change. Regarding car usage please refer to the response to Comment ID: 65. The evidence accumulated noted that elderly residents wished to downsize but remain in this Parish (their community).	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
307	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	4.1			protect the area's valuable heritage and historic assets; retain our valued natural environment and ecology Proposed housing will not do this – our natural environment and ecology in this area includes barn owls, and a cuckoo, reported sightings of bats amongst others. It is very dark at night with almost no artificial light. Development would change this dramatically.	No change. See response to Comment ID: 77 and Policy EH5 and EH6 seeks to control lighting on new development.	No change required.
308	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	4.4	EH1	9	POLICY EH1 – PROTECTION OF HERITAGE ASSETS Development of, within the boundary of, or within the setting of heritage assets will be supported where it avoids or minimises conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and setting and any aspect of the proposal. Support will be given to proposals which positively demonstrate the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of the heritage asset and its setting whilst ensuring the viability of the asset for future generations. This goes against CDC's Sept 2017 findings during the DPD process: "document CDC/SAP/06MATTER 4 where it states: At 1.79 The Council (CDC) accepts there are limited services in Ifold. However, in giving consideration to the various options for the site allocations to meet the parish requirements set out in the Chichester Local Plan Key Policies 2014-2029 (CLPKP) (CLP01) Policy 5, all the various elements of sustainable development have been evaluated. As a result the Council considers that the potential harm to the historic environment in Plaistow outweighs the relative ease of access to facilities and services from this site." How is this housing development proposal justified against the above?	No change. Regarding CDC SA see responses to Comment IDs: 77 and 98. See response to Comment ID: 231 - development at this location is unlikely to impinge upon the surrounding area sufficiently to obstruct its use as a future development site, all as indicated the response from Historic England: <i>'The proposed housing site allocation at Land Opposite The Green is within the setting of the conservation area and there are a number of listed buildings within the wider vicinity. However, the site's exclusion from the conservation area suggests that it does not make a significant contribution to the special interest, character or appearance of the area'</i> . The site is also deemed large enough to allow the design to position housing to reduce the impact further. Also it was recommended as the most suitable location when taking into account its more sustainable position in relation to other sites which have been considered. This view is further substantiated by the CACAMP.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
309	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	4.10	EH2		<p>POLICY EH2 – PROTECTION OF NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>The rural areas of the Parish will be protected in order to preserve the high quality natural environment. Development that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - does not protect and enhance the natural environment...does not conserve or enhance biodiversity within designated nature conservation areas....will be resisted, unless in exceptional circumstances the benefits of development can be demonstrated to outweigh any harm that impacts upon the natural environment . <p>How can this proposal be classed as "exceptional circumstances"? CDC have said that the potential harm to the historical environment in PLAISTOW outweighs the relative ease of access to facilities and services to this site.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>All potential sites considered, fall within the scope of rural environment, therefore a judgment has to be made using different criteria. With regard to the historical environment in Plaistow, the matter of the CDC SA DPD refer to responses to Comment IDs: 77 and 98.</p>	No change required.
310	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	4.23			<p>a number of parcels of land have been identified as Local Green Spaces in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 76-78. These spaces have been identified as they meet the criteria in the NPPF, in that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance; the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land. <p>The site opposite the green should be considered to be a protected community asset. It provides parking for village and Parish events (local school, fundraising events) as the village cannot cope with the number of cars events see – this is a green field site not a brownfield site, but meets all the criteria above to justify being deemed as a local green space AND a protected community asset. Should this not be considered, taking NPP and Conservation policy as well as the Neighbourhood plan vision into account? Furthermore, the narrow road beside this site doesn't support the volume of traffic, and the widening of the road will infringe on the conservation boundary.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The site Land Opposite the Green does not meet the criteria set out in the NPPF as Local Green Space, primarily on grounds that it is in private ownership and not used by the general public, is considered an extensive tract of land and was not considered demonstrably special as stated in the CACAMP (2013).</p> <p>It was recognised that the site has been used at most twice a year for parking for events held on the village green opposite. But this has been at the discretion of the landowner and more recently, nearby Foxfields (Football ground) has also been used for parking.</p> <p>WSCC Highways - Refer to response to Comment ID: 183.</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
311	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	4.31	EH5		Objectives: to avoid or minimise lighting pollution in intrinsically dark sky areas; to avoid or minimise lighting pollution in residential enclaves; to incorporate features into development design which are beneficial to wildlife The proposed site for development would result in an increase in light pollution in a current intrinsically dark sky area, thus having a detrimental effect on wildlife and neighbouring properties	Care has been taken to protect the environment from unnecessary light pollution from such a development, firstly through the normal planning process and secondly through specific requirements as set out in the Draft NP, Policy EH5.	No change required.
312	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	4.33			On new development and extensions, or redevelopment, fixed external lighting should be for security and safety purposes; and particular care should be taken to ensure external lighting is designed to be downward lighting, discreet and with movement and light activated sensors; and with suitable shielding to prevent impingement or nuisance upon neighbouring areas. Downward lighting won't have an effect on buildings situated on an elevated site	The slight elevated nature of part of this site is not sufficient to create issues that cannot be overcome by the requirements of Policy EH5	No change required.
313	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	4.34			Proposals involving the provision of external lighting of publicly accessible developments are required to be accompanied by the details of external lighting including, the proposed hours the lighting would be switched on; When in the vicinity of a residential property; When affecting a listed building or conservation area; When in open countryside; Where external lighting would be provided or made necessary by the development How does this apply to this proposed development?	Any external lighting installed for whatever reason, for a new development, would be assessed through the normal planning process whilst taking into account the requirements as set out in the legally binding, made NP.	No change required.
314	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	Comment number out of sync.	xxx	xxx
315	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	Comment number out of sync.	xxx	xxx

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
316	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	6.2, 6.25 and 8.15			<p>6.2A Site Options and Assessment by AECOM (15 Aug 2016) recommended that one or more sites should be allocated in Plaistow village, where an acceptable level of sustainability could be achieved to accord with the Local Plan and NPPF. New housing would be within walking distance of a primary school, shop, pub, Church and recreational facilities with positive implications for the future of these vital services.</p> <p>6.25 Due to the rural nature of the Parish there is a total reliance on motor cars in order to live and work here. Accordingly, car ownership is high</p> <p>8.15 referring to 8.14 On this basis, most of the people of the Parish live in an inaccessible location. Improving accessibility therefore underlies the objectives.</p> <p>This is irrelevant sustainable criteria as cited by AECOM according to CDC who do not see Plaistow as more sustainable than Ifold ie. Based on having a shop. It is a rural area which has been defined as needing a car to get around as paragraph 6.25 says, copied above. So is there really a need to develop within a village centre as its already classed as a rural area where reliance on the motor car is essential? Surely, as this is the case, efforts should be focused on protecting the village centre's heritage and rural environment not destroying it?</p>	<p>No Change.</p> <p>AECOM was appointed by Locality, a programme partner of MHCLG, as part of a technical support grant awarded to the Parish Council. They provided independent, unbiased, expert advice to the Parish Council to assist in formulating the NP. It is therefore the purpose of the Parish Council to take the expert advice given, even though it might not always be as we would like, and act upon it accordingly. One must be aware that such a professional body is conscious of the technical requirements imposed by the various government bodies to ensure our NP progresses to a successful conclusion, without the involvement of personal or collective emotions which can so easily steer the process off track.</p> <p>It is accepted that the whole Parish of Plaistow & Ifold is unsustainable in regard to access and public transport. It is however incumbent upon the Parish to minimize the use of the private motorcar for general daily activities together with other unnecessary vehicular activities in order to generate a more sustainable environment for our families, neighbours and future generations. The heritage of the Plaistow village centre is already adequately protected by the Conservation Area already in place.</p>	No change required.
317	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	6.5			<p>address housing density, building design and house extensions in a way that seeks to protect the built heritage and rural setting of the Parish;</p> <p>An elevated site will not protect the built heritage. Rather it will tower above Stone House and destroy privacy to Stone House as any building will result in looking directly into Stone House's windows - note windows to Stone House are positioned on the side of the Grade II listed building that face the proposed site for development, and not on the otherside.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The proposed site is slightly elevated in relation to the surrounding area, in the southwest corner. Historic England note in their Reg 14 representation that development of this site would not impact adversely upon the historic nature of the village (Oct 2017): <i>'The proposed housing site allocation at Land Opposite The Green is within the setting of the conservation area and there are a number of listed buildings within the wider vicinity. However, the site's exclusion from the conservation area suggests that it does not make a significant contribution to the special interest, character or appearance of the area'</i>.</p> <p>The design and placement of the proposed homes will be subject to the normal planning procedure whilst taking into account the legal requirements of the NP.</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
318	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	6.8			<p>Has proposals to protect the setting of the Plaistow Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings (Common House; Stone House semi-detached with Golden Cross Cottages; and Todhurst);</p> <p>Please note the conservation area boundary goes around the perimeter to this site. In addition please note Stone House has been classed as semi-detached in this document which is incorrect. Rather it is attached by a section of the back wall to Golden cross cottage. If by this point 6.8 the plan is referring to screening, please note that any screening will be difficult due to the elevated pitch and will infringe on light to Stone House and The Dairy.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Policy EH1 ensures continued protection of the PCA and its setting, whilst also taking into account the statutory consultees comments in this regard.</p>	No change required.
319	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	6.12			<p>Ifold originally had a low housing density of a minimum 1/3 acre plots with most back plots a minimum of 1 acre, creating a feeling of spaciousness, consisting of much smaller dwellings with a small footprint compared to the plot size. Recent development has increased the gross density progressively as follows:</p> <p>Ifoldhurst, completed in 1971 is 2.4 houses to the acre (5.8 per hectare);</p> <p>The Close, completed in the 1990's is 3.252 houses to the acre (8 per hectare);</p> <p>Wildacre Close, completed in 1995 is 3.7 houses to the acre (9 per hectare);</p> <p>Oakdene Place, completed in 2005 is 5 houses to the acre (12 per hectare);</p> <p>Bradstow Lodge (Planning consent granted in January 2016) equates to 6 houses to the acre (13.6 per hectare).</p> <p>All of the above are private developments. Plaistow's development has not been included in this document for example, we understand in 1999 Ashfield was developed and in 2008 Cedar Court was developed. Bushfield is a modern addition to the edge of the village. Is it fair that Plaistow's development over the last 20 years or so has not been included in this document?</p>	<p>Amend.</p> <p>The density changes in Ifold are noted in support of the housing Policy H2. Ifold has had a significant of development since the Ifold Settlement Boundary was introduced in 1990, with a 48% increase in the size of the settlement.</p> <p>The development phases of Plaistow were assessed in for Policy H1 site size reflects surrounding density of Plaistow village.</p>	Add map of development pattern of Plaistow village.
320	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	6.14	H2		<p>HOUSING DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE IFOLD SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan will support proposals for redevelopment of existing plots, replacement dwellings and extensions to existing dwellings within the Settlement Boundary of Ifold, provided that:</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Past development within the Ifold Settlement Boundary has allowed for increasing density which has had a detrimental effect on the character and setting of the settlement.</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
					the quantum of development and site coverage will not be an over-development of the site in relation to the characteristics of neighbouring sites in respect of built form, massing and building line; the development protects the residential amenity of neighbours; This is exactly the development that has happened in Ifold in the past and is what the residents of Ifold are against.	Policy H2 seeks to address the issue of density within the settlement boundary.	
321	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	6.24			Justification - residents were asked in The Parish of Plaistow & Ifold - Neighbourhood Plan Household Survey and Housing Needs Assessment (March 2016) whether they would support various design factors in the proposed Village Design Statement. The majority of respondents (over 60%) favoured limiting the height of development. So how can an elevated site be justified as a starting point when limiting height is favoured by over 60% of residents?	No change. A slightly elevated location does not infer that future development will be unable to meet the requirements of the NP. This is a matter for the CDC Planning Application process.	No change required.
322	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	7.15			The existing shop premises within the villages provide a vital economic function of employment, supplies for the residents and contribute to the sustainability of the settlements. Oak Tree Stores Ifold has closed for redevelopment of the site for combined residential and retail use. The re-instatement of this vital community facility is sought. Why hasn't this been done already? This is the only Community Protected Asset (registered September 2016)	No change. A lack of conditions on the Planning Permission granted by CDC planning officers for redevelopment of the Ifold shop premises did not require the shop to reopen. The shop premises in Ifold are in private ownership and the Parish Council has no authority to enforce it to reopen. Policy EE3 seeks to address this issue.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
323	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	7.16 - 7.17	EE4		<p>Brownfield Site Objective: To consider an appropriate re-use for an identified brownfield site in order to ensure sustainable development.</p> <p>7.17 Justification - The Parish has a site that falls within the definition of a brownfield site (as set out in the NPPF) at Little Springfield Farm, Plaistow. Why can't this brownfield site now be considered for development? Especially as CDC has clarified that Ifold is NOT considered any less sustainable than Plaistow. It's a brownfield site so is it not a more responsible option? I understand there are additional brownfield sites (Foxbridge) open to development that could and should be considered as a solution to a longer term need for further housing (beyond 2029) that will have less adverse effects on the heritage and rural environment of this parish. Why hasn't a considered and thought out strategy been put in place to truly support the vision set out in the neighbourhood plan?</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Regarding brownfield - refer to the response to Comment IDs: 66 and D85.</p> <p>When taking into account the formal definition of sustainable development, it is clear that Ifold, in its present form, is not sustainable. Whereas the village of Plaistow in regard to services and facilities is sustainable in NPPF terms.</p> <p>With regard to the Foxbridge Golf Course site: Refer to response to Comment ID: 193. This was assessed to take the indicative housing number and discounted for similar reasons as given for the brownfield at Little Springfield Farm. Foxbridge Golf Course Planning application for residential development refused by CDC January 2018</p> <p>Regarding long term planning i.e. beyond 2029, that is not within the remit for this NP which will be acceptable to the examiners.</p>	
324	Mr & Mrs Ross Hurst	8.7			<p>The landscaped verges to the lanes and the lack of on street parking contribute towards the rural setting. The public consultation exercises revealed that it was important to residents that Ifold retained its countryside and village feel and that this should be protected whilst ensuring appropriate off street vehicle parking within the settlement boundary and across the rest of the Parish. In view of the restricted parking within the settlement boundary and generally across the rest of the Parish, greater public transport accessibility is required.</p> <p>Why is Plaistow not specifically mentioned here? The same must apply to Plaistow in that greater public transport accessibility is required.</p>	<p>Amend.</p> <p>Comment which appear to refer only to Ifold, should also be applicable to the whole Parish.</p> <p>For clarification amend as shown.</p>	<p>The landscape verges to the lanes and the lack of on-street parking contribute towards the rural setting of the Parish. The public consultation exercises reveal that it was important to residents that the Parish retained its countryside and village fee;l and that this should be protected whilst ensuring appropriate off-street vehicle parking within all the settlements within the Parish. Specifically for the Ifold Settlement where the roads and verges are owned by Ifold Estates Limited who require residents do not park on roads or verges. In view of the restricted parking generally across the Parish greater public transport accessibility is required.</p>

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
325	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	1.7			I disagree the Ifold settlement boundary should not be extended; it should be extended to include the properties known as Tawlbrook and Little Springfield Farm on Plaistow road, which are shown on magic maps inside their designation 'built-up area'. The magic map, a partnership between key central government departments – DEFRA, the environment agency, the Forestry Commission, Marine management organisation, as well as Natural England and English Heritage to produces the maps that are used to identify the environment including settlements. Their designation of built-up area, encompasses the whole Ifold estate shown within the settlement boundary. See Appendix 1. By moving the settlement boundary to encompass these two additional properties it would bring the Ifold settlement boundary into line with the principle consultees' reference mapping data and include the Little Springfield farm brownfield site within the settlement boundary. This would support the statement in Para 1.2 of the NP 'there is a desire to meet local housing need and the sustainable concept of utilising brownfield sites as a matter of priority'. Incorporating LSF brownfield site within the settlement boundary would remove all of the sustainability issues which have been heavily misrepresented during the planning application and appeal process relating to the BF site . Appeal ref APP/L3815/W/15/3129444.	<p>No change.</p> <p>The development of the NP has been a community lead process, taking into account the views, wishes and aspirations of the local residents and local business from the many public consultations and surveys. It is clear that, based on evidence there is an overwhelming desire to retain the current Ifold Settlement Boundary in its present form and location.</p> <p>See response at Comment ID: 191. The Parish Council has no mandate to change Ifold Settlement Boundary.</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
326	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	2.1			I agree that the neighbourhood plan must seeks to ' protect our sense of community and safety, the rural environment and tranquillity that we value', the community must realise the significance of the brownfield site at Little Springfield farm and how it could adversely impact on the community if residential development is not supported. When we bought the site, predominantly old piggeries and unused industrial feed milling buildings, we were operating a small business from premises that had previous industrial use and an operating centre for 12 HGVs. In 2002, CDC forced us to make an application for a certificate of lawful use which was subsequently granted for use class B2 general industrial process and storage use class B8 associated with the principal business use, and the site is currently an HGV operating centre licensed by VOSA. The C of L was forced upon us by the planning system and we conducted our business lawfully under this Certificate with great consideration for our neighbours. Under this Certificate, there is no limitation to the hours of working, nor is there any restriction to vehicle movements and HGV vehicle movements 24/7. If the site returns to industrial use it could have far greater impact on the locality than the recent Crouchlands Biogas debacle, and the Crouchlands appeal inspector's comments on the potential impact at para 75, 77 and 115 refer to the damaging effect ongoing HGV movements can have on residents and the locality. Appeal Decisions APP/L3815/C/15/3133236 & 3133237 & APP/P3800/W/15/3134445	No change. Supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
327	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	2.3			I disagree with a compact development of 11 houses on the elevated site land opposite the green, which will overlook the heritage assets in Plaistow, these should not be compromised by a modern development, which will also be visible from miles around because of the elevation. This would conflict with the Chichester Adopted Local Plan 2014-2029 Policy 47 & 48	No change. Refer to the response to Comment ID: 231 and ID 11	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
328	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	2.3			I agree an appropriate re-use of the identified BF site should be consider in order to ensure appropriate and sustainable development. Having reviewed the viability study information prepared prior to the LSF BF planning appeal ref APP/L3815/W/15/3129444 in January 2015, the CDC estates officer accepted that mixed use of the LSF BF site was not viable and that residential housing was the most appropriate re-use of the site. Residential development of the LSF BF site would, I believe, require the loss of only one tree because its roots have undermined a buildings.	No change. Supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
329	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	2.4			I agree that new developments should be configured to maximise the ability to connect to technology networks. The LSF BF site has high-speed broadband on site, 50 MB download, 9MB uploaded. I agree community infrastructure is needed to ensure sufficient sewerage capacity is available for both existing and proposed additional housing.	No change. Supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
330	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	2.6			I would encourage live work units that satisfy home office working on the LSF BF Little Springfield Farm brownfield] site but live work units with less specific control of the actual use I would not be support.	No change. Supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
331	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	2.7			<p>I agree the PC/NP should look at improving links to public transport, but the information already out there is not being promoted. Few people know of the main low cost service available. I have personally made several representations to the parish Council during this process and identified a West Sussex County Council subsidised low cost transport service called Billilinks which operates seven days a week in this parish and connecting with surrounding villages and the better local facilities in Billingshurst, including alternative bus service and the main London to Brighton / Portsmouth Rail link. I submitted a formal written request via the parish clerk for the information to be provided to members of the PC/ neighbourhood planning committee and incorporated in the neighbourhood plan consultation process (because the transport link added a significant important element when considering the sustainability of the LSF BF site. The site is within 400 m of a designated bus stop for the Billilink service, a CDC criteria and confirmed in 8.12 of this draft Plan.) - See map on Appendix 2.</p> <p>Incidentally, 81% of dwellings within the Ifold settlement boundary are also within 400 m of a pickup point, the remaining 19% are within 500 m of a pickup point.</p> <p>There is no reference to this service in any of the NP documentation that I can find, CDC do not acknowledge the existence of this service in their settlement capacity profile document used as part of the SADPD consultation, not even in their recent 2017 Local Plan review data, even though it has been running for approximately 10 years. (Had the information been better promoted by all the groups involved, the planning appeal inspector at the LSF BF appeal ref APP/L3815/W/15/3129444 could not have used the argument that future residents would be heavily reliant on cars with the resulting comment that 'the LSF BF site was unsustainable in terms of accessibility to services' and it follows that Aecom and Colin Smith Planning could not have relied on that negative statement in their assessments of Ifolds sustainability, which have proved controversial.)</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Refer to the response to Comment ID: 84.</p> <p>Ref. brownfield site at Little Springfield farm - in relation to para 8.12. The proximity to the bus pickup /dropoff points was not a reason for the site being discounted from allocation to take the indicative housing number. Refer to the response to Comment ID: 84.</p> <p>A large number of houses within Ifold are located more than 650 metres from bus pickup /dropoff points.</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
332	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	2.7			I fully support the proposal to reduce the speed limit between the settlements and particularly through Ifold on the Plaistow road.	No change. Supports the part of The Plan related to an Aim to reduce the speed limit on Plaistow Road Ifold (adopted highway).	No change required.
333	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	5.5	CL1 [Ci1]		I agree with the flood data that has been assessed by site survey for the LSF BF [Little Springfield Farm brownfield] site by a flood specialist and was accepted by the environment agency. They then corrected / updated their maps since the beginning of this process which previously showed the floodplain in entirely the wrong location. Contrary to the assertions within the NP process, the access bridge deck is some 54 mm above the one in 100 flood event level and could be raised by 100 to 200 mm fairly easily if retained in its present form. Of the three site layouts we have prepared for practical consideration, all of the properties would have a floor level above 800 mm above the one in 100 flood event level.	No change. Refer to Community Infrastructure section Ci3.	
334	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	5.17	Aim CL3 [Ci3]	18	I disagree with adding 11 dwellings in Plaistow to the already over capacity sewage system that runs through Ifold prior to a satisfactory resolution to the problem, seems like folly, and would contribute to the foul sewage flooding issues suffered by many residents. see also 2.4 above.	No change. Refer to Policy Ci1 – reducing and Avoiding Flood Risk and Community Infrastructure section Aim - Ci3. Assessment of surface water drainage capacity is a matter for the Planning Application process.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
335	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	6.2		19	<p>I don't agree with the Aecom site option and assessment (15th of August 2016) regarding the sustainability of Ifold, and nor did/do CDC.</p> <p>It has been acknowledged and discussed at a PC meetings that it is CDC policy that children from Ifold could be expected to walk to the primary school in Plaistow- and back every day; it is only that highway engineers accept that the road is too dangerous that a bus is provided as a concession. At a meeting between CDC/PC and NP representatives (5th Sept 2016) CDC plainly said that Aecom were wrong in their sustainability assessment for Ifold, that as a service village in the Chichester Local plan, the distance between the settlements and services was irrelevant in planning terms; indeed this draft plan clearly states that at paragraph 7.3; over the next two days, the PC held 4 open consultation meetings informing residents that Aecom had said the LSF BF site was unsustainably located contrary to CDC's view that Ifold is sustainable.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>AECOM (an international planning consultancy) were appointed by Locality, a programme partner of MHCLG, as part of a technical support grant awarded to the Parish Council to conduct a <i>Site Options and Assessment</i> (Aug 2016)</p> <p>WSCC, the education authority, has since the late 1990s provided a school time bus service for children of Ifold attending the Plaistow and Kirdford Primary School, as they deem the Plaistow Road from the Ifold settlement to Plaistow village is deemed too dangerous to walk in 40MPH and National Speed Limit 60MPH on a road with no pavements and no street lighting.</p> <p>CDC planning officers disagreed with the conclusions of the <i>Site Options and Assessment</i> (Aug 2016) regarding the site the District have allocated in their SA DPD. But CDC officers conceded they had not reviewed their site on the basis of a 2016 planning appeal decision (refusal) for the adjacent brownfield.</p> <p>The distance between the settlements of and Plaistow village is relevant in terms of there being no '<i>reasonable access</i>' to facilities and services located in Plaistow village without the use of a motor vehicle. Therefore, distance is a significant factor in failing to meet Sustainability criteria.</p> <p>The walking distance between the Ifold settlement and Plaistow village (approx.1.7km) is over the recommended walking distance as per CIHT guidance.</p> <p>The <i>Site Options and Assessment</i> report was submitted to the Parish Council. This report was made available for public viewing from August 2016 and the findings presented to residents at public consultations held in September 2016.</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
336	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	6.7	H1	20	I disagree that a residential scheme on Land opposite the Green can positively respond to the prevailing character of the area and have reference to the historic surrounding buildings if 11 homes are built on that site. I dont see how they can be compatible.	No change. This is a matter for the CDC planning application process.	No change required.
337	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	6.9	H2	21	I agree it is necessary to address housing density by a comparison. The density of the preferred NP allocated Plaistow site is 11 dwellings on 0.8ha. The whole LSF BF site could be 10 or 11 dwellings on 0.92 ha.; using the BF industrial footprint only would be 11 dwellings on 0.52ha. and therefore still better than CDC's proposed DPD allocated site of 10 dwellings on 0.4ha which they deem acceptable in the area. Notwithstanding the affordable homes consideration, the original proposal of 6 dwellings in Plaistow and 6 on the LSF BF site seemed like a good compromise and solves a number of issues relating to each site.	No change. Supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
338	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	6.22	H4		I strongly disagree that due to the rural nature of the parish there is total reliance on motor cars in order to live and work here. Of course owning a car is an advantage but it does not have to be a total reliance on the use of a car. There is a sustainable low cost transport service that is subsidised by West Sussex county council and gives residents access to many of the outlying villages and communities seven days of the week. That means living in Ifold for example, you're not more than 500 m from a pickup point to go to the doctor, the shop, a local village, a bank, a chemist, or a railway station for example. There are of course other modes of personal transport such as cycles. Home delivery shopping is available and reduces the reliance on a car.	No change. Ifold is fundamentally unsustainable. Refer to response to the Comment ID: 331	No change required.
339	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	7.7	EE1	26	I agree the business use proposed for a live work unit should be carefully assessed to ensure that there would be no harm to the character of the area or amenity of adjoining properties, particularly in relation to increased noise and disturbance, however there is no point building them if you cannot sell them because of the unknown future use. Viability studies are important when considering the practicality of live work units.	No change. Supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
340	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	7.18	EE4	28	I agree with this justification with the exception of the Inspectors unsustainable conclusion because he was not fully informed of subsidised local low cost transport available, detailed in 2.7 above.	No change. In formulating the NP, only the formal conclusion of the Inspector can be considered.	No change required.
341	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	7.19	EE4	28	I agree the site should be redeveloped to protect the local residents from undesirable future use as detailed in 2.1 above and subject to viability to determine the form the development should take.	No change. Supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
342	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	7.20	EE4	28	I agree with the policy to redevelop the site in broad terms with consideration of the adjacent ancient woodland, but the mix and use to be subject to viability.	No change. Supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.
343	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	8.13			I dont agree that most people of the parish live in an inaccessible location, based on the criteria in para 8.12. 81% of Ifold residents live within 400 M of a subsidised transport link (see 2.7 above) However there is room for improvement.	No change. Refer to response to Comment ID: 331.	No change required.
344	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	Comment number out of sync.	XXX	XXX
345	James King-Wilson (Resident, Landowner, Business Owner)	8.14			I think the children and parents of the parish should be made aware of the significant danger they put themselves in, especially in winter months when the roads are slippery and visibility is poor, standing so close to the road, ie Chalk Road, and on the corner at the end of the Ride where it joins Plaistow Road. I have several times observed dangerous situations at these junctions. If the groups stood back away from the roads it would considerable reduce the danger. Some form of warning notice or barrier should be provided.	No change. Supports 'The Plan'.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
346	Louise Grassby	1.2			<p>The document states that Ifold has "very limited facilities (a hall and a Scout/Girl Guide HQ which rely on volunteers)". This is not accurate as there is far more happening in Ifold. Ifold also has a Pre-School, a Car Garage, a local Shop (although not yet open for business),. On the Kelsey Hall website it states that the following groups run "regularly" at the Hall: Aerobics, Art Group, Christian Fellowship, Dance School, Fishing, Gardening Club, Handbells, Ifold Estates, Indoor Bowls, Parish Coucil, Pilates, Mobile Library, Residents Association, Slot Cars, Table Tennis, Tea Group, Yoga, Yoyalates and KHMC. Other events that have taken place in Ifold are "World's Biggest Coffee Morning", Barn Dance and Ifold's Big Event. The Kelsey Hall also has parking for 25 cars.</p> <p>Also the paragraph states that "There is a desire to meet local housing needs and the sustainable concept of utilising brownfield sites as a matter of priority." Land opposite the Green should not be built on because it is a field, not a brownfield site.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The facilities and services within the Ifold settlement are noted.</p> <p>The Ifold shop was closed in mid 2015 and has not reopened. It has since been sold to a new owner. The shop remains closed for business. The car garage is repair only and does not sell fuel.</p> <p>Kelsey Hall is noted in The Plan as a local facility for the Ifold settlement as it is the venue for several local groups run by volunteers such as the Little Acorns Pre-school. This however, does not alter the sustainability for the Ifold settlement.</p> <p>Regarding Little Springfield Farm Brownfield site,-refer to the response to Comment ID: 66 and Policy EE4 which seeks to achieve appropriate redevelopment.</p>	No change required.
347	Louise Grassby	1.7			"Residents' preference and evidence suggests, that the Ifold Settlement Boundary be retained and not extended." This statement is not a valid reason why a field in Plaistow (Land opposite the Green) should be built on instead.	<p>No change.</p> <p>The Plan does not give this as reason. See response at Comment ID: 191 Ifold Settlement Boundary.</p>	No change required.
348	Louise Grassby	2			This section states that the Plan should protect our safety, the rural environment and tranquility that we value. It states it should protect and maintain the character, built heritage and rural setting of the villages and to protect the area's valuable heritage and historic assets. Building houses on a field in Plaistow contradicts these statements. The section also states it wants to discourage loss of tree cover, hedges and natural vegetation, particularly within the settlement areas, but building on Land opposite the Green will mean that hedges are removed, which is another contradiction.	<p>No change.</p> <p>Incorrect, by choosing the most sustainable location available, The Plan seeks to preserve these qualities.</p> <p>The site is free from trees.</p> <p>Housing Policy H1 seeks to preserve existing hedging as much as is possible beyond that which may be required for removal to create appropriate access to the site.</p> <p>Refer also to the response to Comment ID.: 77.</p>	No change required.
349	Louise Grassby	3.6			"Much of the area around the Green has remained unchanged for more than half a century". I believe that the majority of people who choose to live in Plaistow do so because of the truth of this statement. Therefore I do not believe it is correct to build on a field (Land opposite the Green) that has remained unchanged for more than half a century, when there are suitable brownfield sites that could be built on instead.	<p>No change.</p> <p>The Parish must meet its indicative housing number as per the CLPKP (2014-2019).</p> <p>There is no suitable brownfield site to take the housing allocation in the Parish.</p>	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
350	Louise Grassby	6.3		19	Building on a field in the centre of Plaistow would result in potential harm to significant trees and the hedges. Such an impact would be harmful to the setting of the Conservation Area.	No change. The NP has had consideration to the sensitivity of the site, refer to Housing Policy H1. See also responses to Comments ID: 11 and 77 (B, C, D).	No change required.
351	Louise Grassby	6.4		19-20	Just because other sites in Plaistow have been discounted is not a valid reason to include "land opposite The Green, Common House Road, Plaistow" because this site is also not suitable because it would negatively impact the village and the residence.	No change. The site has been carefully assessed and there is no other reasonable alternative. Refer to the response to Comment ID: 11, and ID 231	No change required.
352	Louise Grassby	6.8			Building on Land opposite The Green will not "positively respond to the prevailing character of the area" because the character of the area is an idyllic and quiet village, not a place where extra houses should be built.	No change. Refer to the response to Comment ID: 351	No change required.
353	Louise Grassby	6.8			If you build houses on Land opposite The Green you will not be able to make provision for safe vehicular access because Common House Road is a small lane that is already used by many cars, school buses, tractors and work vehicles. The road will become even more busier and it will be a danger to people walking etc.	No change. Refer to response to Comment ID: 62.	No change required.
354	Louise Grassby	6.8			If houses are built on Land opposite The Green they will have a negative impact on the lives of people living nearby egSunnymead and The Stone House.	No change. Any site chosen will likely have a negative impact on somebody.	No change required.
355	Louise Grassby	6.25			"Due to the rural nature of the Parish there is a total reliance on motor cars in order to live and work here". This statement indicates there is no justification for building houses in the centre of Plaistow as everyone drives so the new houses could just as well be built somewhere else eg near Ifold or Foxbridge.	No change. In accordance with the NPPF and CLPKP, all development must meet the criteria of sustainability, where the need to use a motor car must be lessened.The proposed site is within walking to the facilities and services in Plaistow village. The site at Foxbridge Golf Course was assessed and discounted.	No change required.
356	Louise Grassby	6.26			The Plan says "a satisfactory road access is provided that does not result in increased danger and inconvenience to other highway users, including pedestrians and cyclists" but this cannot be done whilst also preserving hedges near Land opposite The Green, which is another condition of the Plan.	No change. WSCC Highways - Refer to response to Comment ID: 183. Policy H1 has regard for the preservation of hedges and the extent to that required for removal for satisfactory road access becomes a matter for the CDC planning application process.	No change required.

ID	NAME	PARA NO.	POLICY REF.	PAGE NO.	REPRESENTATION COMMENT(S)	RESPONSE / JUSTIFICATION	AMENDMENT (if required)
357	Louise Grassby	7.4			"A modest 3.3% of the population either walk or cycle to work within the Parish". With this in mind there is no justification for building houses in the centre of Plaistow Village.	No change. The Parish must meet its indicative housing number (as per the Local Plan) of 10 units. The site proposed in Plaistow for 11 units has been assessed as best meeting criteria against National and Local planning policies.	No change required.
358	Louise Grassby	7.10			"The traditional businesses of working the land remain important in maintaining the character of the Parish. Whilst not employing large numbers, the farms and larger equine facilities are seen as a benefit to life in the Parish". Therefore the new houses should not be built on Land opposite The Green as this is a field where sheep graze.	No change. The site proposed in Plaistow has been used for periodic grazing of livestock and no other known agricultural uses, it does not form part of a farm. All sites that were identified as potentially suitable for housing to take the indicative housing allocation are in the countryside.	No change required.