**Representation Form**

**Plaistow and Ifold Parish Neighbourhood Plan**

**The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16**



|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PART A** | **Your Details** |
| **Full Name** | CHRISTINE GIBSON-PIERCE |
| **Address** |  |
| **Postcode** |  |
| **Telephone** |  |
| **Email** |  |  |  |  |
| **Organisation (if applicable)** |  |
| **Position (if applicable)** |  |
| **Date** | 27 OCTOBER 2020 |

**PART B**

# To which part of the document does your representation relate?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Paragraph Number | 1.9 | Policy Reference: |  |

**Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph?** (Please tick one answer) Support Support with modifications Oppose  Have Comments 

# Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here:

I OBJECT to Chichester District Council’s use of the Plaistow–Ifold ‘Service Village’ concept in this Neighbourhood Plan. This is despite Chichester Local Plan Key Policies (CLPKP) incorrectly defining Plaistow and Ifold as a combined Service Village: Plaistow-Ifold.

The NPPF states that ‘sustainable development’ should lessen the use of motor vehicles. Plaistow and Ifold are several kilometres apart, and it is not reasonable to expect Ifold residents to walk on the unsafe and winding Plaistow Road, with its 60mph national speed limit, to access the many services and facilities located in Plaistow village, including its primary school. Plaistow Road (aka Loxwood Road) also has no pavements or street lighting. Ifold school children are provided a school bus by West Sussex County Council to transport them to and from the primary school in Plaistow village, as the road is deemed too unsafe for school children to walk to the Plaistow primary school.

Despite Plaistow village having the most services and facilities: a Primary School; village Green (with outdoor childrens’ playground), Plaistow Stores; Church; Pub; Football Club; Winterton Hall (with weekly post-office services); multi-use outdoor games area; a preschool (with its own dedicated outdoor play area); and WSCC Highways ‘adopted’ roads; CDC planning policies allow unlimited ‘*windfall*’ housing to be built within the Ifold Settlement Boundary.

Ifold has a scout hut and a hall (both run by volunteers). The Ifold shop (only selling basic staples), does not make Ifold as sustainable as Plaistow, and that is as according to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPFF). Unlimited windfall has altered the area character damaging its rural openness which Plaistow village has been allowed to retain despite it being the most sustainable area in the Parish to locate housing. The character of Ifold must be managed and the burden of new housing be shared across the Parish.

Plaistow village and Ifold (including Ifold Estate which is entirely within a Settlement Boundary and has private roads and Public Rights of Way, with many roads designated as bridleways) are two very separate settlements. Plaistow village is more sustainable in NPPF terms than Ifold, therefore to apply the Service Village concept in this example is incompatible with the NPPF.

Clearly state in the Plaistow and Ifold Parish Neighbourhood Plan that the Chichester Local Plan Key Policies (CLPKP) service village concept of Plaistow-Ifold, which defines Plaistow and Ifold as a combined service village is not applicable.

Remove the service village concept of Plaistow-Ifold from the Chichester Local Plan Key Policies (CLPKP) which defines Plaistow and Ifold as a combined service village.

Please ensure the Examiner is aware of this unreasonable service-village concept, and the reasons noted above for why it is inappropriate for the Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan.

**What improvements or modifications would you suggest?**

***N.B. I request to be notified of the local planning authority’s decision under Regulation 19 in relation to the neighbourhood development plan.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Paragraph Number |  | Policy Reference: | 3.6 |

**Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph?** (Please tick one answer)

Support

Support with modifications  Oppose

Have Comments 

In Public Consultations and a Parish-wide survey conducted by the Parish Council, they asked landowners a question regarding the existing Settlement Boundary and extension to it, however they did not address a similar question of Plaistow. Residents should have been able to state whether they agreed Plaistow should also have a Settlement Boundary defined which enables unlimited windfall housing.

Plaistow village has the most services and facilities: a Primary School; village Green (with outdoor childrens’ playground), Plaistow Stores; Church; Pub; Football Club; Winterton Hall (with weekly post-office services); multi-use outdoor games area; a preschool (with its own dedicated outdoor play area); and WSCC Highways ‘adopted’ roads. Therefore, Plaistow village must have a defined Settlement Boundary.

**Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here:**

Insert new a Para regarding Plaistow Settlement Boundary.

The Local Planning Authority will define a Settlement Boundary around the village of Plaistow as it has done for Ifold, and which enables unlimited windfall housing managed by the policies within this Neighbourhood Plan.

**What improvements or modifications would you suggest?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Paragraph Number | Introduction 1.14 | Policy Reference: |  |

**Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph?** (Please tick one answer)

Support

Support with modifications

Oppose  Have Comments 

During the course of the Neighbourhood Plan development the former Parish Council Chairman appeased every criticism Plaistow councillors and residents had in relation to the suggestion of development within Plaistow village. She insisted upon the term sensitive historical environment being applied to references of Plaistow village in this NP. However, Plaistow village is no more sensitive or historic than any other settlement area. To use the term sensitive implies Plaistow has a higher hierarchy of importance in the Parish, and infers it is to be excluded from any development, which is not the case.

**Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here:**

Remove all references to ‘sensitive’ in relation to Plaistow village.

**What improvements or modifications would you suggest?**

# Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here:

I have suggested modifications.

I SUPPORT the Plaistow village housing development site identified in the Neighbourhood Plan Policy H1, which is opposite Plaistow village green, and within walking distance to the many Plaistow village services and facilities.

The site identified in Policy H1 - Site proposed for Housing Development: Land Opposite the Village Green in Plaistow, has been identified by the Parish Council as viable to meet the parish’s identified housing need of smaller units, and housing suitable for the elderly.

The identification of the site was supported by several ‘independent’ assessments:

1. a Site Options and Assessment (awarded to the Parish by Locality) and completed by AECOM on their behalf (15 August 2016).
2. a Health Check ‘Examination’ (awarded to the Parish by Locality) and completed by Intelligent Plans – Inspector Catherine Loveday BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI (June 2018).

Any housing on this Plaistow site is more sustainably located than the site CDC have assigned in their Site Allocations Development Plan Document (SADPD) which is in the countryside and lies outside the Ifold Settlement Boundary.

To include a new para in the Policy H1 – Objectives:

* Amend Para 6.13 to be:

To meet the CLPKP and NPPF requirement for sustainable development with commensurate infrastructure, and to have regard to the range of housing need and demand identified by the *Neighbourhood Plan Household Survey and Housing Needs Assessment* and, where relevant, other local assessments;

* Amend Para 6.14 in the Policy H1 – Objectives to be:

To promote affordable housing, specialist housing for the elderly, and housing to meet local needs, and with regard to the need to deliver a range of unit types at different price points;

* Include a new para in the Policy H1 – Justification:

Well-designed one- and two- bedroom units can attract those residents wishing to downsize from their existing homes, and this ability to free up existing family stock should be considered when assessing the unit mix of a new build development.

**What improvements or modifications would you suggest?**

Due to CDC planning policies there is an increase in housing density imposed on Ifold, and specifically within Ifold Estate, which is entirely within the Ifold settlement boundary and has unlimited ‘windfall’ housing as defined by the District Council. This results in the lighting of bonfires causing significant nuisance to houses in close proximity to one another and danger to visibility on the narrow private roads. There are no laws against having a bonfire, but there are laws for the nuisance they can cause.

I have suggested amendments.

**Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here:**

Include an AIM under Policy H2:

AIM – GARDEN BONFIRES:

There are no laws against having a bonfire, but there are laws for the nuisance they can cause.

Burning Domestic Waste:

Residents cannot get rid of household waste if it will cause pollution or harm people’s health. This includes burning it.

Residents are encouraged to get rid of household or garden waste by composting or recycling it.

Contact Chichester District Council to find out how to dispose of garden waste and about recycling in your area.

Residents could be fined if they light a fire and allow the smoke to drift across the road and become a danger to traffic. Chichester District Council can issue an ‘abatement notice’ if a neighbour’s bonfire is causing a nuisance. A bonfire must happen frequently to be considered a nuisance.

**What improvements or modifications would you suggest?**

The policy does not make reference to the Land Drainage Act 1991. I have suggested amendments.

Insert new conformity reference:

* The Land Drainage Act 1991 – which sets out the legal responsibilities of Riparian Ownership.

**What improvements or modifications would you suggest?**

The policy does not make mention to Riparian Ownership which defines the legal responsibilities of landowners as per the Land Drainage Act 1991.

# What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

* + Insert new text to Para 5.18 as follows:

Landowners are remined that they are considered a *Riparian Owner* by law if they own land which is adjacent to a watercourse or land which has a *watercourse* running through or underneath it.

The *Legal Responsibilities* of Riparian Ownership are that you are responsible for the maintenance and upkeep of the watercourses to ensure they do not become a flood risk to people, or property. Common problems affecting watercourses are:

* Allowing silt to build up, which can reduce the capacity of, or block, watercourses.
* Failing to keep vegetation growth under control.
* Disposal or storage of garden or domestic rubbish or waste on the banks of watercourses.
* Failing to clear the entrances to piped watercourses.
* Failing to obtain consent for any building, planting or alterations within eight (8) metres of the bank.
	+ Existing Para 5.18 will then be renumbered to be 5.19.

The policy does not make mention of Riparian Ownership which defines the legal responsibilities of residents and landowners.

**Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here:**

Insert in Policy Ci 1 – Reducing and avoiding flood risk

If landowners are a Riparian Owners, they are responsible for the maintenance and upkeep of the watercourses to ensure they do not become a flood risk to people, or property. The Land Drainage Act 1991 sets out the legal responsibilities of Riparian Owners

**What improvements or modifications would you suggest?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Paragraph Number | Introduction 1.12 –1.14 | Policy Reference: |  |

# Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here:

The CDC Site Allocations DPD allocates a green field site for 10 units (Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm and immediately opposite the brownfield site specified in this NP.). The CDC site lies outside of a defined Settlement Boundary and is located in designated countryside, whereby the policies of CDC’s own development plan state that development will only be permitted, where it requires a countryside location and meets an essential, small scale and local need, which cannot be met within or immediately adjacent to the existing settlement. These are the exact reasons CDC Planning gave in refusing planning application PS/19/02182/FUL (on the brownfield site). This site does not meet a local need and is unnecessary due to the unlimited windfall specified within the Ifold Settlement Boundary.

CDC did not demonstrate that the proposed dwellings require a countryside location, nor that it is required to meet an essential, small and local need. In consequence, the proposed 10 dwellings would result in an unjustified, unsustainable and harmful form of development that is located outside the Settlement Boundary. This is in conflict with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (as amended), Policies 1, 2 and 45 of Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 and the Draft Interim Policy Statement for Housing (June 2020). There are no exceptional circumstances that are of sufficient weight, so as to justify the development that is contrary to these policies.

Remove Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm from the CDC Site Allocations DPD and allow mixed-use housing on the brownfield site as per policy EE4 Brownfield Site in this NP.

**What improvements or modifications would you suggest?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Paragraph Number |  | Policy Reference: | EE4 Brownfield Site |

This policy does not provide sufficient emphasis regarding the Use Class B1(c) light industrial. Case in point, the site landowner’s most recent planning application (Reference: 19/02182/FUL) allocated an additional bedroom but did not provide specific conditions for the use as B1(c) light industrial.

In discussions the Parish Council / Steering Group had with CDC planning officers it was agreed that it would be best for Policy EE4 to be evaluated during Examination of The Plan. An experienced Inspector would likely offer further enhancement to this policy.

**Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here:**

I consider that it still be the appropriate course of action to have an independent Examiner review this policy. This site is next to Ancient Woodland, badger setts, a watercourse and other wildlife habitats. Whilst I believe the brownfield site should be decommissioned and a change of use be implemented, that is converted to part-residential use, the maximum number of units permitted to be built on this site needs to be specified to avoid over-development of the site to the detriment of its sensitive location.

Clearer emphasis is needed in the policy itself regarding the Use Class B1(c) light industrial requirements for each and every unit approved for development.

**What improvements or modifications would you suggest?**