

THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT
1990 AND
THE ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981

CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL
(TANGMERE)(NO 2) COMPULSORY
PURCHASE ORDER 2023

**APPENDIX AF1 TO THE
STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE**

OF

ANDREW FROST

Director of Planning and Environment

- 1.1 The chronology below details the frequent correspondence and meetings between the Council and the various landowners, promoters and agents regarding delivery of a scheme by the landowners. Key meetings and letters with the Council up to mid-2021 (shortly before the CPO1 inquiry) are summarised in the table at the end of this appendix. Communications after that time are recorded in the evidence of Peter Roberts.
- 1.2 I note in particular the following events in the period 2010-13, which illustrate the 'disjointedness' mentioned in paragraph 4.15 of my evidence:
 - 1.2.1 On 29 April 2010 Drivers Jonas Deloitte (on behalf of Church Commissioners) emailed CDC regarding attendance at a meeting together with Mr Heaver and Seaward Properties. A meeting was subsequently held on 14 May 2010, at which CDC attended with the Church Commissioners and Seaward;
 - 1.2.2 On 14 September 2011 a meeting was held between CDC, Church Commissioners, Seaward Properties and Mr Heaver to discuss masterplanning at Tangmere and the landowners confirmed their commitment to work together;
 - 1.2.3 On 2 November 2011 a meeting was held with the Consortium to discuss concept plan objectives, and the outcome of that meeting was the Consortium would agree a list of actions with the Council over the period to summer 2012;
 - 1.2.4 No further progress appeared to have been made, and in October 2012 Savills (on behalf of Mr Heaver) met separately with the Council and thereafter wrote to CDC to express the Heaver Family's support for the allocation of Tangmere;
 - 1.2.5 The Council sought to convene a development forum with the Consortium for 17 January 2013, but on 23 November 2012 Savills wrote to CDC to advise that it would be hearing from Church Commissioners and Seaward Properties to advise they would not be attending it, but that Mr Heaver wished to attend and present a plan for delivery of the first phase of a wider masterplan;
 - 1.2.6 On 26 November 2012 the Council wrote to Savills, Church Commissioners and Seaward Properties to relay that its fears had been confirmed that the Consortium had collapsed, and urged the parties to resolve their differences and present a 'united front' at the Development Forum;
 - 1.2.7 On 27 November 2012, Church Commissioners replied to reiterate their commitment to the scheme, that they would attend the forum and continue to engage with Mr Heaver and Seaward Properties to "move forward on a united front and on an equal basis";
 - 1.2.8 The Council's email records at this time are incomplete but no progress seems to have been made, and the issue of the ransom strip appears to have come to the fore in the intervening period. On

15 August 2013 Amanda Jobling (then CDC Director of Home & Community) emailed the Homes and Communities Agency for advice on how to unblock the stalemate between the landowners – she states: *“the landowner that controls the principle [sic] route into the site has stepped outside of the cooperative arrangements and is now stating that he wants a ransom payment to reflect the additional value his site controls. The other parties are not prepared to agree and the site risks being undeliverable.”*

- 1.2.9 On 5 September 2013 the Council met with Carter Jonas (on behalf of Church Commissioners) who advised that their client continued to support comprehensive growth but could not work with an inequitable approach to development with a ransom strip.
- 1.3 By this time it appeared to the Council that the landowners were not able to work together to devise and deliver a scheme. This was particularly so in the light of the ‘ransom strip’ issue, and work on the draft Local Plan was at an advanced stage. In order to be found sound the (then) draft local plan needed to show deliverability, and this could not be demonstrated in the absence of a clear and definitive agreement between the landowners.
- 1.4 It was therefore determined that the potential use of compulsory purchase powers would be referenced in the plan text. The alternative would have been to withdraw the site from the draft Local Plan and allocate an alternative (and less suitable) development site, which could have had significant adverse consequences in delaying the preparation of the Plan.
- 1.5 Therefore on 8 October 2013, the Council’s Cabinet approved the general principle that the Council would use its compulsory purchase powers if necessary to bring forward delivery of the strategic development locations.
- 1.6 The report to the Council’s Development Plan Panel (which precedes the Cabinet decision set out above) notes:
- “4.1 Officers have been involved in continuing communications with the planning consultants representing the landowners. Whereas previously the advice was the landowners had an agreed approach to implementation and delivery, officers have recently been made aware that there are disagreements over how the respective parties’ land is valued.*
- 4.2 It appears as though there is a situation where one of the landowners is claiming an enhanced value due to the need for access over a parcel of land. Other landowners are indicating that in this situation they will not bring their land forward for development. Discussions with the relevant land owners are continuing, however, the ability for officers to broker an agreement is relatively limited”.*
- 1.7 In the following period between September 2013 and November 2015, numerous communications between the Council and the landowners took place, including discussions as to the preparation of a masterplan and the importance of it being a masterplan for the site as a whole. However, no masterplan was prepared or shared with the Council. The Council also sought to reiterate that one of the

reasons for selecting the TSDL as a location for strategic growth was to ensure that the development would provide significant infrastructure in the area.

- 1.8 On 3 November 2015, the Council emailed the Consortium to outline concerns that no substantive progress had been made in terms of agreeing a landowners' agreement in respect of costs and values, and that officers did not have sufficient confidence that development of the Scheme was being actively progressed.
- 1.9 At a meeting held by the Council, which all of the landowners except for Mr Heaver or his representatives attended, the Council outlined that the requirement for the link road (a policy requirement of the adopted Local Plan, Neighbourhood Plan and, subsequently, the Local Plan Review) meant that no landowner could proceed in isolation, and that it was looking more likely that, in the absence of agreement, the use of CPO powers would be explored.
- 1.10 Subsequent letters sent from the Council to the Consortium sought to request details of ownerships and interests, and establish whether there was willingness on the part of the landowners to work together to deliver the Scheme. In response to this, the agent for Mr Heaver indicated in correspondence dated 22 February 2016 that in their view the ransom strip remained a valid consideration for provision of access to the A27.
- 1.11 The response letter dated 29 February 2016 on behalf of Pitts stated that there was a significant issue in being able to bring forward the land as a whole due to the stance of the owners of the control strip and their agent, who continue to maintain that they have a 'ransom' position, and would not engage in dialogue unless the other landowners are prepared to talk to them in regard to agreeing commercial terms.
- 1.12 A number of landowners, including those representing CS East Limited and CS South Limited (within the Heaver interests) did not respond to the requests for information about land interests made by the Council by letter dated 12 February 2016, and in the absence of key responses the Council sought to pursue replies and investigate the potential for a CPO.
- 1.13 On 7 June 2016, the Council's Cabinet resolved to appoint consultants to prepare a masterplan for the site, and to pursue compulsory purchase powers if necessary for the delivery of the scheme.
- 1.14 The Report to the Cabinet of 7 June 2016 notes:

"3.3 Throughout the formulation of the Local Plan, the Council was assured by the landowners and developers that there was a commitment to jointly deliver the scheme and requisite infrastructure in a coordinated way through the production of a masterplan and subsequent planning applications. However, since the Local Plan has been adopted and unlike the other strategic development locations there has been no progress in producing a masterplan which, in turn was expected to lead to the submission of a comprehensive outline planning application for the development as a whole. At this point in time the ability of the landowners and developers to work together to deliver the scheme has not been demonstrated and there is no confidence that the site will be delivered. Consequently, it is considered necessary to take steps to examine other methods

to bring forward development of the site, including the potential use of a compulsory purchase order (CPO) by the Council.

3.4 Officers have been meeting regularly with the consortium of landowners and developers and their respective agents over a number of years. However, there is one landowner whose interests are not represented at these meetings, despite being invited to attend. Given the lack of progress being made, those meetings have presently ceased. Following a meeting held on 18 December 2015, a letter was sent to consortium members requesting detailed information about their intentions in developing the SDL. While the majority of parties responded to the letter and expressed support for joint working to deliver the SDL, not all of those with an interest in the site have responded. Of those that did respond, none were able to offer a timetable for delivery.”

- 1.15 Since the adoption of the Local Plan in 2015 which formalised the allocation, the principal landowners have yet to produce a masterplan or planning application for the entire site – which is evidently due to the inability of the parties to reach agreement amongst themselves. The Council understands that its pursuit of CPO powers had provided ‘comfort’ to some of the landowners and further discussions had been held about an equalisation agreement and masterplan, however this was in the absence of any involvement of any of the Heaver interests and Bloor Homes.
- 1.16 At a further meeting on 21 February 2017 at which all of the landowners and/or their agents were present, the Council reiterated the need for comprehensive development and a comprehensive masterplan for the site. At the same meeting, the agent for the control strips would not confirm that his clients would be involved in the masterplan process.
- 1.17 In April 2018, a letter on behalf of the Church Commissioners, Pitts and Seaward Properties was sent to the Council, in which it was outlined that the landowners had invited Mr Heaver to participate in the masterplan preparation but that this invitation had been declined.
- 1.18 A Promotion and Option Agreement was entered into between Bloor Homes Limited, (which has an option over plot 16) and Bosham and Shopwyke Limited (a major owner of the Heaver Interests as set out in the table in paragraph 11.5 of the Council’s Statement of Case) in December 2012.
- 1.19 However the Promotion and Option Agreement did not result, and still has not resulted, in a planning application being submitted, or any detailed proposal being put forward to the Council for the comprehensive development of the TSDL or part of it.
- 1.20 Prior to the making of CPO1, the Council tendered for a development partner for the TSDL in the summer of 2018. None of the landowners applied to be involved (except for Seaward Properties, which has an option over plots 6 and 13), and the process resulted in the appointment of Countryside.
- 1.21 In November 2018, Countryside approached the landowners with heads of terms for voluntary acquisition. These discussions are discussed in the statement of evidence of Ged Denning and in the table in paragraph 11.5 of the Council’s Statement of Case.

- 1.22 Following the Council having passed its first resolution to proceed with the making of the Order on 3 March 2020, on 30 July 2020 a Memorandum of Understanding (the “MoU”) was entered into by the Church Commissioners, Pitts Family and the Heaver Interests, a copy of which is Appendix 5 to the Council’s Statement of Case.
- 1.23 The MoU provided that the parties would “continue to co-operate and collaborate” in order to bring forward a masterplan, agree a valuation approach and agree a procurement and delivery strategy. However, the fact remains that even after all these years, issues such as the ‘valuation approach’ had yet to be agreed. This was very significant since it was (and remains) the Council’s understanding that such difference of opinion as to valuation has proved a major stumbling block to development coming forward.
- 1.24 Subsequently, the Church Commissioners and the Pitts Family both agreed heads of terms (in September 2020 and November 2020 respectively) with Countryside. They have indicated that they will withdraw their objections on entering a voluntary agreement and at the time of making this statement the detailed documentation was in the process of being completed.
- 1.25 The Council has seen no evidence at all that the MoU has been acted upon and no steps have been taken to put forward an alternative scheme.
- 1.26 The Heaver Interests are the only parties ostensibly still promoting the concept of an alternative scheme to that promoted by the Council. The Council has maintained that it would be happy to hold meetings with Mr Heaver, but no responses have been received to date and no information advanced which would indicate to the Council that a credible and viable alternative to the Scheme exists.

Glossary:

Ashurst -	who act for Shopwyke and Bosham
ATP -	Aylward Town Planning (who act for Heaver Homes Ltd/John Heaver)
BH –	Bloor Homes (who hold option over much of HV land)
BS –	Ben Simpson, Drivers Jonas Deloitte - DJD - (who act for Church Commissioners) – subsequently becoming CJ
CC –	Church Commissioners of England (now C.C. Projects Limited)
CDC –	Chichester District Council
CJ –	Carter Jonas (who act for Church Commissioners)
CW –	Colin Wilkins, Savills (who acts for HV and CS East Ltd/CS South Ltd)
DJB -	Davitt Jones Bould (who act for CDC)
DJD –	Drivers Jonas Deloitte (who act for the Church Commissioners and the Pitts family)
HA –	Henry Adams (who acts for the Pitts family)
HV –	Herbert George Heaver
JL -	James Leaver, Knight Frank (instructed by CDC on valuation & CPO advice)
LB –	Luken Beck (who act for Seaward Properties)
NJ -	Nigel Jones, Chesters (who acted for CS South Ltd & CS East Ltd)
NLP –	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (who act for CC)
NP –	Neighbourhood Plan for Tangmere
OC/RC -	Osborne Clarke/Russell Cooke (who act for Countryside Properties)
OK -	Oliver King (who acts for John Heaver)
JW –	John Weir, Church Commissioners
Pitts -	The Pitts Family (Deirdre Jane Pitts, Michael Williams Pitts, Diana May Pitts, Valerie Ann Young, Andrew John Pitts)
Savills –	Savills (who act for HV and CS East Ltd/CS South Ltd and BH)
SP –	Seaward Properties (who have an option over some of Pitts land)
TPC –	Tangmere Parish Council
Consortium -	landowners (CC, HV, Pitts, owners of Tangmere Business Park) and their advisors/representatives

No.	Date	Event
1.	29 April 2010	Email from BS re attending meeting joint with HV and SH
2.	14 May 2010	Meeting Note (CDC, CC and SP) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • discussion of potential development at Tangmere
3.	14 September 2011	Meeting Note (CDC, CC, SP, HV) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • discussion of masterplanning Tangmere, importance of Tangmere, commitment from landowners to work together
4.	23 September 2011	Representations to Core Strategy – Housing Numbers and Locations Consultation (DJD obo Consortium) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consortium recognises importance of working together and has significant experience of planning and delivering development • Submitted Vision for Tangmere • Need to plan for more homes • Suggest comprehensive development should be at Tangmere (circa 1500 homes)
5.	2 November 2011	Notes of meeting with Consortium <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of concept plan • Discussion of constraints/opportunities
6.	22 October 2012	Letter from CW to CDC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HV are supportive of allocation of land at Tangmere and wish to participate and promote land as part of a wider vision for housing
7.	23 November 2012	Letter from CW to CDC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC and SP will not be attending Development Forum 17 Jan 2013 • HV remain committed to supporting strategy for housing delivery at Tangmere and wish to attend Forum. Land can be delivered as a first phase of a wider masterplan. Would welcome opportunity to present how this can be achieved.
8.	26 November 2012	Email from CDC to CW, CC and SP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correspondence received confirms fears • Discussions held over how to get consortium back together and to resolve issues around development economics • Urge you to find a resolution amongst yourselves. • Be cautious about what is said as disagreement amongst consortium may be used as a basis to undermine development proposals • Stress importance of united front being presented at Development Forum
9.	27 November 2012	Email from CC to CDC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underline CC ongoing support for achieving strategic growth at Tangmere • Always been open about desire to work constructively with landowners and have maintained regular communication with officers about progress

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to hold dialogue with SP and HV over how to move forward on a united front . • Will attend Development Forum on 17 Jan 2013 and other meetings organised by CDC around strategic growth
10.	15 August 2013	<p>Email from CDC to Homes & Communities Agency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDC seeking advice on the 'problem' of the landowners not co-operating • Landowner that controls principal route into the site now states he wants a ransom payment to reflect the additional value his site controls, which the other parties do not agree to • Site risks being undeliverable
11.	5 September 2013	<p>Meeting Agenda (CDC, CJ)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council's approach to pursue CPO •
12.	5 September 2013	<p>Meeting Note (CDC, CJ)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CJ acting on behalf of CC and not instructed by HV or SP • Importance of demonstrating deliverability of Tangmere • CC continue to support comprehensive growth at Tangmere but cannot work with an inequitable approach to development with a ransom strip
13.	11 December 2013	<p>Letter from BH to CDC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bloor Homes has option on land controlled by HV to north of ransom strip and therefore has no influence over discussions concerning ransom strip • Not seen alternative access into the strategic site • Fully supportive and welcome opportunity to engage with TPC; commitment has been made previously to fund this process however do not support approach if the NP is to prepare detailed masterplan • Welcome opportunity to understand with concept statement would seek to achieve
14.	11 December 2013	<p>Letter from CW to CDC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In principle they are willing to contribute towards the costs of CDC appointing an independent expert to stand between the land owners and CDC to provide advice in respect of the valuation framework that would be utilised when a CPO procedure is invoked. • The Heaver family are supportive of the land owners and promoters (Seaward Homes and Bloor Homes) working together to present a comprehensive master plan. This approach could extend to engagement with Tangmere Parish Council to inform their Neighbourhood Plan and associated public consultation if deemed appropriate.

15.	11 December 2013	Individual letters sent from CDC to Consortium <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following from letter 24 Sept 2013 informing you of possibility of using a CPO for Tangmere SDL, writing to gather information to proceed. • Please confirm exact interests of your client and details of who owns or has interest in the land. Please provide description that corresponds with Companies House.
16.	13 December 2013	Email from BH to CDC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm Bloor Homes has an option on land under ownership of HV in northern part of SDL. Bloor do not own any of the land
17.	18 December 2013	NP meeting (with TPC, Consortium, CDC and NP steering group) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of role of NP in concept plan • Concerns over NP • Consortium confirmed meeting with HV to discuss new access; confirmed intention to work together but concerns over ransom and cost of NP and delivery • Meetings to be held with consortium, CDC and NP group on regular 6 weekly basis
18.	10 January 2014	Email from CW to CJ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given HE agreement to second access, requirement for inclusion of HV control strip is superfluous. Both principal land areas can be promoted at the same time forming part of an overall masterplan but as 2 separate planning applications. • Any collaboration involving HV control strip is unnecessary
19.	14 January 2014	Email from CW to CDC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of land ownership – Heaver. Control strips owned by CS South Ltd and CS East Ltd.
20.	23 June 2014	Email from Savills to CDC, NP group and Consortium <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sets out indicative timescales for delivering large strategic projects such as this
21.	18 September 2014	Statement of Common Ground signed by CDC, CC, SP and Bloor Homes submitted to the Chichester Local Plan Examination in Public
22.	27 February 2015	Meeting Note (Steve Carvell, Andrew Frost, Mike Allgrove, Tracey Flitcroft, Jeremy Bushell, Anna Gillings, Ron Hatchett, Ben Simpson, Mark Luken, Steve Culpitt, Chris Rees, John Weir) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plan and NP updates • Masterplanning – importance for the site to be planned as whole, concerns that HV land might not be available and presence of ransom strips • EIA to be a single screening • Infrastructure

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next meeting 20 April 2015 – did not take place as result of Local Plan unknown and no feedback from masterplanning
23.	5 March 2015	<p>Chain of emails between Consortium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> agree meeting at Luken Beck offices meeting to discuss masterplanning and programming Steve Culpitt (SP) reiterates Ben Simpson's (DJD) comments "we must be clear that this will be on the basis of preparing a masterplan that will have the council's support and sign-off, prior to submission of a single planning application for the SDL."
24.	9 March 2015	<p>Letter from Andrew Frost (CDC) to consortium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> need for concerted and coordinated effort of all parties to ensure timely delivery of homes reassured that those around the table appear to have a common goal and that CDC will continue to allocate staff resources to this project work to produce comprehensive masterplan, single EIA and a single outline planning application Infrastructure is long-standing concern for local community – one of reasons for selecting this SDL is to ensure that the development will provide significant infrastructure to lessen proportionate infrastructure deficit. CDC will resist any attempts for the piecemeal development of the site.
25.	9 March 2015	<p>Email from CDC to CW</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like to meet to discuss the intentions of your client in relation to the development of the site
26.	7/8 April 2015	<p>Email chain between CDC and LB</p> <p>CDC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CDC unable to make headway in terms of resolving ransom strip CDC resolved at Cabinet meeting on 8 Oct 2013 to consider CPO if landowners cannot come to a negotiated solution, although this is a route CDC would hope they do not have to follow <p>LB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> hopefully the requirement for a masterplan, phasing plan, outline PA with spine road and S106 will demonstrate to reluctant landowner that there is no room for isolation and trying to create a ransom Consortium met on 1 April 2015 and is progressing with masterplan studies
27.	14 May 2015	<p>Email chain between CDC and CJ</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CDC request for news on progression of masterplan BS confirms that in the process of procuring technical studies to inform the masterplan, and the outcome will be beyond a meeting in June/July
28.	11 June 2015	<p>Tangmere NP meeting – Brian Wood (NP), Simon Oakley (CDC Cllr), Steve Culpitt (SP), Bryony Stala (not sure), Andrew Frost (CDC), Tracey Flitcroft (CDC), Andrew Irwin</p>

		(NP), Ben Simpson (CJ), Ron Hatchett (BH), Steve Carvell (CDC), Mike Allgrove (CDC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion over education provision • Update on Local Plan and NP • Developers to produce draft delivery timetable with lead in timings • Discussion over ransom strip – requirement for 1 masterplan but could have 2 applications with shared S106 agreement
29.	16 June 2015	Letter from CDC to CS South Ltd <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to understand your intentions as a landowner in relation to development of the SDL and would be grateful if you could provide information, or are happy to meet
30.	23 June 2015	Letter from Blake Morgan LLP to CDC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation that acts for CS South Ltd and clients are happy to cooperate with SDL delivery. Clients are represented by Colin Wilkins of Savills
31.	1 July 2015	Email from CDC to CW <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite to meeting on 21 July to discuss Local Plan, masterplanning obo CS South Ltd
32.	1 July 2015	Email from CW' PA to CDC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colin can attend meeting on 21 July.
33.	Undated but follows meeting 21 July	Letter (text only) to consortium <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand that ransom strip is holding up the masterplanning of the site • Believe that all parties are of opinion that need to work together towards achieving comprehensive masterplan/planning application • CDC can act as a mediator between any disputes
34.	4 – 17 August 2015	Various emails between CDC and Consortium to arrange new meeting as consortium unable to meet on 21 August
35.	27 August 2015	Email from CDC to Consortium <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite to meeting on 5 November at CDC to discuss masterplanning and timing of application • “As usual it has proved very difficult to arrange a meeting that you can all attend”
36.	2 November 2015	Email from BH to CDC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BH and Savills unable to attend meeting on 5 November
37.	2 November 2015	Email from CDC to Consortium <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reminder of meeting on 5 November • Received apologies from Bloor, Savills and Pitts
38.	3 November 2015	Email from CW to CDC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unable to attend meeting
39.	3 November 2015	Email from CDC to Consortium <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting on 5 November has been cancelled given number of invitees unable to attend. Expresses disappointment given meeting was organised many weeks ago • NP is at examination and now carries significant weight

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have received assurances that development of SDL will be delivered as a comprehensive scheme and that there is no ransom strip. CDC have expected the consortium to be able to agree a landowners agreement in respect of costs and values so that work on the masterplan can commence, however it appears that no substantive progress has been made • Officers do not have sufficient confidence that development of the scheme is being actively progressed. • Options are: 1. consortium provides reassurance and evidence that it is working together and is capable of delivering a comprehensive masterplan with indicative timescales. 2. CDC investigates CPO to facilitate development. 3. As part of the LPR, CDC considers removing the allocation as it cannot be demonstrated that it is deliverable. • CDC's preference is that development of the SDL progresses however the Council may have little option but to progress one or more of the above options • Request availability for an urgent meeting
40.	30 November 2015	<p>Email from CDC to Consortium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite to meeting on 18 December 3-4pm at CDC • "As usual it has proved very difficult to arrange a meeting that you can all attend"
41.	4 December 2015	<p>Email from CDC to Consortium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reminder of meeting on 18 December and request confirmation that representatives will be attending • If unable to attend, request confirmation of whether you wish to continue with meetings. Also would be useful to understand what you see the issues are in the delivery of the SDL in the short to medium term.
42.	16 December 2015	<p>Email from Savills to CDC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unable to attend meeting • Understand that the purpose of the meeting is to focus on matters concerning control strip of which neither Bloor nor Savills have any involvement with or influence over
43.	18 December 2015	<p>Meeting on SDL – Steve Carvell (CDC), Mike Allgrove (CDC), John Pitts, Simon Slatford (CC), Steve Culpitt (SP), Andrew Frost (CDC), Tracey Flitcroft (CDC), Martin Curry (HA), Alex Gillington (CC), Mark Luken (LB)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update into Local Plan, NP & CIL progress • Noted absence of representatives for land in 2 ownerships north of Pitts' land and south of A27 • Meeting had been set up between Consortium and CS South/CS East but cancelled by Colin Wilkins • Requirement for link road meant no landowner can proceed in isolation • More likely that a CPO will be investigated

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of removing allocation
44.	12 February 2016	<p>Individual emails from CDC to Consortium with letter attachment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attach letter to gauge progress in development of the site • Request availability for a meeting
45.	12 February 2016	<p>Individual letters from CDC to Consortium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter to gather information to enable investigation into a CPO • Request details of ownership/interests; willingness to work with CDC and other parties; timetable for delivery; any background work; evidence of joint working amongst the consortium • Reiterate need for masterplan, single EIA and single planning application with S106. • CDC's preference is that development of the SDL is led by consortium rather than having to resort to use of CPO powers, however if consortium unable to demonstrate delivery within reasonable timeframe the Council will look to proceed with a CPO of the whole or part of the site.
46.	22 February 2016	<p>Letter from CW to CDC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm HV own land adjoining and access to A27, under option to Bloor Homes • HV and BH always been willing to bring forward land for housing. BH have sought pre-application but not met with positive response. BH are willing to prepare a single masterplan for the whole area and submit an outline application for the land under their option. • BH intent to submit a planning application has been frustrated to CDC to date • Never been any objection in principle to working with other land owners to deliver master plan area • Control strip remains valid consideration for provision of access to the A27. Your suggestion to invoke CPO powers is welcomed.
47.	26 February 2016	<p>Letter from BH to CDC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BH have option over land within northern area of SDL. Land is owned by HV family. • Savills and BH have attended numerous meetings to work to bring the SDL forward. Savills requested a meeting in August 2015 to discuss how further progress could be made but CDC declined the offer. • Need to expedite progress to achieving planning permission and construction as quickly as possible. • BH have commissioned topographical, ecology, access and FRA/Utilities studies to enable progress but is frustrated by lack of willingness for other parties to invest in sourcing similar levels of evidence.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 2015, sought agreement with other parties to source quotations for high level land use strategy plan, but mid-2015 informed by other parties that they no longer wished to pursue this • Consider that the SDL would not be prejudiced by separate planning applications provided masterplan and IDP are single
48.	29 February 2016	<p>Letter from HA to CDC (response to request for information)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land owned by John Pitts and is being promoted by Steve Culpitt at SP • Have always maintained that the land is available for development and have agreements with SP to promote the land to that effect • Understand necessity to bring forward site with one masterplan by way of a single planning application and S106 agreement • Land continues to be available • Client is longstanding tenant of CC and has ongoing discussions to resolve outstanding matters in regard to his other interests however this does not preclude the land coming forward in the future • Significant issue in being able to bring land forward as a whole is the stance taken by the owners of the control strip and represented by Colin Wilkins. This party continue to maintain that they have a ransom position which we do not agree with. They will not engage in dialogue unless the other landowners are prepared to talk to them in regard to agreeing commercial terms. • SP have responsibility to carry out survey work and have responsibility to prepare masterplan.
49.	2 March 2016	<p>Letter from NLP to CDC (response to request for information)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landowners are CC. Tenancy with John Pitts • Consistently confirmed that are willing to work with CDC and, on an equalised basis, with other landowners. Confirm that CC are prepared to work with landowners to achieve single masterplan and single outline permission • Timetable remains for discussion and agreement. No wish to delay the preparation of a planning application and will commit resources • CC have explored how land (excepting HV land) could come forward but understand CDC's preference for whole allocation. • Regular dialogue with SP and BH for many years. SP and CC have acknowledged CDC's desire for single scheme and support single application provided all landowners reach agreement on an equalised approach. • CC wish to continue to work with other landowners to deliver scheme.
50.	3 March 2016	Email from CDC to CW

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request confirmation whether recent letter is on behalf of HV and CS South Ltd and CS East Ltd
51.	8 March 2016	<p>Email from CDC to the Consortium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arrange a meeting on 8 April 2016
52.	9 March 2016	<p>Emails between CDC and Consortium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unable to make 8 April, suggested other dates 15/19 April
53.	6 April 2016	<p>Email from CDC to Consortium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In absence of key responses (to CDC's letter dated 12 Feb 2016) continuing to pursue replies and investigate potential for CPO. Not felt there is benefit in meeting until this work has progressed and we are clearer on the scope and timescale for the CPO. Nothing appears to have changed from developers/landowners that would warrant a meeting Meeting on 15 April (was moved from 8 April) cancelled.
54.	25 April 2016	<p>Letter from CDC to CW</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have not received a response to our letter dated 12 Feb obo CS East Ltd and CS South Ltd Are in the process of pursuing a CPO of the SDL and will be taking a report through the committee process Request confirmation that you represent the landowners CS South and CS East and forward their response to the questions in the letter.
55.	2 June 2016	<p>Letter CW to CDC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clients willing to work CDC subject to agreement of commercial terms Other landowners sought to neutralise control of strips by seeking to adversely influence planning process, resulting in delay in deliving housing numbers <p>Bloor willing to prepare single masterplan for overall development and submit application for land controlled by their option.</p>
56.	7 June 2016	<p>Email from CDC to Consortium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notify of Cabinet approval to undertake further work to deliver the Tangmere SDL, potentially through a CPO Request availability for a meeting
57.	2 August 2016	<p>Meeting Note CDC, CW (Savills), John Heaver, Mike Allgrove (CDC), Tracey Flitcroft (CDC))</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CW confirmed that the reason for meeting was to confirm he represented the owners of the control strips. Whilst willing to work with other landowners, the control strip remains CDC would prefer the site to be brought forward by consortium but no progress had been made/appeared likely CDC confirmed that had refused pre-app meeting with Bloor to discuss site outside of

		landowner/developer meeting. If pre-app was requested and paid for then CDC would meet in line with that process
58.	2 November 2016	<p>Meeting Note CDC – Steve Carvell (CDC), Mike Allgrove (CDC), Andrew Frost (CDC), Tracey Flitcroft (CDC), Steve Culpitt (SP), Mark Luken (Luken Beck), Alex Gillington (Gerald Eve), John Pitts, Pauline Roberts (NLP), Martin Curry (Henry Adams)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress on masterplan as intention of CDC to pursue CPO had given comfort to spend money on background studies • Equalisation agreement had been discussed • Masterplan produced by consortium (excluding BH, HV, CS South and CS East) • Outline planning application to be submitted June 2017 • Need to continue momentum with CPO despite progress on masterplan – but whether whole site will need to be subject to CPO or only part where there is no willing landowner
59.	24 November 2016	<p>Email from Martin Curry (Henry Adams)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commenting on draft note of meeting on November 2016, requests that the meeting note “rather than the possibility of CPO it says the intention to pursue as it will give a stronger message to those that were not present at the meeting.”
60.	18 January 2017	<p>Email from JL to CDC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note of conversation with CW (Savills) • CW confirmed he advises HV family; no formal appointment from CS East or CS South – “clearly muddled about who he acts for” • Chris Rees advises BH – no conflict of interest because interests of respective clients are aligned • HV negotiated with Highways England to provide new access onto site • CW did deal for HV to sell option to BH for site with access of A27/A285 and connectivity to village amenities – vague about dates but about 4 years ago • Believe that BH could deliver site in isolation – JL corrected and said CDC looking for holistic solution hence pursuing CPO. CW stated that HV are willing participants provide commercial agreement is reached with other landowners to secure access over control strips • Tried to get information on KF’s instruction/timetable. • CW away week of meeting on 21 Feb but important to send someone; admitted he hadn’t been to many meetings because “the land owners go over the same ground whenever they meet” so onus on CC and SP to make an offer
61.	10 February 2017	Email from CW to CDC and JL (KF)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding that NJ has been appointed to represent owners of CS South Ltd and CS East Ltd. John Read will attend meeting on 21 Feb
62.	21 February 2017	<p>Meeting Note CDC – Mike Allgrove (CDC), Andrew Frost (CDC), Tracey Flitcroft (CDC), Nigel Riley (Citicentric), James Leaver (Knight Frank), Mark Luken (Luken Beck), Steve Culpitt (SP), John Pitts, Martin Curry (Henry Adams), Pauline Roberts (NLP), Mark Schull (NLP), Alex Gillington (Gerald Eve), Rebecca Fenn-Tripp (BH), Chris Rees (Savills), Simon Cash (BH), Charlotte Gorst (Gerald Eve), Nigel Jones (Chesters)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response from TPC to masterplan proposal document prepared by CC and SP (this and technical information funded by CC and SP) BH had not been asked to be part of masterplan team, confirmed they were happy to engage Importance of tripartite masterplan was stressed. Involvement of KF and CPO work had given confidence in moving forward Work had slipped but pre-app could be achieved by June Progress on technical studies on CC/SP land, and ecology survey had been undertaken on BH land CDC expect comprehensive development. Although possible for comprehensive masterplan to be prepared which includes part of site with unwilling landowner, difficult to demonstrate deliverability. CDC could CPO part of the site NJ could not confirm that his clients would be involved in the masterplan process Consideration of CC/SP as development partner if CPO went ahead Consideration of removal of allocation through LPR Needs to be an indication of date/line in the sand when the CPO goes ahead or when the landowners need to reach agreement by
63.	21-25 November 2017	Email chain between JL, BH & NJ re meeting on 24 November 2017
		<p>23 November 2017 Email from NJ to BH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Now unable to attend meeting <p>24 November 2017 Email from JL to NJ</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request whether anyone else will be attending to represent CS South Ltd and CS East Ltd <p>24/25 November 2017 Emails between JL and BH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BH had believed meeting would be planning focussed but focus was on land ownership and commercial agreements which was unexpected HV are keen to support masterplan but cannot confirm intentions of owners of control strips JL responded to state function of meeting was to enable consortium to present masterplan, as this was not received it was not unreasonable for CDC

		<p>to use the opportunity to clarify the status of collaboration between the parties to understand the prospects of delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC responded to state that there was a misunderstanding on part of BH and they intend to convene landowner meeting before Christmas
64.	25 April 2018	<p>Letter from Alex Gillington (Gerald Eve) to BH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter on behalf of CC, Pitts, SP in relation to the SDL, in respect of BH's interest and of landowners. • Parties have sought to engage with landowners and extend open offer to collaborate in process on basis of equalisation on gross acreage to enable move forward to facilitate delivery • Open offer has been made on same basis to NJ who represents CS South Ltd and CS East Ltd
65.	25 April 2018	<p>Letter from Alex Gillington (Gerald Eve) to CDC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter on behalf of CC, Pitts, SP in relation to the Tangmere SDL • Parties have been working closely over a number of years to bring forward the site for development through masterplan. Parties have invited owners of land within northern section of SDL (HV) to participate yet they have declined to do so • Parties encouraged CDC to consider using CPO powers • Since Cabinet resolution to investigate CPO powers, parties have continued to advance masterplan and remain committed to bringing forward land. Given this commitment, it is not considered necessary for landholdings to be acquired, nor in public interest • Parties committed to working collaboratively with CDC to support selection process of a development partner and will share technical work and masterplanning to date; committed to working with the development partner
66.	21 June 2018	<p>Letter from NJ to JL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clients are happy to join in with the scheme however require market value for their land
67.	6 March 2019	<p>Email Note of Meeting CDC – Simon Cash (BH), Colin Wilkins (Savills), John Heaver, Oliver King (King & Co), Mike Allgrove (CDC), Andrew Frost (CDC)</p> <p>Points by those representing HV:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress being made on land assembly including control strip which is being acquired by HV • HV is willing party and has been frustrated by other parties • HV want to be involved in development with Countryside – BH delivering phase 1 and Heaver Homes delivering homes in SE part • HV and advisers (not BH) met with Countryside. Countryside's offer unacceptable. • Considering preparing separate masterplan and outline applications with early phases

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can be demonstrated that CPO not necessary <p>Points made by CDC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDC expect Countryside to assemble site voluntarily, or compulsorily if necessary • CDC expect Countryside to develop site • CDC will use CPO powers if needed and this work is in parallel with Countryside's efforts to negotiate • Negotiation must be with Countryside and CDC would not comment on possible arrangements beyond noting that large sites are frequently developed by more than one developer • Any separate masterplan and planning applications would be determined objectively but given previous performance of consortium, CDC have put in place other mechanisms to deliver the scheme on a comprehensive basis <p>Note made by CDC</p>
68.	25 March 2019	<p>Meeting at CDC note made by CW (Savills)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HV have agreed to purchase control strips – should accelerate and facilitate delivery without recourse to CPO • HV liaising with other landowners seeking collaboration for delivery of SDL • HV in discussion with Countryside to discuss terms for inclusion of land (inc BH interest) within masterplan. BH did not attend meeting as it related to offer made by Countryside to HV to which BH are not party. HV are encouraging BH to engage with Countryside • Heaver Homes may wish to build housing on part of their land subject to BH option • Heaver Homes promoting a separation application at Tangmere Corner – CDC expressed some scepticism about submission of a pre-app. HV have many motivations including the fact they want the site to be developed as quickly as possible; which aligns with CDC's objective. HV believe this is best achieved if CDC support the pre-app as land can come forward quicker than Countryside • Tangmere Corner app has shown how Southern Water's proposed location for their new sewer is not the most efficient, which suspect neither Countryside nor other landowners have considered • In event, archaeological surveys reveal significant constraints, HV have additional land to south of Tangmere Road which would be willing to be included in allocation.
69.	9 July 2019	<p>Letter from Aylward Town Planning to Turley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representations on behalf of Heaver Homes Ltd/John Heaver to TSDL framework masterplan • Masterplan fails to satisfy policy objectives • Ongoing lack of engagement with owners

70.	30 July 2019	<p>Meeting note CDC - Oliver King (King & Co), Mark Aylward (Aylward Town Planning), Andrew Frost/Hannah Chivers (CDC)</p> <p>Topics discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress towards TSDL Masterplan and engagement with landowners • Potential changes to Southern Water scheme • Progress on local plan review • Broadbridge representations • Tangmere Airfield availability
71.	3 September 2019	<p>Letter from CW to CDC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavers maintain no need for masterplan to include their land as it can be developed separately • Heavers will continue to engage to explore how development could be brought forward together • Discussions will need to include Bloor
72.	23 September 2019	<p>Letter CDC to Savills:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response to CW's letter dated 3 September 2019 to outline the Council's planning policy position subsequent to meeting on 30 July 2019. • Planning policy for TSDL is set out in Local Plan policy and emphasises the need for the TSDL to be planned through comprehensive masterplanning process meeting specific policy requirements, including those within made Tangmere NP. • CDC not in a position to prevent planning applications being submitted, however applications would be assessed against relevant development plan policy. • CDC has been seeking to engage with all principal landowners within the SDL to seek delivery of entire TSDL. • Note that HV have been working with BH to bring forward a planning application. • No planning application has been submitted for the site, nor has evidence been provided of any form of collaboration between HV, BH and other landowners/option holders. • Significance of TSDL is such that in the absence of agreement between landowners to achieve policy objectives, CDC is seeking to bring forward comprehensive development by the making of a CPO. • CPUK appointed as development partner for purposes of masterplanning, obtaining planning permission and delivering the TSDL. HV has had sight of the development agreement. • CDC remain open to continuing discussions with you concerning the development of the TSDL, including delivery of its policy objectives.
73.	30 December 2019	<p>Letter from OK to CDC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm agreement and support of masterplan, subject to further refinement and minor

		<p>representations (none of which impede delivery of the masterplan).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations include historical route for Southern Water foul sewer which reduces housing density and is too generous a buffer along southern boundary to Tangmere Road • No infrastructure provision for future growth of settlement south onto Tangmere Airfield • Clients are committed to delivery of the TSDL and their view is that their development proposals and aspirations are entirely consistent with Countryside's masterplan. Clients can bring forward own proposals which complement current thinking in a way that is mutually beneficial for all and avoids need for CPO • Endorsement of the masterplan will permit the submission of a planning application by my clients for the whole TSDL or in collaboration with other landowners. Clients have secure control strips and are agreeable to their inclusion in a planning application. There is no impediment that would frustrate delivery of the TSDL. • No need or requirement for Council to utilise CPO powers and private treaty discussions are progressing well. • Awaiting further detail from Countryside on their proposals. There is a meeting on 9 January • Offered control strips to CC and Pitts family and are awaiting details of their preferred structure to equalising across development. Suggested that CC and Pitts may wish to acquire a right of way over or to acquire outright the land associated with the arterial road infrastructure to enable delivery.
74.	10 January 2020	<p>Letter from CDC to OK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requesting clarification of John Heaver's interests in TSDL • Engagement has been ongoing for 10 years with no definitive proposals submitted and no evidence that landowners have agreed collaborative alternative approach • CDC remains open to further negotiation
75.	5 May 2020	WOP letter from OC to Ashurst
76.	14 May 2020	WOP letter from Ashurst to OC
77.	26 June 2020	WOP letter from OC to Ashurst
78.	3 August 2020	WOP letter from Ashurst to OC
79.	5 August 2020	WOP letter from OK to Andrew Frost (CDC)
80.	12 August 2020	<p>Email from Andrew Frost (open) to OK (WOP) letter dated 5 August 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note nature of Heaver family interest

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of bringing forward development of TSDL and importance in meeting housing needs and policy objectives. • Council in discussion with all landowners since 2010 – since then no definite proposals • In absence of policy compliant proposals that CDC has decided to pursue CPO powers, however CDC has all along been willing to listen to proposals that will secure comprehensive masterplanning and development of the TSDL • Request copy of MoU – although from what you have stated it appears to represent an agreement to agree and there are still number of stages to go through before landowners can progress meaningful proposals • CDC willing to meet all landowners, however all relevant individuals and parties would need to be present.
81.	20 August 2020	WOP letter from OC to Ashurst
82.	26 August 2020	WOP letter from Ashurst to OC
83.	28 August 2020	<p>Letter from OK to Andrew Frost (CDC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encloses MOU • CDC cannot seek to wash its hands of negotiations with landowners • Requests CDC intervene and meet with all landowners to be co-ordinated by OK
84.	7 September 2020	<p>Letter from DJB to OK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No other masterplan has been brought forward yet • CDC remains willing to meet to discuss any such proposals • MOU does not preclude making the CPO
85.	8 October 2020	WOP letter from Ashurst to DJB
86.	16 October 2020	WOP Letter RC to Ashurst
87.	16 October 2020	<p>Letter DJB to Ashurst</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responding to letter 8 October 2020 • CDC remains willing to see any meaningful proposals for policy-compliant development of TSDL • CDC has been in dialogue for a number of years but failure to produce a proposal has led to need for CPO • OK has not been in contact since 28 August 2020 letter to convene all parties • Other parties to MOU have instead been progressing direct HOTs with CPUK
88.	16 October 2020	<p>Email from CDC to OK</p> <p>List of dates for possible meeting with all landowners</p>

89.	8 December 2020	<p>Letter from Ashust to DJB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responding to letter 16 October 2020 • Maintains that responsibility has been 'ceded' to CPUK • Agreement with Bloor is not necessary pre-requisite to agreeing terms with CPUK – could be conditional • CPO is premature – MOU 'paves the way for a clear alternative'
90.	17 August 2021	<p>Email from CDC to M Bodley (Heaver agent) to confirm CDC position in light of recent emails with CPUK/DWD</p>