



MINUTES: NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - STEERING GROUP

DATE: 12 September 2016 at 6.30pm

AGENDA:

1. Minutes
2. Apologies.
3. Review 6th and 8th September 2016 Public Consultation: Attendance, Comments, Analysis
4. Review the four potential development sites against sustainability criteria:
 - Site 1: Land opposite The Green, Plaistow
 - Site 2: Land adjacent to Todhurst, Plaistow
 - Site 4: Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm, Ifold
 - Site 7: Land adjacent to The Dairy, Plaistow
5. Local Green Spaces
6. Draft proposal from the Steering Group to Parish Council for 13 September 2016 meeting
7. Updates on Draft Plan for Colin Smith Planning

Present: Steering Group: Sara Burrell (SRB), Denise Knightley (DK), Bill Townsend (BT), Sallie Baker (SB), David Ribbens (DR), Vivien Forwood (VF), Sophie Capsey (SC), Richard Wyatt (RW) and Christine Gibson-Pierce (CGP).

6.40PM The meeting opened.

- 1. Minutes:** With no-one else volunteering, CGP again took the minutes.
- 2. Apologies:** Steering Group: Beverley Weddell (Parish Clerk) and Phil Colmer (PC). SRB reported that Suzanne Hounslow has resigned. Suzie's interpretation of the AECOM Site Options and Assessment report is that it sets a precedence that all future development would be in Plaistow. Even though this was not the case and that it had been pointed out to her that the Neighbourhood Plan sets a unique exception for development outside a settlement boundary and in the countryside, that otherwise any proposed development in Plaistow would be managed by countryside policies, however she was resolute and had resigned. CGP reported that she had also emailed Malcolm Frost to ask if he still wished to be part of the Steering Group as he had not attended a meeting for many months nor made any comments on matters. CGP reminded the group that she always offers a selection of meeting dates then chooses the one where the most number of people can attend at the earliest date and it was unfortunate if that was not convenient with Malcolm Frost's schedule. Malcolm had not responded to her email. The group voted to remove Malcolm Frost from the Steering Group email distribution. He of course will be still able to access information on the Neighbourhood Plan website as with all residents.
- 3. Public Consultation 6th and 8th September:** The outcome was discussed. There had been 136 attendees across the four sessions of two evenings (approx.10% of the Parish population). It was the general consensus of the group that though it may seem a low attendance, many parishioners may have been to previous consultations and thought they had already seen everything or had looked online. In total across the two days: Ifold 47.8%; Plaistow 42%; Durfold Wood 7.3% and Shillinglee 2.9%. RW commented that Ifold's population is about 70% of the Parish. The group were reminded that there is a considerable amount of information on the Neighbourhood Plan website, which more parishioners are following; and the publicity that preceded the recent consultation evenings included A3 roadside posters, 3 large banners at key road junctions, the notice in *The Parish News*, social media posts and notices put up on the Parish Council noticeboards in all the settlements. CGP advised she had also placed a Neighbourhood Plan update into the October issues of *The Village Tweet* and *The Parish News* to keep people further informed and to remind them to look at the website.
 - 3.1** BT informed on the analysis of comments from the consultation that had been done (from comment forms received.) Though residents were not specifically asked to comment on or rank development sites many respondents had provided their view, specifically relating to three potential sites: The Dairy, Todhurst and Land Opposite the Green.



3.2 BT advised there had been a majority of positive responses to all of the Local Green Spaces (LGS) proposed for designation and very few negative comments:

- 95.7% of respondents favoured LGSD1 (Durfold Wood). There were two negative comments from residents of Durfold Wood. Some of the Durfold Wood residents were positive about the proposed Local Green Space for Durfold Wood;
- 100% favoured LGSi1-5 (Ifold);
- 97.8% favoured LGSi6 (Land adjacent to The Lane, Ifold – assessed for recreational space);
- 100% favoured LGSi7 (Ancient Woodland in Ifold centre);
- 100% favoured LGSP1 (The Green, Plaistow village);
- 97.8% favoured LGSP2 (Cox's Pond, Plaistow);
- 2.2% dismissed LGSP2 (Cox's Pond, Plaistow) as unsuitable;
- 100% favoured LGSP3 (Meadow in front of Todhurst, Plaistow);
- 95.7% favoured LGSP4 (Area behind Todhurst, Plaistow);
- 4.3% dismissed LGSP4 (Area behind Todhurst, Plaistow) as unsuitable;
- 95.7% favoured LGSP5 (Foxfields, Dunsfold Road, Plaistow);
- 4.3% dismissed LGSP5 (Foxfields, Dunsfold Road, Plaistow) as unsuitable;
- 100% favoured LGSP6 (Nell Ball Hill & Trig), LGSS1 (Shillinglee traffic island) and LGSS2 (Shillinglee entrance boulevard)

3.3 SRB reminded the group that the comment form did not require anyone to make any specific response on any specific site nor were respondents asked to rank sites in order of their preference; but that attendees could make a comment about anything that was presented in the Public Consultation in addition to those areas proposed as designated Local Green Space.

3.4 BT advised that the comments received in relation to a site were only for the Sites: Land adjacent to The Dairy; Land adjacent to Todhurst; and Land opposite The Green:

- **Land adjacent to Todhurst, Plaistow**
 - 84.8% of comments favoured the Site: *Land adjacent to Todhurst*.
 - 15.2% dismissed the Site: *Land adjacent to Todhurst*, as unsuitable.
- **Land adjacent to The Dairy, Plaistow**
 - 89.1% of comments favoured the Site: *Land adjacent to The Dairy*.
 - 10.9% of comments dismissed the Site: *Land adjacent to The Dairy*, as unsuitable.
- **Land opposite The Green**
 - 87.0% of comments favoured the site: *Land opposite The Green*.
 - 13.0% dismissed the site: *Land opposite The Green*, as unsuitable.

3.5 There were four comments where brownfield was mentioned but not specifically about the site: *Little Springfield Farm - Brownfield*. The four comments all had the premise of '*development on brownfield before greenfield*'. SRB advised that the Steering Group could not take the brownfield site forward as part of the Parish allocation due to the expert planning advice the Parish had received from AECOM, but that it would be taken forward on another basis in the Draft Plan.

4. Review of the four potential development sites against sustainability criteria: VF suggested the Parish went forward with 11 units on The Dairy to get the 30% affordable and that the Parish also put forward the brownfield for 6 units. SRB reminded her that the Little Springfield Farm Brownfield site now had to be considered separately to the housing allocation. The Parish had to accept that it is unsustainable in terms of access to facilities, etc... SRB mentioned that the brownfield site should be addressed in the Draft Plan with a specific policy because of the historic B8 and B2 inappropriate in that location. CGP added that the issue of sustainable location aside, the site was not large enough to take the 11 units the Parish intends to allocate to have the affordable element.



4.1 The group was advised to look at specific sustainability criteria for each of the remaining four potential sites (which included the site CDC have noted in their DPD document). Each site had to be evaluated against the sustainability criteria: Economic, Social, Environmental role; to determine the most appropriate site to take to the Parish Council to ratify for taking forward into the Draft Plan. A matrix of criteria with the four sites listed had been produced and the group had to determine a rating against the criteria per site:

- Land adjacent to The Dairy;
- Land opposite The Green;
- Land adjacent to Todhurst;
- Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm (the site noted in the CDC DPD).

4.2 RW asked how many points were awarded for support of CDC to the site: *Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm*. He was advised that was not appropriate for the way the group were about to assess the sites against sustainability criteria. RW asked if the Steering Group were being dismissive of the fact that CDC supported that site and that when the Steering Group met them, CDC were dismissive of the AECOM report. SRB agreed that CDC were dismissive of the AECOM report. CGP reminded that it wasn't simply that CDC supported the site: *Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm*, it was that it was the site CDC had noted in their DPD at that time and was in the absence of the Parish having a Neighbourhood Plan that allocated a site or sites being far enough along to carry any weight. RW asked if the CDC DPD allocation was not going to be a worry for the Parish. CGP said she thought that should CDC pursue that site in their DPD that it would be likely CDC would have to further review it in light of the recent Planning Inspectorate Decision Notice at Little Springfield Farm Brownfield (which is immediately behind Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm) and also due to the closure of Ifold stores. Colin Smith Planning had also provided their opinion to the Parish and agreed with the conclusions of the AECOM report. The group was reminded again that the Parish needed to make a decision on a site, on the basis of planning sustainability criteria. This included assessing the CDC DPD site with the other three potential sites. The criteria in the matrix is used by the LPA and noted in the NPPF.

4.3 It was pointed out that the main drivers in the Parish sit within the social and environmental role with a very small element in the economic role because there are not many local businesses offering employment or retail centres. It was predominantly limited to support for local Parish services: hiring the halls, hiring the multi-use games area, frequenting the pub... SRB advised that there were also technical constraints for the sites to consider. It was explained that criteria where all sites would score similarly had been removed from the matrix, for example, because the foul drainage system is at over-capacity, any addition of housing units into the sewerage system is problematic (particularly for Ifold and the over-capacity Brewhurst Mill pumping station in Loxwood).

4.4 Common Criteria across all of the sites – and where the sites would score similarly:

- Drainage (Foul) - adding onto an already over-capacity mains sewer system;
- Drainage (Surface Water) - Roof surface area of development adding to surface water drainage;
- Countryside: all sites are in the countryside;
- Settlement Boundary: all sites are outside a settlement boundary;
- Access to jobs (most parishioners have to travel outside the Parish for work);
- Impact to Landscape environment – as all are greenfield sites there is an impact.

4.5 The group was asked to rate each of the criteria (on a scale of 0 poor to 3) for each of the following criteria against each of the sites. The rating was then recorded.



ECONOMIC ROLE:

4.6 Support of local Parish Services: for example using the shop, hiring a hall, hiring the multi-use games area, visiting the pub, using the post office services at Winterton Hall...The group were asked to think about where would people they go if they were living at each site and what services would they support. A discussion took place for each of the sites and a rating was noted.

- Land opposite The Green, Land adjacent to The Dairy and Land adjacent to Todhurst were all considered to have good access to be able to support the range of services available in Plaistow.
- Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm: SRB mentioned that many people living in Ifold, who are set some distance away from Plaistow, are equally as likely to go to Loxwood to the Doctor's surgery, the Loxwood shop, butcher and post office. CGP advised that as there were limited services to support in Ifold i.e. hiring of the hall, it scored low in this criteria. DR mentioned that Ifold Stores was still an unknown. AECOM had advised in a phone conference that the Ifold shop was closed and the Parish could not base a decision on a promise that it may reopen. Therefore for the site decision-making the group had to consider it closed. VF said there was access to everything, that everyone gets in their cars and drives. The group was reminded to look again at the National and Local Policy definition for sustainability and that is the reason why this Ifold site scores poorly on this criteria. DR reminded that the restaurant at Foxbridge Golf Course was open to the public. DK said that it was not a regular occurrence. BT commented that the facilities at Foxbridge Golf Course are in Plaistow and not Ifold.
- .RW disagreed with the ultimate rating for the Ifold site and said he did not think Ifold was disconnected from civilisation.

SOCIAL ROLE:

4.7 Access to Public Rights of Way – Footpaths. Developing a thriving, healthy community. A discussion took place for each of the sites and a rating was noted.

- Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm: It was pointed out that getting access to PROWs from the Ifold site required walking (approx.. 600-650m) on the 40MPH Plaistow Road without a pavement. It was mentioned that the Crouchland Biogas HGV tractor/trailer traffic also was an inhibitor of people walking on the Plaistow Road. VF was adamant that most people do walk on the Plaistow Road, but Steering Group members who live in Ifold informed her that very few Ifold residents actually do walk on Plaistow Road because of how unsafe it is due to traffic speed, high traffic volumes and types of traffic (HGVs).

4.8 Social Interaction: Can walk outside house and meet/greet neighbours and other villagers (*Facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities*). A discussion took place on this criteria and a rating was noted for each of the four sites.

4.9 Walking distance to amenities. A discussion took place for each of the sites and a rating was noted.

- Land opposite The Green: DR said this scored very high for this site as it was nearest the shop. RW disagreed and said that assumes that everyone walks to the shop whereas he thought most people get in their cars and drive. BT reminded the group the criteria is based on central and local government's definition of sustainable and those are services people can physically walk to without involving a car; and that that is how the group were advised to interpret it when assessing the sites against each of the criteria.
- Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm: BT reminded the group that it should be viewed as walking to the service centre from the Ifold site which is actually 2.5km as the service centre in CDC's Local Plan is in Plaistow and therefore the Ifold site as a consequence would rate very poorly. DR asked if would be easier to walk to Loxwood. VF agreed. CGP said it was 2.8km to walk to Loxwood from this site when using the PROWs. This site is also approximately 1.5km from the Golf Course and that due to the 40MPH speed limit and the traffic including Crouchland Biogas HGV traffic, very few Ifold residents consider it safe to walk the Plaistow Road and Foxbridge Lane to the golf course.



4.10 Safe access to public transport (eg. within a reasonable walking distance to a bus stop, can wait for bus off the road, there are pavements to walk to the transport). A discussion took place for each of the sites and a rating was noted.

- Land opposite The Green: VF said there were no pavements for the site Land opposite the Green. DK thought this site scored favourably on the criteria. CGP said that access is made safer by crossing from the Land opposite The Green across the road and then crossing the green than walking on the road to Loxwood Road. SRB disagreed and pointed out that anyone pushing a child in a buggy could not cross the Green, particularly in winter when it was very muddy.
- Land adjacent to Todhurst: This site scored high as there were proper pavements all the way from Todhurst to the shop and other amenities.
- Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm: VF pointed out that the Ifold bus stops near the closed shop were safe to wait and off the road. CGP disagreed and said it was only safe on one side to wait off the road, but it is unsafe to wait at several of the Ifold bus stops due to there being no pavement or verge, for example the stop opposite Oak Tree Stores. It did not have any verge or pavement to wait safely off-road. RW said that the Plaistow Road was the same road people had to cross in Plaistow. SRB pointed out they were not the same and that the difference was that the Land to the North of Little Springfield Ifold site is in a 40MPH zone and the Plaistow sites were all in a 30MPH zone.

4.11 Ease of access to local Parish recreational facilities: the green, playground, multi-use games area, football field, youth club. A discussion took place for each of the sites and a rating was noted.

- The Plaistow sites all scored favourably.
- Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm: The Scout Girl Guide HQ in Ifold was mentioned but it was pointed out that very few parents walked their children there.

ENVIRONMENTAL ROLE:

4.12 Adverse impact on Historic Environment: whole of the settlement. A discussion took place on the impact on adverse impact to historical environment for each of the sites and a rating was noted.

- Land opposite The Green: CGP thought the impact on Plaistow village from the site Land opposite the Green was not high and that many people probably do not currently notice the site due to the existing high hedging but that admittedly housing development with roof-lines would be obvious and different to a mown field. But not as high an impact as some in the group thought. RW disagreed and said it was the highest point in the village. VF also thought this site scored poorly because it [development] would have the most impact on the village. SB thought that development would be seen from everywhere but if at the Todhurst site or The Dairy site development would be tucked out of sight and not as impactful. CGP disagreed. DK also disagreed and pointed out that people driving or walking through Plaistow would not see the site and impact would not be as adverse.
- Land adjacent to Todhurst: SRB thought it would have little impact on the village because development would be set back. RW thought development at this site would have more impact than development on the site: Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm and rated this site higher for adverse impact. SB did not think development at this site would change the look of the whole settlement.
- CGP mentioned that in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan the group were intending to develop design constraints so any impact could be mitigated. SRB said it was important to run through the scenario first for each site. Then once the group had determined the best site and if sensitive in terms of impact on historic environment the group could then develop policies to mitigate.



- Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm: CGP informed that the nearest listed building in relation to this site is Keepers Cottage approximately 450m away and that it would be unlikely there would be an adverse impact on that dwelling as it was far enough removed. RW asked if there were listed buildings in Ifold. CGP informed him that there were listed buildings in Ifold and quite a few buildings of historical merit. SRB pointed out that the development at Oak Tree Stores next to The Lodge in Ifold was an example that development could be undertaken next to historic buildings.

4.13 Adverse Impact on Historic Environment: Listed Buildings. A discussion took place for each of the sites and a rating was noted.

- Land opposite The Green: The dwelling immediately adjacent (Sunnymead) though in the Plaistow Conservation Area is not a listed building. The nearest listed building is Stone House (Grade II) which is across the two-lane highway, The Street, and screened from the site by its own mature hedging. Golden Cross Cottages are accessed via Rumbolds Lane therefore distanced from the site, set back and screened by mature trees and hedging. The dwellings at Todhurst are also set well back behind the meadow (proposed for Local Green Space designation).
- Land adjacent to Todhurst: It was thought the listed buildings in Back Lane were set back away from the development area of the site as is Todhurst itself due to a proposed designation of Local Green Space between the dwelling and the area identified for potential development.
- Land adjacent to The Dairy: It was pointed out that Golden Cross Cottages could be seen across the site and over the curtilage of The Dairy from the highest elevation of the site. Stone House was less visible. CGP did not believe there would be too much impact on these listed buildings as they were far enough removed from the site. However, SRB thought the impact would be more adverse at this site as opposed to Land opposite The Green.
- Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm: The nearest listed building in relation to this site is Keepers Cottage, approximately 450m away.

4.14 Adverse Impact on Historic Environment: Conservation Area.

- Land opposite The Green: SRB pointed out the site though adjacent to the Conservation Area (which wraps around the site) was not noted in the [Plaistow Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposals \(May 2013\)](#) as having any significant views.
- Land adjacent to Todhurst: The group were reminded that part of the Todhurst site that was proposed for Local Green Space was in the Plaistow Conservation Area but the area proposed for potential development was not in the Conservation Area. It too was not noted in the [Plaistow Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposals \(May 2013\)](#) as having any significant views.
- Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm: The group were advised this criteria was not relevant for this site as it is not in or adjacent to a Conservation Area.
- Land adjacent to The Dairy: The group were reminded of a small part of the site nearest to the boundary with the highway that is in the Plaistow Conservation Area. It too was not noted in the [Plaistow Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposals \(May 2013\)](#) as having any significant views.

4.15 Visual impact of development (eg topography of the site – elevation). A discussion took place for each of the sites and a rating was noted.

- Land opposite The Green: SB said that as the site had a rise from one end to the other it was not possible to know where a development scheme would be. SC pointed out that when an outline application was put forward there was also opportunity for a developer to change the ground levels on a sloping site. SRB said that the group had to assess the sites as they are now. Assessing based on possible design scheme for development was not in the remit of the group. SB thought that if development were to be built on the high part of the site it would be very impactful. The group were reminded that a planning application would still need to be submitted by any developer of this site should it be selected and there would be further input.



SRB reminded that the Neighbourhood Plan would also be in place and any application would also have to be mindful of that.

- Land adjacent to The Dairy: The site is on a slight slope and would have an impact.

4.16 Adverse impact on Biodiversity:

- Land opposite The Green: The site is a grassed field, kept mown, with hedging all around but the hedging could remain. There was majority agreed that development on this site would have a minimal impact on biodiversity.
- Land adjacent to Todhurst: Development on this site would have an adverse impact on biodiversity due to having naturalised over many years and that there are several ponds on the site. There were several veteran trees on the perimeter and ponds on the site. The site also in close proximity to Ancient Woodland was also an indication that development at this site would have a very high adverse impact on biodiversity.
- Land adjacent to The Dairy: RW, VF and SC thought the oak trees at the top of the site, next to the boundary with the highway, was indication there would be an moderate effect on biodiversity. Others in the group disagreed and thought it very likely the trees could be retained and protected by crown lifting, designating TPOs and conditioning for root barriers.
- Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm: It's a grass field, kept mown. Therefore the Group thought that development on this site would have minimal impact on biodiversity.

4.17 TECHNICAL CONSTRAINTS OF DEVELOPMENT: constraints that are problematic to development on the sites.

4.18 Site Services: Pumping Station, Electricity pylons.

- Land opposite The Green: Not applicable.
- Land adjacent to Todhurst: The sewage pumping station may have to be relocated, electricity pylons would have to be relocated,
- Land adjacent to The Dairy: A BT telegraph pole would have to be moved from near the current entrance.
- Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm:

4.19 Veteran Trees, Hedging, TPOs.

- Land opposite The Green: There is a Veteran tree are on the boundary with the Street but there are no TPOs.
- Land adjacent to Todhurst: Veteran trees are on the boundary. The better specimens are on the boundary with Back Lane and are worth retaining with a view to a TPO. There are currently no TPOs. These trees are in the area of land that is proposed for designation as Local Green Space and not in the area of development. There are some trees within the centre of the site but are mostly scrubland.
- Land adjacent to The Dairy: Veteran trees are on the boundary. No TPOs but they are in the Conservation Area. SB was concerned the gap between the trees was narrow for access. However, it was thought that the healthy specimen oak could be retained and protected by root barrier. The tree within the curtilage of The Dairy is a lesser specimen but could still also be retained. The hedging could also be removed at another section for a new access.
- Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm: There is an oak tree on the boundary but is on the title of Little Springfield Farm (their entrance). There are no TPOs. The site is in close proximity to Ancient Woodland East and West.

4.20 Speed Limit: entry to /exit from Highway. Entry and exit onto the adopted Highway is different because of different speed zones.

- Land opposite The Green: The site is within a 30MPH zone.
- Land adjacent to Todhurst: The site is within a 30MPH zone.
- Land adjacent to The Dairy: The site is within a 30MPH zone.
- Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm: The site is within a 40MPH zone.



4.21 Other Matters discussed: Ease of access was discussed for each of the sites. DR said the many Plaistow residents had voiced concerns at a Parish Council meeting related to Parking. The Nell Ball survey was discussed and SRB said the Parish Council does intend to seek improvements to parking through Nell Ball into Ashfield.

- Land opposite The Green: A discussion took place on where the current access is to the site. There is an existing gate for access but it is possible access may be changed and through the hedging at another part but the existing gate is placed the appropriate distance from the crossroads.

4.22 RESULTS: The group then calculated the scoring for each of the sites based on the ratings that had been given to each criteria:

- Land opposite The Green, Plaistow - 35
- Land adjacent to Todhurst, Plaistow - 37
- Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm, Ifold (the site noted in the CDC DPD) - 29
- Land adjacent to The Dairy, Plaistow - 35

4.23 The site: Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm was discounted because it had met the least criteria for sustainability.

4.24 A discussion took place regarding the site: Land adjacent to Todhurst and the constraints existing that makes the site less viable for development. The meeting and site visits undertaken with CDC Housing (Rural Enabler) and the Hyde Group (housing association), and the subsequent email exchanges and reports from them, were mentioned again and their comments and opinion regarding the site is that it is less viable than others for development. A discussion took place that if Todhurst were taken forward due to the constraints and question on viability then a reserve would be needed. SC was concerned that more existing properties would be affected by development at the Todhurst site than others and wanted a further criteria included on which site would have the most impact on existing buildings. DK pointed out the group that new development could also have a positive impact not just adverse. The number of objections that had been received regarding the Todhurst site was raised. A further discussion took place. It was agreed that to bring the site forward would be problematic due to the constraints and the impact that had on viability of the site and it was discounted.

4.25 The discussion then focused on the remaining two sites and how they had scored against the criteria. Positive and negative impact to existing residents adjacent to the two sites being developed was discussed. SB did not think many would be adversely affected by development on the site: Land opposite the Green. But she asked as 11 units were being proposed (to enable affordable housing) how would building on the Green remain in the affordable bracket because it's position would be considered prime location in the village. RW said he was confused by the presumption that if you live in a listed property you have greater rights. His point was to do with why should the group consider in the assessment, listed buildings. The group was informed that the historic impact was important to consider. A discussion took place re: affordable home value and how the housing association can accept properties that are part let/part buy and would not market value affect them. It was discussed again that the affordability element Todhurst would make the site the best option because the market value would be reduced but the group again agreed that if it were not for the technical issues of Todhurst the site would be the best.



4.26 Concern was expressed that central government were allowing right-to-buy on housing association properties. VF was concerned that an affordable housing policy states affordable housing remains so in perpetuity. SRB said the only way it can remain as affordable housing is via Community Land Trust where the Parish retains ultimate control or it resides with the housing association and is re-let and managed by them, her understanding was that local authorities can opt out of that and a question remained as to what was the position of CDC on this matter.

4.27 It was suggested the group look at the ratings for the two sites and take out where criteria was scored the same and highlight only the criteria where the differences occur. This was in three criteria: Environmental Role: Adverse impact on historic environment; Visual impact of development; and Technical Constraints: Veteran Trees, Hedging, TPOs. With that assessment the site: Land adjacent to The Dairy met slightly more of the sustainability criteria than the site: Land opposite the Green.

4.28 The group was advised they had to put forward a site for allocation and to have a reserve. RW asked if the reserve site could be the site: Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm. He was advised again that the reason for discounting the brownfield site were the same reasons why the site: Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm was also discounted. RW then said that his 'favourite would be the Site: Land adjacent to Todhurst followed by the site: Land adjacent to The Dairy.'

8.40pm RW left the meeting to attend a personal commitment.

4.29 The group agreed that all the sites could be considered contentious so that had to be set aside, as across the board people will have an opinion of one site over another; that during Regulation 14 Public Consultation residents and landowners each have opportunity for representation and of course at referendum get to vote on the Plan.

4.30 The assessment of the sites was reviewed again and the group determined that the site: Land adjacent to The Dairy met slightly more of the sustainability criteria than the site: Land opposite the Green. A discussion took place again over the evidence that was in place that supported the assessment result. BT advised again on the statistics from the recent Public Consultation.

9.10pm A conclusion was reached. The site put forward for allocation in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan is: Land opposite The Dairy. The reserve site: Land opposite The Green.

4.31 It was agreed a statement had to be made about the site: Land adjacent to Todhurst and why this site was discounted. It was agreed a statement had to be made regarding the site: Little Springfield Farm Brownfield and why this site was discounted. It was agreed the proposal to the Parish Council had to specify the selection of the site: Land opposite The Dairy and that it will be fully justified in the Plan.

4.32 A discussion took place regarding CDC DPD and how the Parish could get the site changed to the decision of the Parish. The group were reminded that the Parish had to submit a pre-submission document before CDC would ever consider changing that site allocation. In the absence of a pre-submission document it was unlikely CDC would never remove the site: Land to the North of Little Springfield Farm.

ACTION: CGP to draft a proposal from the Steering Group to the Parish Council, based on the discussions of this meeting and the outcome (and evidence to support it) to circulate to the Group for comments and amendments. Once agreed by the Steering Group, CGP to submit the proposal to the Parish Council (N.B. including to the 6 Parish Councillors that are members of the Steering Group) in readiness for the 13th May 2016 full Parish Council meeting where the proposal is to be ratified.

5. Dates for future meeting: 13th May 2016 full Parish Council meeting.

9.30PM The meeting closed.