West Itchenor Parish Council

Minutes of an Extraordinary Meeting of West Itchenor Parish Council held on Tuesday 23 April 2013 in Itchenor Memorial Hall.

Present: Mr M Chater OBE (Chairman), Mr G Colbourne, Mr J Hartley, Mrs S Taylor

In attendance: Mrs C Smith (Clerk), 34 members of public,

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm

32/13C Chairman's Welcome

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting adding that he was delighted to see so many people present. It showed that people cared about their community.

33/13C Questions/comments from members of the public.

Mr Watson commented on the sewerage and drainage issues on the Peninsula in general suggested this incorporated into the Parish Council response. This was relevant as future development would have an impact on sewerage and drainage.

The Chairman highlighted the recent article in the District Council's Initiatives magazine on the draft Local Plan. He commented that planning policies had to comply with European Law first, then the National Planning Policy Framework before filtering down to local level.

Mr Impey commented on reading document his main concern was that the strength of the AONB was being diluted and development on the Manhood Peninsula was still being considered. He suggested that this was impossible without infrastructure improvements. He added that the draft Local Plan did not appear to reflect the objectives highlighted in the Initiatives magazine, objectives that most residents would support. He also suggested that the draft was written in hidden language that infered local consent.

Mr Henshaw reported that he served on the Conservancy Planning Committee which was meeting on Monday 29 April and he invited the Parish Council to the meeting. There would be two presentations: The Conservancy intended to highlight their thoughts that the AONB needs a standalone policy and there will be a presentation from presentation from CDC on the draft local plan.
The Chairman thanked Mr Henshaw for the invite and it was agreed that the Parish Council would be represented.

34/13C Apologies for absence.

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Cllr Spencer, Cllr Varvill and Cllr Boadle.

35/13C Declarations of Interest.

There were no declarations of interest.

36/13C Parish Council response to the District Council consultation on the draft Local Plan.

The Chairman explained that Cllr Taylor would summarise the Parish Council's views and that due to the importance of issues residents would be allowed to comment where appropriate.

Cllr Taylor explained that due to the lack of a Local Plan developers had taken advantage of the opportunity put in adhoc plans that had to be permitted. The new draft Local Plan will have to be adhered to. She added that the draft Local Plan appeared very aspirational but it needed more detail. The majority of future housing will be on the A27 corridor. However, development within the A27 corridor could not take place until the Tangmere treatment works had been upgraded and this was not likely before 2019. Although the Peninsula doesn't have that much housing the District Council want this in place first as developments here do not rely on the Tangmere treatment works. Funding would be forthcoming from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, the level of development on the Peninsula would not provide enough CIL funding to help with infrastructure. There are also issues remaining with the A27 and the Government was not doing anything as the funding was not there. Itchenor has no housing allocation but is part of a wider community. The Parish Council recognises there is a need for housing but it wanted a strategy where housing can be supported.

Another major defect in the draft Local Plan was the lack of emphasis on harbour. The Parish Council had sent its draft comments to other parishes, inviting comment. The previous Planning Policies had provision for the harbour and it was important that it continues to be attractive to residents and wildlife. The draft Local Plan doesn't have these provisions. Havant Borough Council's Local Plan does have such provisions. There is concern that much of the housing may be dependent on Apuldram which is full to capacity. There was concern about the effect on the harbour and the lack of detail in the Local Plan was causing concern. Parish Councillors had met with the Itchenor Society who had contributed significantly to the draft response.

Mr Paterson asked about levels of housing on the Peninsula as he understood that small development of 2 or 3 houses would not count towards the overall housing allocation. Cllr Taylor responded that she did not know what the housing figures were. The Chairman acknowledged that there was concern that small developments of 2or 3 houses were considered in isolation and the cumulative effect of such developments was not being recognised.

Mr Talbot suggested that responses might be rebutted and the focus should be on key policies. There was a need to have key policies as these will determine what happens in the area.

Mr Impey suggested the Parish Council should be pushing for a policy that there should be no development south of A27 until the A27 and the Apuldram treatment works have been sorted.

Cllr Taylor explained that the issue was that the District Council have been told by Government they need to meet the growing housing need. The last Local Plan was rejected as the housing allocation was not considered high enough. Mr Impey suggested the District Council should go back to Government and say this not possible.

Cllr Colbourne reported that all of the parishes on the Peninsula were in agreement that there was no capacity for additional housing because of infrastructure issues. The reality is that Government has set housing allocations and if the District Council rejects housing then the developers will go to appeal and will in all likelihood win. Parishes would like to influence Government and they have support from the local MP but they are not being listened to. If the Local Plan is not in tune with Government

policy then it will be rejected and this would leave the district open to inappropriate development. Most of the development will be on the A27 corridor. He added that it was interesting that Southern Water continues to say it is able to cope with additional development. The Parish Council is proposing to highlight a need for more detail about the harbour. A lot of the clauses in the currently Saved Policies should be reintroduced into the Local Plan to protect the harbour.

Mr Dunn suggested that the CIL was not going to provide enough cash in time to aid developments. He asked if the could be turned around so that money comes first to allow development to go ahead.

The Chairman acknowledged the logic that funds are available to provide necessary facilities for any developments. If the Local Plan is not set at the right level then Government will impose targets and housing numbers on the district. There was a need to influence what goes into the Local Plan and ensure it is sustainble so that it meets needs of community.

Mr Roose suggested the numbers were not being objected to but the wording of the draft should state that development is conditional on infrastructure being delivered. He expressed concern about getting extra housing and no infrastructure will be forthcoming. He also stressed the need for extra protection for the harbour. He questioned why CDC had not considered this when Havant Borough Council had. There was concern that they managed areas of the harbour in partnership but did not appear to have a co-ordinated approach for the Local Plan.

Cllr Taylor expressed her agreement to these comments. The Parish Council acknowledged the strength of the support at the meeting for the draft response and it was agreed that extra emphasis on points raised could be included.
The Chairman suggested that CDC had a problem that with the National Park to the north all of the development would need to be concentrated on the south and west parts of the district. It was important to maintain a very strong case for the uniqueness of the Peninsula. This was a case of being self indulgent as the area was enjoyed by a wide variety of people and there was a danger it would loose its recreation and tourist value.

Mr Watson commented that some recent developments had been quite extensive and the developers had borne the cost of improving/maintaining the infrastructure.
Cllr Taylor explained the current use of Section 106 which is being replaced by the Community Infrastructure levy.

Mr Mead-Briggs reported that in a meeting with the Parish Council the Itchenor Society had asked the Parish Council to combine with other harbourside villages in its response. There was clearly a consensus of objections to the Local Plan raised so far. The Itchenor Society has has written to Andrew Tyrie and spoken to other leading people locally. They would ideally like Parish Councils to join forces as the harbour needs its own policy. In the new draft Local Plan Policy 44 and 45 replace all the old Saved Policies. There was no protection for the boat yard and waterside development. Now instead of policies that say what development cannot take place it generalises on what development can take place.

Cllr Colbourne reported that there was already a lot of co-operation between local parishes through the Peninsula Forum. When dealing with elected District Councillors there was agreement with parish views but the paid employees were going against this. He encouraged residents to make their own submissions to the plan.

Mr Arnold reported that the Itchenor Society had communications with both Selsey and West Wittering Residents Associations and he reiterated the reuest for the local parishes to have a uniform response to the Local Plan.
The Chairman highlighted the role of the Parish Council in reflecting the views of the community.

Mr Roose expressed concern that stating that specific policies by reference were being removed would not mean anything to most people. Specific issues mean a lot more to residents. He suggested that there was reference to the elements of protection being sought. These are the protections we think this areas should have.

Mr Holmes commented that the importance of the Conservancy could not be overstated and he hated to think that the Conservancy might provide its own response without co-operation with local Parish Councils. He suggested it was important that the Parish Council views should be shared with the Conservancy.

The Chairman confirmed that a representative from the Parish Council would attend the Conservancy meeting. It was noted that a copy of the draft response had gone to the Conservancy.

The Chairman commented that the Parish Council had noted the importance of the issues raised, the desire for co-operation with other parishes, where clauses have been removed the specifics don't slip through, the need for co-operation with the Conservancy, that housing should have sustainability and the need to be careful about not changing features of Manhood so that its unique qualities will not be lost. Some development will happen but it needs to be clear what and where is appropriate.

Cllr Taylor added that the meeting had been useful and had reinforced the faults already identified in the local plan. The Parish Council will finalise the response in light of the comments made and will circulate this to other parishes and invite them to join and make a further formal submission.

The Chairman reported on a recent conference in Tangmere, where every council had been very articulate and balanced in its comments. It was hoped that an effective Local Plan will control the parameters under which developers will operate.

Mr Mead-Briggs reported that the Itchenor Society objections had already been posted on line and these could be viewed and followed by residents as appropriate.

RESOLVED that the Planning Committee will finalise the response from the Parish Council in light of the discussions at the meeting. The response will be posted on the Parish Council website.

The Chairman expressed thanks on behalf of the community to the Planning Committee and the Itchenor Society for all their work in going through the plan and providing a summary response.

There being no further business the Chairman declared the meeting closed at 7.47pm

Signed_____Date_____
Chairman