West Itchenor Parish Council

Minutes of an extra Meeting of West Itchenor Parish Council to be held on Monday 16 December 2013 in Itchenor Memorial Hall.

Present: Mrs J Boadle, Mr M Chater OBE (Chairman), Mr J Hartley, Mr A Spencer, Mrs S Taylor, Mr C Watson

In attendance: Mrs C Smith (Clerk), 2 members of public

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm

110/13C Chairman's Welcome

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting. He thanked the Itchenor Society for the information they had supplied.

111/13C Questions/comments from members of the public.

Mr Arnold asked if the Parish Council has seen the comments from the Harbour Conservancy which were in line with the Havant Borough Council views in relation to the AONB surrounding the harbour. He added that he hoped the Parish Council would align its comments with those of the Itchenor Society and the Conservancy.

112/13C Local Plan – Key Policies Pre-Submission 2014-2029

Copies of the comments from the Itchenor Society relating to Policy 1 and Policy 43 were circulated to members. Details of the Conservancy representation regarding Policy 43 were also read out.

Reviewing Policy 1 the Parish Council had some difficulty understanding why this had been added when it was not included in the primary legislation.

Reference was made to a letter from Bob Neil (MP) who had indicated that the National Planning Policy Framework did not require Councils to provide more houses than they needed and that housing development should be properly planned and not provided just at any cost. Consideration was given to copying his letter to the Planning Inspector.

It was noted that the Parish Council had at an earlier consultation submitted comments supporting the comments relating to Policy 43.

The Chairman closed the meeting.

Mr Mead-Briggs explained the stages of the consultation. Pieter Montyn (WSCC) had given verbal reasons for ignoring the comments, possibly for political reasons. He explained the role of the Inspector. The Conservancy will be represented at a hearing and he suggested that the Parish Council should consider being represented by a planning surveyor.

The engagement of a planning consultant would be very expensive and it was felt that the Parish Council would probably have to represent itself. Mr Mead-Briggs offered his assistance as appropriate.

As the Conservancy has asked to be represented at the hearing it was also suggested that the Parish Council offers to support them. It was also noted that the views of the Chair of the Conservancy were not necessarily consistent with views of the Conservancy Planning Officers.

The Parish Council was advised that John Holmes has left the Conservancy with his role being re advertised.

The Chairman reopened the meeting.

The Chairman briefly ran through the guidance notes to the consultation as a reminder to Councillors of the general principles for responding. A number of comments were made.

On Page 59 - housing allocation 2010 – 2019. West Itchenor is showing as 0 with an asterisk. If affordable housing was needed would it be imposed? Yes it would.
There was further concern that developers could have separate sites for affordable housing. The benefit of having a Neighbourhood Plan would guard against this, as the community has agreed what type of development is appropriate for the village and where it should be. It was noted that it would be difficult to go against a Neighbourhood Plan.

The Chairman closed the meeting
Mr Mead-Briggs commented that the Parish Council could not have a Neighbourhood Plan that departs from Local Plan. If you try and produce a Neighbourhood Plan that deletes the asterisk it won't be passed.
The Chairman reopened the meeting.

Page 54 gives the timetable for what is happening with much not starting until 2019. The assumption is because waste water and transfer works at Apuldram will not come on line until 2019 at earliest. Southern Water is unlikely to get funding to refurbish the sewage works. Therefore plans for housing off the Manhood will be put back. It was suggested that the Plan was not good enough if it was reliant on refurbishing the sewerage works.
Page 53 7.20 makes reference to access to the A27. It was noted that Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions cannot be used to make good existing problems here.

The Chairman closed the meeting.
Mr Mead Briggs commented that it had previously been announced that the Highways Agency will fund the improvements at the six junctions on the A27, and then because of the austerity measures this had been dropped. He understood that this was now back into the budget for the area. He added that he was worried how sound the Local Plan is and was left with impression that the Local Plan would not be approved.
The Chairman reopened the meeting.

It was noted that Planning applications with traffic impact of up to 2/3% are deemed acceptable but no action was being taken on the cumulative effect.

The Chairman closed the meeting.
Mr Arnold commented that until now the village had the protection of falling within the AONB which allowed only one to one replacement. If completing the Neighbourhood Plan includes building in housing allocation this would be detrimental to the area. One cannot produce a Neighbourhood Plan unless it ties into local development. There would no longer be a one for one protection on development within the village.
The Chairman reopened the meeting.

The Parish Council reiterated that the Neighbourhood Plan could be used to protect open spaces and other issues that can be brought in such as work on broadband services. There are lots of positive issues that can go into the Neighbourhood Plan. In addition there were no guarantees that Itchenor would not be earmarked for new homes and it was important that if this were the case the village had decided where these would go.
The Chairman added that it important for community to be owning the prospects for its future and much harder for Planning Authority to overthrow view of whole community.
Other issues raised included;
Provision for education, the Local Plan has reference to secondary education in the Chichester area but no evidence of primary education on the Manhood. It was felt that this omission needs to be referred to.

A query was raised about the requirements for affordable housing. The requirements could be young couples/families or older people too.

The Chairman closed the meeting
Mr Arnold commented that most of the young families in Itchenor send their children to private school and would therefore not be on the low cost housing register.
The Chairman reopened the meeting.

The Chairman raised the issue of affordability of property and how things have changed over time. There were some properties in the village that are rented out on lowish rents. He suggested that the focus was on looking at how we help the village continue to be supported. Distinctiveness of a place is something to be cherished and there had been many changes over last 40 years. Features do change in communities over time. He also highlighted the continuance of the school bus which gave rise to the fact that children do go to state school in the area.
The Chairman suggested that the aspirations of the Local Plan had merit but this was pressured against the demand for housing.

RESOLVED to comment supporting the comments made by the Conservancy and Itchenor Society in relation to Policy 1 and Policy 43.

RESOLVED that the lack of any reference to primary education should be addressed along with the observation that there appeared to be no provision for land to build new primary schools.

There being no further business the chairman declared the meeting closed at 8.10pm

Signed_____Date_____
Chairman