

## **Notes of meeting at CDC 23rd May 2017**

**Present: Alan Frost, Mike Allgrove and Maureen Chaffe**

I asked when the SEA scoping report might be back and they stated that Historic England had responded stating that SEA was still required due to the housing site.

I made the point that we would not have submitted at Reg 14 if we had not had emails from CDC and Historic England stating that the removal of the housing site would remove the requirement for SEA. I asked why they did not believe that the housing site was removed. I explained that Localism says that the residents have the right to choose where they want development and we cannot ignore their wishes which is why we have worded the policy as we have. I stated that I do not believe that the wording of the policy ties CDC in any way to developing the site. They did not agree.

I explained that at the start of the process we did a call for sites. We reviewed all those that came forward. There were only two that could accommodate the number of houses allocated to the parish. One of those sites was at Priors Acre which neither the Parish Council nor the District Council were in support of and the other was the site at Halnaker Crossing. I therefore asked what the PC could do given that the DC do not support the Halnaker site either. If Priors Acre had not been lost at appeal there would be no option but to use this site, likewise if there is a future allocation.

Mr Frost explained that there was a process to go through to look at issues relating to the impact on the Conservation Areas. I stated that the impression we have gained from those that we have contacted about the SEA is that there is no point in going forward with the site as it is not supported by the DC. Both Mr Frost and Mr Allgrove denied that this was the case. I explained that the SEA costs were out of our reach and that the PC had made the decision that it could not waste tax payers money on a venture that did not have the support of the DC. Mr Allgrove said that the DC did not have an issue with the site and indeed stated that the DC always step back and allow residents to determine where development should be located through NP's.

I made the point that we had done our own SEA as I had at Clapham and that CDC had said it was not sufficient. Mr Allgrove said that he had not seen our SEA.

Mr Frost stated that he did not agree that the policy was not an allocation. He felt that to take the Plan forward without SEA would lead to possible challenge. I therefore said that we would take the housing site out of the NP and go forward with no housing allocation as I had been instructed to do. I further stated that as CDC were already looking for more sites any request to Boxgrove would be received by putting this site forward again as we do not have any others.

Mr Frost stated that the Parish has met its housing numbers so did not need to do more. I stated that we were fully aware of that but that the Parish wants to positively plan for the future including improving the Conservation Areas and improving the road alignment and are prepared to take more housing to achieve it. Mr Frost then offered to pay £3000 towards the SEA but I stated that it was not enough.

I asked if there was any way of re-wording the housing policy to make it acceptable to the DC but they said there was not.

Mr Allgrove said that if we remove the housing policy we will have to go back to have the Plan screened again and that should ensure that it will not require SEA.

The consent of the PC to take the housing out needs to be given. I stated that the PC agreed at a previous meeting that the housing should be removed if it stopped the Plan going forward. Mr Allgrove stated that a formal comment from the PC would be required.

Although disappointing, if we can get the Plan through to Referendum the PC gets CIL funding which could be used to support road improvements.

A possible way forward for the future is that we could amend the Plan after it is 'made'. There are new rules going through Parliament to allow 'made' Plans to be amended. The PC could determine that it will take that route. The only part that would need to be amended would be the housing policy. There will be new funding available which could be used to pay for an SEA.

Maureen Chaffe