



Peninsula Community Forum Minutes

Venue: West Wittering Parish Council, Sports Pavilion, West Wittering
 Time & Date: 7pm, December 4 December 2018

Attendance and apologies (in *italics*)

Parish	Councillor / Speakers
Selsey	M Beal C Purnell (CDC)
Birdham	L Pocock G. Campbell T Firmston
Sidlesham	P Bedford T Tull (CDC) M Melody
East Wittering & Bracklesham	B Reeves M Lawson
West Wittering	K Martin W. Buckland R Lewis P Montyn (WSCC)
West Itchenor	C. Mead-Briggs A Spencer C. Watson
Earnley	R Carey J Williams
Apuldram	G Delahunty
Donnington	M. Hitchin
Hunston	J Foster D Betts
North Mundham	T Russell P Chivers A McClean
	G. Barker S.Oakley (WSCC)
Speakers	Graham Olway - WSCC Tracey Dunn - WSCC Mike Allgrove
CDC representation	Louise Rudziak Amie Whalen Jenny Jones
Names recorded from the sign-in attendance sheet on the evening	

2.	Introductions and Election of Chairman	Action
	Louise Rudziak welcomed the group to the evening's meeting. Keith Martin was voted in as Chair.	
3.	Presentation 1. Schools on the Peninsula – Graham Olway	
	<p>Education Planning on the Manhood Peninsula</p> <p>Graham Olway began saying that he heads up School Organisation, Capital Planning and Transport for WSCC. Paul Wagstaff has recently been appointed the new Director of Education.</p> <p>They regularly talk with local councils about house building in their areas and what that means in terms of school provision.</p> <p>He added that with S106, they ask the developers to mitigate the impact of their development and that where the development is taking place, they expect the developers to meet the impact they are causing by the development of the infrastructure in the area, sometimes to the point of ensuring the developers build schools in lieu of S106 payments.</p> <p>CIL – Graham explained that there has been much discussion around the pooling restrictions – limiting the number of contributions that can come forward.</p> <p>For the Peninsula, for the provision of schools, they produce annually a booklet that details the capacity in the area. From County's point of view, they set a trigger point when the school is at 95% of its capacity. They look at this and the 'child product' e.g. 1000 homes would generate 30 children per form of entry.</p> <p>Figures together including: East Wittering, Sidlesham, West Wittering, Medmerry and Seal as a whole area, we are showing that capacity is at 98% This means the schools are already looking to additional accommodation should there be new developments. Either to look at new schools or expanding the schools already there.</p> <p>County does not have the power of direction over an academy in the same way and they have to be asked how they wish to expand. So they are still in the process of talking with schools and looking at school sites where there is some additional land to expand into and how that might be financed.</p> <p>They are also aware of the area and that children may wish to go off the Peninsula to go to school. There may be families who want to go further afield such as the free school at Hunston or even further afield. But The County Council is clear that it wants to ensure provision within the area. So children can walk or cycle to school.</p> <p>The following is the position statement supplied by Graham:</p> <p>'The County Council is a statutory consultee in the preparation of Local Plans across the County Council, partly due to its role as the Local Education Authority (LEA) for the County. The County Council also has a statutory duty to ensure that there is sufficient and appropriate education provision across West Sussex. It discharges this duty in partnership with diocesan authorities and other education providers.</p> <p>The County Council provided comments on the Local Plan preparation, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), which is a supporting document in the preparation of the Local Plan, that sets out the infrastructure needed to mitigate the planned development over the plan period. The IDP evidence document is used at the Local Plan Examination to help show that the plan is sound and capable of being delivered. The IDP is produced through consultation with all the organisations responsible for leading on or providing the infrastructure. In the case of education this is West Sussex County Council, who has the statutory duty to ensure each child of statutory school age has a school place.</p> <p>The infrastructure projects required through the IDP have been taken forward into the Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) in Chichester District, that identifies and prioritises infrastructure projects for developer contribution funding through the spending of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).</p> <p>The County Council is working with the District Council to bring forward the required improvements required to mitigate development in the Local Plan as</p>	

outlined in the annually reviewed IBP.

There is always a shortfall in funding for infrastructure, and this shortfall is our evidence for charging CIL (although the CIL is still insufficient to cover the entire shortfall in funding).

It is intended that where a new development requires a whole new school to be built, then this will be funded via S106 and provided on-site. Where an entire new school is not needed and only school places are required, the county council seeks to provide these through expansions to schools within a planning area. These places are funded through government Basic Need Grant, CIL and WSCC capital funding where required.

The current situation regarding new school places and infrastructure is set out in the draft IBP, CIL spending plan, which will go to Council in March for approval. The school places in the Manhood Peninsula are proposed to be expanded in 2019/20, and the county council has identified this project to cost £1,200,000 with a proportion, yet to be confirmed, requested from CIL to assist this expansion. This has been approved through the preparation of the IBP and is included in the project selected for CIL funding in the IBP. The County Council has this year requested that this project be brought forward to 2019/20.'

Questions: *(in Italics)*

You mentioned all the junior schools but not the secondary one. Is it the formula the same as it is for an Academy?

- a. Yes, it is a 5FE (5x30) 150 places per year secondary school. That is the expectation, but depending on the house type we are now seeing a lot of children living in flatted accommodation. At secondary level they are not full and so difficult to get contributions in that case.

You refer to the East side but what plans are there for the west side of Peninsula?

- a. There are schools in Chichester – co-ed but there are several hundred places waiting to be used including the Chichester free school. So this within recognised travel patterns, there secondary places available.

You mention 1000 new homes, to date there are already 700 houses which have been completed on the Peninsula and this will have an impact on the already full schools so what will happen in the next few years?

- A. Re the 700,000 etc., any capacity has been taken up in the county. Going forward all new schools have to open as Academies. They open where the County Council seeks a sponsor approved by the Sec. of State for Education or they come through something called a Free School Wave which is where a sponsor makes an application to open a school themselves. From the County point of view we like to see full schools. The reality is when the schools are built they want them to open as 2FE as the minimum size so looking at that means a new school would not be needed as could end up being an over-supply of schools. They try not to put on temporary accommodation, but to ensure they have the ability to plan ahead instead.

Birdham, West & East Wittering primary schools are at capacity, so are you saying you are not allowed to increase the size of these schools?

- A. I am not expecting a whole new primary school for this area. CC cannot direct an Academy school to expand. As they are not Academies, there would be the possibility to ask for expansion. There may be more traffic going off than coming on to the Peninsula due to parent's preferences.

So will you be bussing children off the peninsula?

- A. no we will be looking to expand the schools to create more spaces.

In your 2018 projected school places you say the temporary places on the E Wittering and Bracklesham site are expected to go, how do you propose this will be done?

Particularly when you bear in mind East Wittering and Bracklesham in the last part of the Development Plan took 180 houses and we are now scheduled to take another 350 not to mention those being built close to us. So its 500 houses which gives 15 children per year group, therefore the plan could be changed on the basis of that to 60 have you got any thoughts on that and also do you consider floor area as there is less floor area than any other school?

	<p>A. Re temp accommodation on site, we do not have all the resources to replace all the temporary places to permanent places. As these are deemed not part of the permanent capacity of the school. So we have to use the opportunity where development generates funding to be able to do so. Re the floor capacity yes it does take account of the net floor capacity so this will be taken into the calculations. If we were to grow this we would be seeking permanent planning permissions. We also try to put in temp accommodation to cater for temporary bulges. We <i>could</i> be expanding one of the Wittering schools so one could suggest that East Wittering School could be used as has large field to use.</p> <p><i>Re: The Cost of getting students off the peninsula to further education is huge – there has to be a solution – with Stage Coach for example.</i></p> <p>A. This is certainly an issue. It may be something you would want to raise with your County Councillor. That can be forwarded to the transport provision team I would need to discuss. Please write in.</p> <p><i>Within your planning of school numbers do you take into account the number of Manhood school children who only go to the independent school sector? And secondly may suggest that a lot of areas of the country have suddenly had large families entering their communities from other countries, what account do you take of this?</i></p> <p>A. The drop-out rate is 6% to go independent. This is based of trends. Re large families – Catholic schools in particular have large families. We are very neutral in this – to suddenly decide what type of families you are having – there will be ups and downs with many factors. We cannot predict amounts of births due to GDPR.</p> <p>For further queries please contact: graham.olway@westsussex.gov.uk or tracey.dunn@westsussex.gov.uk The Chair thanked Graham for coming along to present at short notice.</p>	
4.	<p>Presentation 2. Local Plan – Mike Allgrove and Tim Guymer</p>	
	<p>MA went through his presentation Next Steps: Out to Consultation from 13 December to 7 February 2019. He encouraged all the parishes to respond to the consultation and get the word out to the public. Spreading the word on this is extremely helpful to us in order to get responses in to us. The Council then wants to achieve the next version of the plan by July 2019 Questions:</p> <p>Apuldram:</p> <p><i>Regarding the A286 and clocking of speed.</i></p> <p>A. MA stated it is a matter for the Police. – Suggests reporting to Op Crackdown</p> <p>Birdham:</p> <p><i>What measure is the plan going to put in place to prevent over swamping of sites around Birdham?</i></p> <p>A. MA referred to the need to achieve a 5 year housing land supply. One suggestion is putting in a stepped development trajectory. Other councils – Havant e.g. have invited planning applications on HELAA sites. MA doesn't have think that CDC would do this. Ultimately the Council will plan for 609 dwellings per annum and that figure comes from the government and is not a choice.</p> <p>Donnington:</p> <p><i>Re the Medical structure – No GP's – a big problem how can you supply an infrastructure for very elderly services.</i></p> <p>A. MA agreed saying although he cannot solve the problems of the NHS he can</p>	

facilitate meeting the infrastructure needs generated by the plan. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan shows a huge capital funding requirement which will come from a central government funding. At least with a local plan NHS can react to it – but CDC cannot promise this will happen. CDC can also make CIL money available.

The Stockbridge link road has been refused but it is still on the local plan.

- A. is the Stockbridge Link Road would be a single carriageway. Funding- take some money from development but costs are huge. We can make a calculation to get money from developers plus Housing infrastructure fund. But we need a plan to be able to bid for public funding.

Flooding map borders AONB and has previously been objected why is it going through now?

- A. The scale of development identified has been demonstrated through initial evidence to be capable of being accommodated in those areas outside of flood zones 2 & 3 and with provision of a significant buffer to the boundary of the AONB. Clearly further work will be required as the Plan progresses to demonstrate this in greater detail.

Earnley.

In the current plan it says East Wittering has 180 homes, but in the latest plan it says it has a minimum of 350 homes – He thinks this is misleading and could mean more than that. Why not replace this phrase with e.g. Indicative allocation?

- A. The reference to a minimum 350 dwellings to be required for East Wittering & Bracklesham relates to the provision expected to be made through proposed allocations in the East Wittering Neighbourhood Plan, over and above the identified supply (completions since 2016, outstanding permissions as of 1 April 2017 and an allowance for windfall sites of less than 5 dwellings)

At council I asked the question: Are these the number of houses that are completed after 1 April 2016 and the answer was yes, not new applications.

- A. Asked Graeme to put this detailed question in writing, and he would get back to him.

East Wittering & Bracklesham

Infrastructure – Is there any way we can we look at road structure, the difficult bends in roads coming out of Bracklesham and look to put in some mitigating work to make those bends easier for people?

Also – sewage problem we will have – how can we ensure that we get the foul water sorted out?

- A. The transport study commissioned, looks at local roads as well as the A27 and it is unlikely there will be any significant funding available for local roads when there is such a big problem with the A27.

Sewage – There is a study which looks at water quality assessment in relation to the impact of the development in the plan and capacity at waste water treatment works. It is flagging up that they all need to be expanded, even Apuldram.

Southern Water has a duty to provide this and they have a 5-year business plan cycle to do so e.g. what we are seeing now is something which has just been completed at Tangmere which was to service some of the development which was flagged up on the 2015 plan.

Hunston

We are preparing Neighbourhood Plan now and following the public meeting held last Wednesday attended by 120 residents they clearly indicated their objections to the 200 houses currently allocated in the Local Plan. Can they proceed with the number that they feel is preferable whilst the consultation takes place?

- A. That won't help in achieving a Local Plan; he added that he would encourage planning for a higher number then ratcheting down the numbers rather than the

other way around.

Can you assure the residents that there is a potential for the housing numbers to be reduced and referring back to the last local plan iteration, how many changes were made.

- B. There is a potential for the number to be changed either if the council changes its mind in the light of representations made as a result of the consultation or if the council doesn't change its mind through the examination process if the Inspector thinks it should be changed.
Referring to the changes made, MA said he was not employed by the council when this went through so is not the best person to ask. He suggested that if you don't wish to prepare a NP for 200. You could opt for not doing a plan for the 200 and then object to the Local Plan.

North Mundham

Earlier this year you shared with us the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). We then responded to it. We were told it was a live document, but when we met you earlier on this year you said it was represented of the situation of August 2017. So when is the HELAA to be resurrected as it would assist us in developing a NP

- A. MA said the team will be reviewing this almost immediately. It will take some time but will definitely be done by the time the next version of the plan goes through to Council. However it is very time consuming and cannot guarantee it will be finished by June/July 2019. He added they are quite happy to share any information they have with sites, and also said they don't have to stick to sites which are in the HELAA.

Selsey

Mitigation of ground water on the Peninsula – they have plans are supposed to deal with this but that struggle in flood conditions and is there anything in the provision under environmental issues of dealing with Grey Water.

- A. Ground water – this all needs to be risk assessed. You can drain the land – drainage needs maintenance. Grey water – love to include but would get resistance from developers on this. However some will say that Grey Water recycling is not sustainable as you need to have 2 pumping systems so couldn't be justified.

How do we ensure who are genuine Travellers, referring to a development which was constructed by an individual – now a solid building – if it hasn't got wheels on it how can you be a traveller?

- A. Legislation has changed slightly now. To be a traveller in the planning definition, you need to either demonstrate you have or are travelling or intend to travel in the future. It is very hard for us to prove someone isn't a traveller. The consultants they hired to do the Gypsy and Traveller accommodation assessment have interviewed various families to look at the needs moving forward, and one of the questions they asked was where they travel and what they travel for and when they come to enforcement cases again it can be very hard to prove.

Sidlesham

Re the conformity of NPs, Is it true that in reality this cannot be achieved until after the approval in 2020?

- A. This is a complex situation as you could produce a NP now and be in general conformity to the existing Local Plan. The problem may arise in some areas that they may be a change. Last time round Parishes like Kirdford and Loxwood did produce their NP in advance of the LP and were fortunate that nothing changed at examination, but they knew that if they had received a change, it would make their NP completely out of date.

Looking at last year's 2017 sustainability appraisal, it looks like any major development

that is coastal will have a detrimental effect on parishes between them and the A27, meaning the range of mitigation should spread throughout the intervening parishes. For instance we looked at the drainage to Sidlesham water treatment works – it's got 800 headroom capacity but we know that figure is based on 2014 estimate by Southern Water. They have just done an upgrade and there is nothing in the plan so it looks like the EA has problem with water management plans.

West Itchenor

Referring to page 36 of the plan – southern areas – Selsey with a population of 11,000 has secondary school and a major supermarket and gets an allocation of 250. We on the western manhood share the A286 notice that East Wittering with a population of only 5200 with no major supermarket and no secondary school gets a higher allocation. What is the significance of this?

A. We have looked at the availability and suitability of land and looked at the land available to the North of East Wittering and also the land available around Selsey and it was a judgement made with recommendation through to Members.

You say that Park & Ride in Chichester is not considered necessary at the present time; Surely it would reduce the city centre congestion and would reduce pollution so why can't you bring a park and ride scheme into your map on the south side of the A27?

A. So far it has been looked at and there isn't a critical mass to do the park and ride to make it viable.

West Wittering

Mentioned you're going to facilitate NP's. What other factors are there for you to facilitate.

Most NP's are being made against last plan. We will try and offer support for you on your NP but have to do this is alongside work on the Local Plan. It will be assessed for conformity against the strategic policies of the adopted local plan.

5. Minutes of Last Meeting

Minutes were approved and seconded

6. AOB and Future dates and meeting Topics & venues

Louise introduced Amie Whalen to the group and thanked Jenny Jones for all her help as she is now stepping down as Admin Support for the Forum. Any further queries regarding the forum agenda to contact Amie: awhalen@chichester.gov.uk

Carol Purnell spoke of the Manhood Wildlife heritage group and that they create maps for walks – they would like to make parishes aware of this. Amie Whalen to contact Bill Martin and to invite him to the next Forum.

Bill Martin to be invited to next Forum meeting.

CCG may be able to send a representation.

Southern Water Joel

Topics for Next Meeting:

- Bill Martin to talk on maps for walks within the Parishes
- Natural England and coastal pathways will also be pleased to present to us in the New Year.
- Possible debate on Medical facilities for regular patients and visitors – CCG?
- Southern Water Joel Hufford happy to come to March Forum.

Next meeting: 4 March 2019 at Birdham Village Hall

Chairman thanked all for coming along to the meeting

End of meeting.

