

Minutes.

Date: 12.03.2025

Attendees: Cllr Amanda Worne, Arun District Council, Yapton Parish Council (AW)
Cllr Dawn Smith, Ford Parish Council (DSm)
Cllr Danny Armstrong, Ford Parish Council (DA)
Cllr Sam Langmead, Ford Parish Council (SL)
Maureen Chaffe, Ford Community Land Trust (MC)
Barry Hodges, Ford Community Land Trust (BH)
Julie Curteis, Ford Community Land Trust (JC)
Cllr Tim Hibbert, Clymping Parish Council (TH)
Cllr Colin Humphries, Clymping Parish Council (CH)
Elaine Cordingley, Ford to Hunston canal society (EC)
Cllr Victoria Newman, Yapton Parish Council (VN)
Julia Chelygo, Yapton resident (JC)
Jackie Thompson, Yapton resident (JT)
John Longhorn, Vistry (JL)
David Scane, SEC Newgate (DSc)

Apologies: Gardiner Hanson, Tor & co
Sophie Richardson, SEC Newgate
Cllr Jacky Pendelton, WSCC

	Action
1.	AW to assist in getting meeting with Arun's drainage officer.
2.	Parish Councils and CLT to write letters to ADC in support of getting the outstanding issues with the RMs agreed upon and in front of committee.
3.	MC indicated that she would write to the Deputy Prime Minister.



4.	DSc to continue regular newsletter to the community. Noticeboard to go up and alternative PROWs to be marked out subject to Construction Management Plan approval.
5.	Next CLG meeting to be in May/June.

Comment	Actions
<p>Planning Update</p> <p>JL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">JL explained how the three reserved matters applications were submitted last year and that the council then collated all the statutory consultee responses. This was followed by a round of meetings to discuss the comments.Additional information and alterations had been submitted in January, which had to be uploaded to the council's website. The statutory consultees then had to be reconsulted.There are three outstanding issues: the need for a planning performance agreement extension, drainage issues, and the need for more monitoring during the winter months.Planning performance agreement (PPA): Vistry working to get the council to commit to another extension to the PPA which expired in October. This means that Vistry pays for a dedicated day a week of the planning officer's time. JL believes ADC is now reluctant to sign up to the agreement again likely due to drainage issues.In pre-application ADC said that Arun Drainage had no capacity to engage so the project team worked directly with WSCC Flood Authority as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). During the consultation process WSCC's objections were addressed and resolved. However, Arun Drainage recently submitted objections to all three RMs despite not being involved earlier in the process.Arun Drainage want monitoring to have been carried out during Winter months to determine the type of drainage required. The team had previously presented a 'belt and braces' approach due to the high water table across the site. Putting measures in place that mean draining by infiltration is a risk and the project team have gone with a safer option that uses SUDS.	<p>AW to assist in getting meeting with Arun's drainage officer</p> <p>Parish Councils and CLT to write letters to ADC in support of getting the outstanding issues with the RMs agreed upon and in front of committee.</p> <p>MC to write to deputy prime minister.</p>



MC:

- How long ago were the comments from the lead local flood authority?

JL:

- Comments were given by WSCC drainage pre-application and during the consultation. The planning department did not consult the Arun drainage department on the basis that WSCC were leading, but the drainage department took it upon themselves to comment separately. JL has asked for a corporate response from the council rather than receiving differing opinions from different departments.

AW:

- AW had spoken to the case officer for the site and had been told that WSCC are responsible for the drainage but that it had come back to ADC. She has worked well with the drainage engineer at ADC on previous flooding concerns.
- AW said that drainage concerns should be dealt with before the application goes to committee otherwise the application risks being refused.
- AW noted that ADC need the site for their housing numbers and want the best from the site regarding drainage. It needs to be a two-way conversation between Vistry and ADC.

VN:

- VN asked whether a compromise on drainage has been reached yet.

JL:

- Vistry had met with Karl Roberts, Director of Growth, and the new chief executive of ADC, Dawn Hudd, in November to introduce themselves. Karl Roberts highlighted that his door is open so they went back to talk to him about delays around the PPA extension and drainage. In March there have been new exchanges between David Dodds (Vistry) and Karl Roberts, with Vistry asking ADC to spell out what else is needed from them, and vice versa.
- A meeting needs to be organised between ADC and WSCC drainage and Vistry.
- Vistry would also like a committee date agreed on, ideally May. ADC has suggested that an extraordinary committee meeting could be called to determine the three RMs. Jess Riches, the case officer, said that historically this hasn't been needed.

AW:

- Happy to go back to the drainage officer and help to get a meeting arranged.
- Keen to understand more about what ADC's concerns are.



JL:

- Some more design comments have been received from ADC, not necessarily objections. The Vistry team has been asking the officers to distil these comments and highlight any areas of concern around design.
- Objections from the environmental health officer about noise have also been received relatively late in the day. Issues not addressed at the outline application stage has not helped this. For example, a bund of 4m near the tyre enterprise was suggested as a noise solution but the outline permission is for 3m.

VN:

- Important that the application is in line with the design code.
- Confirms that the difficulty is around getting a meeting with everyone from Vistry and ADC in the same room.

MC:

- Proposes that the parish councils and CLT writes to ADC to emphasise how much time they have already spent on the application (3 years to agree the S106 for example) and that they want to finally get it approved and built.

VN:

- Both Yapton and Clymping as well as Ford can write as they want to see the development happen.

MC:

- Suspects that JL will say the footpath delays is due to ADC too. Everyone on social media is complaining that Vistry has shut the footpaths and are not doing anything, a counter message is needed.

CH:

- Similar issues experienced with the Foreman Homes development with the field just sat there. Getting the drainage right is important.
- WSCC and ADC flooding focus is different. WSCC focuses more on how flooding effects highways.

JL:

- JL regularly deals with the LLFA and does not believe that they are just concerned with highways. Detailed modelling from across the site is required by the LLFA in order for them to agree a drainage solution for the whole site.

VN:

- ADC is currently dealing with lots of houses where the drainage has not worked. So that is where their hesitance is coming from.



Footpaths

CH:

- Residents in Clymping are upset about PROW 175 being closed. They are using the homemade track down the side of Yapton Road.
- CH believed that WSCC had approved the alternative PROWs in November so need to understand what has delayed implementation.

JL:

- Understands frustration around footpaths as the improvements promised have been delayed due to lag time of the start of construction due to RM delays and continuing drainage considerations.
- There are site wide conditions such as the construction management plan that need to be approved still in order for prowl works to commence.

AW:

- Asked how the footpath issue is connected to the drainage issue. Would like the alternative PROW routes that were mentioned in November to be constructed.

VN:

- Asks if Vistry could give rights to roam in lieu of the instating the temporary footpaths.

JL:

- There are issues of health and safety, especially regarding the trenching in place for archaeology works. Vistry would be liable for harms on their land.
- The archaeological works are still ongoing.

TH:

- Asked what can be done now with the permissions currently given by the council, as supposed to waiting for the whole package of permissions.

JL:

- Tom Dean, the site manager, has said that they are waiting on the Construction Management Plan (CMP) to be approved by ADC in order to proceed with the alternative PROW works and putting up the information boards.

DS:

- The timescale for the CMP approval will be another 4 weeks.
- The closed footpaths need to remain closed due to the archaeological digs that are ongoing. The alternative footpaths cannot be opened because the CMP has not been approved.

AW:

- Question if SUDS concern is to do with them being part of open space provision.

JL:



- The SUDS are made to look green and natural and become a landscape feature.
- The open space provision was an agreed feature of the design code.

Continuing communication with ADC

TH:

- Suggested that Ford Parish Councillors need to help facilitate a meeting between relevant officers and the Vistry team. The advisory group could be used for this.

SL:

- An advisory group meeting is not the right vehicle for such a meeting.

MC:

- A PPA needs to be agreed too. This is the only major site that ADC have at the moment and it needs to be finalised.

VN:

- An agenda and critical path needs agreeing with ADC to insure they focus on drainage rather than playgrounds for example.
- Asks if a compromise to a hybrid drainage system can be reached.

JL:

- ADC's position would be that a drainage system cannot be agreed until more Winter monitoring is carried out.
- Monitoring has been carried out in the two previous Winters.

VN:

- ADC cannot expect Vistry to sit around for a year and wait for monitoring. Materials are getting more expensive which will affect the viability.
- Individual parishes need to keep the pressure on ADC.

AW:

- AW has a good professional relationship with Carl, the lead engineer, who has been leading flood forums. He is a very conscientious officer.

JL:

- Appreciates what the parishes are saying about wanting to broker meeting and said that this will help back up what conversations his managing director is having with Karl Roberts at the moment.

MC:

- MC said she would write to Angela Rayner, the Deputy Prime Minister. They have been trying to get proper housing for local people for years and years and now we are stuck. Everyone around the table has taken a lot of time reading through the application documents and putting forward comments that have been considered. The deadlock needs to be broken.



JL:

- If the 3 RMs don't get approved, Vistry is committed to the project and will have to resubmit. This will cost another £750,000 of planning and consultant fees.

AW:

- Issues need to be worked out before it goes to the planning committee on 5th May. Will try to arrange meeting with officers the next week.

JL:

- It is a significant amount of work for the case officer to write up the report two weeks prior to the committee date. Vistry have offered the option to ADC for them to provide a draft of the document and the officer to critique it - to make it a smoother process.
- They will always press for the earliest possible committee date but the current ambition is just to keep the dialogue going between Vistry and officers. He emphasised how the project team would drop anything to attend a meeting with officers.
- Karl Roberts has been very helpful in making sure a dialogue is continuing.

VN:

- Asked if the hybrid drainage system an option that Vistry could consider if required by the council.

JL:

- It could be looked at on the basis that another round of winter testing isn't required. A view as to how far resolved the environmental health issues are would need to be taken - if in a good place where the application would go to appeal on just one point (drainage) a legal opinion would be sought. During the appeal process they would likely go to ADC with a new application and agree a new set of conditions. This would use up a large amount of resource.

MC:

- Risk of application going through by appeal removing the ability to put conditions on the development.

VN:

- Planning application not the end of discussions with Vistry, opportunity for discussions throughout the 10 year build out.

JL:

- Wants to reassure that having outstanding issues at the 11th hour isn't an unusual occurrence in planning. A solution does tend to present itself and this should be worked towards in the case of Ford Airfield too.

AOB

MC:



- The Ford Neighbourhood Plan passed examination and is set to be ratified by ADC next Wednesday.

DSm:

- DSm received the email with the newsletter and asked if this will continue.

D^{Sc}:

- D^{Sc} said that a newsletter with regular updates will continue to be sent out to the CLG and put on the Vistryhomesford.co.uk website, dependent on there being updates to provide. The notice board will soon be put up at the Rollaston Park entrance once the Construction Management Plan is approved.

Next CLG Date

D^{Sc}:

- The next CLG is likely to be in the next couple of months when there updates that need discussing. If there is a committee date of 5 May, a CLG afterwards would be useful. Updates will be communicated with members in the meantime.