

**Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023 – 2039**  
**Summer 25 Informal Consultation**

| Section of the NP    | Comment | Comment   | Response   |
|----------------------|---------|---|--|
| <b>Policy NDHA 1</b> | 1.      | <p>I1 The Lodge, Ifold</p> <p>Please find our response to the Revised Appendix D of the neighbourhood plan. As amended on 02/07/2025.</p> <p>We look forward to your early response to find resolution to this matter.</p> <p>Comments regarding the Parish Council's assessment contained in Appendix D, published on the parish council website page.</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>The comments below are the personal views of one household, named within Appendix D of the parish council neighbourhood plan, and should not be viewed by the parish council as the view of all the owners of those properties so mentioned within the Appendix.</p> <p>The following comments relate solely to the property shown as number 1 on the amended Appendix D, namely, The Lodge, The Drive, Ifold.</p> <p>We note with interest that the assessment was conducted in May 2025. This was certainly done without our knowledge or input and also without any physical inspection of the property, which we believe has led to some over-marking in the scores, as recommended by Chichester District Council.</p> <p>Comments for each of the five sections of the matrix are shown below.</p> <p>1) Rural and Townscape Setting Value.</p> <p>This attracted a score of 2: buildings that make a positive contribution to the street scene/landscape.</p> <p>We accept that the property does indeed have "limited individual aesthetic value", we believe that The Lodge does not "directly contribute to the street scene/landscape" as we are mostly hidden from view on the street, unseen from the road and several people that we have spoken to personally do not</p> | <p>PC to retain the inclusion of this designation its importance historically as the property sets the scene of the entrance to the old estate and as one of the properties belonging to the Old Estate. The PC assessment scoring to be retained and although low due to the re design the PC feel there is historical merit to leave this to CDC to carry out a review to ascertain if the property is worth designation indue course. The inclusion will also be tested at Examination by the Independent Examiner.</p> <p>Write to resident.</p> |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>realise the house is there, as they drive past so quickly. The Lodge currently has no original historic details visible, the property having undergone extensive and radical re-design in the 1970's. Nothing visible today originates in the 1800's. Nearby and adjacent properties are modern by comparison. We therefore believe the score for this section would be more appropriate as 1.</p> <p>2) Local History Value.<br/>This also attracted a score of 2.<br/>It is our opinion that, a score of 1 is more appropriate given that, whilst the original property on the site had an association with the estate, the radical changes over the last 70 years or so, mean that in no way does the property give value in understanding local history.<br/>We acknowledge and accept the association with local history, in that it was an estate workers cottage but the visual impression of the building in its current state, gives no "understanding of local history" as it no longer resembles an estate workers cottage.</p> <p>3) Architectural Value.<br/>This scored 1.<br/>We accept the property holds aesthetic merit, however it is not typical of its original period and is substantially different to its original format. This score should be re-examined.</p> <p>4) Archaeological value.<br/>This scored 1.<br/>It could be argued that this property should score 0, as there are no visible original features. The property underwent substantial exterior and interior re-purposing and re modelling in the 1970's. There were further additions in the early 2000's. As a result of such changes, there is "no consistent survival of historical fabric", either internally or externally, which would therefore warrant a zero score.</p> |  |
|--|--|---|--|

|  |    |   |  |
|--|----|---|--|
|  |    | <p>5)Visible external appearance.<br/>This scored 1.<br/>This property was altered irreversibly in 1970's. The extensive remodelling means that no original features remain visible. A score of 0, would in our opinion, be more appropriate.<br/>Given the comments above it is our position that this scoring matrix should be re-visited in person to generate a more accurate report, before it is incorporated within the Parish Neighbourhood Plan.<br/>To illustrate this point, the re- design completed in the 1970's included but was not limited to:<br/>New roof, re-positioning / reorientation of internal stairs and blocking off the original access point, re-positioning of front door from the south to the east face of the property, replacement of chimneys, roof and windows (none are original).<br/>We would be happy to meet a Parish representative to facilitate a re-evaluation of the scoring of The Lodge and ensure a more accurate result was registered for the property.</p> |  |
|  | 4. | <p><b>P1 Subject:</b> Wephurst Park farmhouse</p> <p>The letter below was passed on to me. The Farmhouse at Wephurst is a 4 bed cottage that has been the farm managers home for decades and I have no idea where Green road is. I own the farm and I think this is a mistake. You wrote some months ago about this. I am not really a fan of authority interference / control over my properties. I had a particularly poor experience with Chichester some years ago, when they employed an American lady. I understand she was sacked. They gave no consideration to my requirements and had no understanding of the property itself., but I understand it is a tricky area based on personal views, which vary a good deal.<br/>Many thanks.</p>  | <p>Further details on this property could not be found to evidence historic merit and there working group propose to remove this nomination for designation.</p> |

|  |    |  |   |
|--|----|--|---|
|  |    |  |   |
|  | 5. | <p><b>P3 Edmonds Hill Cottage and P4 The Dairy</b></p> <p>I am reading the draft of the PINP and I have a question about the evaluation of properties P3 and P4 in section 6.3. This seems to give undue weight to two rather insignificant properties. The only reason for their inclusion seems to be their location on the edge of the Plaistow Conservation Area. Having looked at the criteria and scoring in Appendix D, similar scoring could be applied to many properties in the village. Apart from location, what merit do these properties have over say, the former Cokeler chapel and manse formed by Marazion, Zion Cottage and Zion House?</p> | <p>The further properties suggested Cokeler Chapel, Zion Cottage and Zion House to be assessed by the Group once further details received from the Plaistow Village Trust</p>   |
| <b>LGS Policy- LGS Ancient Woodland in the Centre of Ifold</b> | 2. | <p>Comments regarding the lack of adherence to Planning Policy Guidance, including identifying owners too late in the process and not at a proposal stage when representations could have been made before publication</p> <p>Comments regarding area designated being largely residential property and curtilage and not all woodland.</p> <p>Comments regarding unnecessary duplications of protections given Tree Protection Orders on all trees within woodland area</p> <p>Comments regarding not meeting any of the NPPF Para 106 criteria with a lack of supporting evidence; and misuse of ancient woodland designation to determine the area as</p>   | <p>The Parish Council working group are satisfied owners were contacted at an early stage in the consultation process being well ahead of formal consultation at Regulation 14.</p> <p>The area was designated to follow the same boundary as Natural England's Ancient Woodland area. Ancient Woodland relates to a habitat area and not necessarily a wooded area in total, primary and tertiary Ancient Woodland exist within a designation.</p> <p>The Ancient Woodland designation protects the habitat area not just the trees.</p> <p>The Parish Council Working Group's assessment of the area under para 106 of the NPPF related to the Special Nature of the area due to its designation as Ancient Woodland within the</p> |

|  |    |   |  |
|--|----|---|--|
|  |    | <p>demonstrably special to a local community and holding particular local significance.</p> <p>See attached APPENDIX Commentator 2 and APPENDIX Commentator 2 Further -for full comments.</p>   | <p>Settlement Boundary being unique as the only remaining area of Ancient Woodland within the settlement boundary. The area was also to be valued for its richness of wildlife. The Parish Council's research as to richness was limited to a desk top study. The area was included on Chichester District Council's Bat Home and Bat Movement Network map and within the Invertebrate Conservation Trust Sussex Bee Lines map.</p> <p>Anecdotally Badgers have been observed in Oak Way, Chalk Road and The Drive area. Foxes have been observed in the in The Ride. Deer have been observed in The Drive (opposite Oak Way) and The Ride and it would be surprising if they did not also use this protected wooded area. However, it was decided the Ancient Woodland Designation having been given significant prominence in the Chichester Local Plan adopted in August 2025 would be sufficient to protect the habitat which benefits the Ifold Settlement.</p> |
|  | 3. | <p>The description and photograph is misleading as it does not identify the individual gardens it covers, neither is it clear exactly the area included within the proposal.</p> <p>Within the proposed area were 5 individually owned gardens all appropriately fenced. Whilst the area may be assessed as a single unit the criteria should be applied to each individual plot.</p> | <p>The CDC online Ancient Woodland area map was used for the location map. The area was designated to follow the same boundary as Natural England's Ancient Woodland area.</p> <p>The Ancient Woodland is a continuous habitat despite the fences and as such assessed as one.</p>   |

|  |    |   |  |
|--|----|---|--|
|  |    | <p>In regard to this we would question the term “insufficient” in the reason for the withdrawal of the proposal. The true position is that there was NO underlying, verifiable evidence whatsoever to support the test of "richness of wildlife.", or for that matter for any of the NPPF Criteria</p> <p>See attached APPENDIX Commentator 3- for full comments</p>  | See response to Comment number 2 above.  |
| <b>LGS Policy-<br/>LGS Generally</b>   | 7. | <p>Thanks for getting in touch with us about the proposed designation of areas as Local Green Space.</p> <p>The areas proposed seem to meet the criteria and we would support their inclusion.</p> <p>All the best Jane Cecil National Trust</p>  | Noted.   |
| <b>LGS Policy<br/>Green space<br/>containing<br/>Landmark Oak<br/>Tree at the<br/>entrance to The<br/>Drive, Ifold</b> | 3  | <p>I have not studied your consultation documents in full but would use the site at Oak Tree Stores as an example.</p> <p>Yes it is a magnificent tree and as such adds to the beauty of the area.</p> <p>It is appreciated by all those that pass and those who enjoy a cup of coffee there.</p> <p>However it is placed in close proximity to the entrance to The Drive. It is surrounded by the shop area and houses on The Drive. There is virtually no practical possibility the area on which it stands could be built on. It simply doesn't meet the necessary criteria. The simple solution is for the tree, if it is not currently protected, to be the subject of a TPO. A LGS designation is not appropriate</p> | Retain as the green area provides the setting for the rural village. Request a TPO for the Ancient Oak.  |
|  |    |   |  |
| <b>Other</b>   | 6. | <p>I don't see anything in the plan to address the need for traffic calming measures through the villages. Speed bumps and road narrowing devices. Like they have in rural France, for instance. If people cannot drive at the appropriate speed, then they have to be forced to slow down by physical interventions.</p>   | The Aim ECC6 provided for approaches from the PC to WSCC Highways for traffic calming. A Policy was not possible as Traffic Calming was outside the control of the PC and would be determined by Highways. |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | Community Speed Watch is totally ineffective, and I have not seen a police car locally for several years. |  |
|--|--|---|--|