

RE: Draft Site Allocations DPD - critical information omitted and inaccuracies present

[REDACTED]
Mon 23/09/2019 6:20 PM

To: Helena Griffiths [REDACTED]

Dear Ms. Griffiths,

The material on the web site has now been corrected by my planning colleagues.

The matter is being considered by Council on Wednesday 25th September at 7pm here at Oaklands Haywards Heath and you are free to attend in the public gallery.

When a proposed site allocation document is sent out for public consultation you are free to send in your thinking on the sites through that process. All such representations will be considered and a further sites document agreed ahead of the second and final public consultation before the matter reaches the independent planning inspector.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]
01444 477459

[REDACTED]
www.midsussex.gov.uk

Mid Sussex District Council,
Oaklands Road, Haywards Heath,
West Sussex, RH16 1SS
(DX 300320 Haywards Heath 1)

Working together for a better Mid Sussex

From: Helena Griffiths [REDACTED]

Sent: 17 September 2019 12:06

To: Tom Clark

Cc: [REDACTED]; Helena Griffiths

Subject: Fw: Draft Site Allocations DPD - critical information omitted and inaccuracies present

Dear Mr [REDACTED]

I am emailing you regarding concerns I have with the Draft Site Allocations DPD.

I noted that you were at the scrutiny committee meeting on last Wednesday evening (11th) where two Councillors raised question following an email from myself about site selections in Horsted Keynes.

The sites I am promoting on behalf of my family were rejected, and the reason stated was that access was an issue because land enabling a safe access was in 'third party ownership'. This is not true, and in April I sent documents to the planning officers showing that the land did belong to the family.

My question to you is concerning the evidence of ownership that I provided the planning officers (Alice Henstock and Alma Howell) in May. I provided land registry documents. Can you please liaise with the planning department to find out why they considered this to not be adequate evidence of ownership? Or do they need additional legal information (if so what)? or was it just a mistake that the information in May was not corrected?

I would like to get a clearer understanding of this issue prior to any regulation 18 consultation so that I can document and provide the correct information in the consultation for further consideration.

Many thanks for your assistance with this matter,

Kindest Regards,

Helena Griffiths

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 5:54 PM
To: Helena Griffiths [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]

Clive Laband (Cllr) <Clive.Laband@midsussex.gov.uk>; Richard Bates (Cllr) <Richard.Bates@midsussex.gov.uk>; Margaret Belsey (Cllr) <Margaret.Belsey@midsussex.gov.uk>; Emma Coe-Gunnell White (Cllr) <emma.coegunnellwhite@midsussex.gov.uk>; Rachel Cromie (Cllr) <Rachel.Cromie@midsussex.gov.uk>; Robert Eggleston (Cllr) <Robert.Eggleston@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Draft Site Allocations DPD - critical information omitted and inaccuracies present

Dear Miss Griffiths

Thank you for your email below and for your comments regarding the site selection process/the sites promoted by you.

The regulation 18 consultation stage provides opportunities for land owners/promoters to make representations and I would encourage you to submit your comments through this process so that they can be fully considered at this stage.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Working together for a better Mid Sussex

From: Helena Griffiths [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 September 2019 16:29
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED] Neville Walker (Cllr); Clive Laband (Cllr); Richard Bates (Cllr); Margaret Belsey (Cllr); Emma Coe-Gunnell White (Cllr); Rachel Cromie (Cllr); Robert Eggleston (Cllr)
Subject: Re: Draft Site Allocations DPD - critical information omitted and inaccuracies present

Dear Miss [REDACTED]

Thank you for your quick response regarding my concerns about the assessment of the Jeffreys Farm sites. I am reassured that the 3 sites being promoted by us at Jeffreys Farm have been evaluated, however you have not addressed the issue of inaccurate information being used to make those evaluations. I still believe that the final assessments are flawed due to the use of inaccurate and false information.

As per my previous correspondence, the assessments in the draft document clearly state that site #68 and #971 are unsuitable because the land needed to create a safe access is in third party ownership. I would state yet again that this is categorically untrue. The land required to provide safe access to these sites is owned by ourselves and is fully available as I have made every clear on a number of occasions. I have even provided land registry title deeds to support this. It is therefore simply untrue for the Council to state that the sites can not be provided with safe access because the land is in third party ownership.

Can I draw your attention to previous planning applications for site #68 and site #69 (DM/19/0957 and DM/16/3974) which included detailed plans for an alternative access to Sugar Lane, which was NOT challenged by West Sussex Highways as they considered the alternative access to be safe. This access was proposed following input from Richard Speller of West Sussex Highways prior to the application being submitted as a safe alternative to access the site (see attached document Ref HKNP 016 aka MSDC site #68 and fields, and site sketches 07 and 08 at the end of the report - please note that comments made about purchasing additional land to enable this improved access are also completely incorrect - as noted above the land is in our ownership).

It is astounding that this information is available to the planning department at Mid Sussex, yet concluding remarks for site #68 state that there are 'difficulties achieving safe access' (Ref main report of Site Selection Paper 3: Page 70). Again this is clearly untrue.

I request that the Committee meeting tonight are made fully aware that these inaccuracies remain in the public document, so that they appreciate that the allocations of land in Horsted Keynes are being decided upon inaccurate and incorrect information.

Many thanks and regards,
Helena Griffiths

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 2:28 PM
To: Helena Griffiths [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]; Neville Walker (Cllr) <neville.walker@midsussex.gov.uk>; Clive Laband (Cllr) <Clive.Laband@midsussex.gov.uk>; Richard Bates (Cllr) <Richard.Bates@midsussex.gov.uk>; Margaret Belsey (Cllr) <Margaret.Belsey@midsussex.gov.uk>; Emma Coe-Gunnell White (Cllr) <emma.coegunnellwhite@midsussex.gov.uk>; Rachel Cromie (Cllr) <Rachel.Cromie@midsussex.gov.uk>; Robert Eggleston (Cllr) <Robert.Eggleston@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Draft Site Allocations DPD - critical information omitted and inaccuracies present

Dear Miss Griffiths

Thank you for drawing my attention to the fact that site 69 – Jeffrey's Farm northern Fields, is not currently included in the Site Selection Paper 3: Housing Appendix B: Housing Site Proforma document that has been published to support the Scrutiny Committee for Housing, Planning and Economic Growth agenda.

As you state my Team have been working closely with promoters to ensure that site details are accurate. As a consequence, and following your revised promotion, I can confirm that three sites at Jeffrey's Farm, Site 69, Site 971 and Site 68 have been assessed through the Site Selection process. This is clearly demonstrated in the main report of Site Selection Paper 3: Housing. Pages 70 and 71 of the report show all three sites were assessed alongside all the other sites at Horsted Keynes. The boundaries of the three sites can clearly be seen on the map and the conclusion of the site assessment work are also set out.

Unfortunately however, due to an administrative error, one of the detailed site proforma has not been included in the associated Appendix. Appendix B does include the proforma for two of the three parcels (ID Refs 68 and 971) however the proforma for the larger site (ID 780) has not been replaced with the third parcel (ID 60). The corrected version will be published alongside the Council report.

I hope that I have been able to reassure you that the three sites have been properly assessed through the Site Selection process.

I have copied in all the Members of Scrutiny Committee into this reply as I have been made aware that you have emailed them under separate cover raising this issue.

Kind regards



Working together for a better Mid Sussex

From: Helena Griffiths [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 September 2019 09:45
To: [REDACTED] d
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Draft Site Allocations DPD - critical information omitted and inaccuracies present

Dear Miss [REDACTED]

I am forwarding this email to you regarding the MSDC Draft Site Allocations document. There has been little time to review these documents since they have been in the public domain, but I am extremely surprised and frustrated to read the assessments made in respect of sites in Horsted Keynes.

Having liaised directly with the Council's planning policy team extensively over the past year (Alice Henstock and Alma Howell) I am disappointed to see a number of statements made in respect of our sites at Jeffreys Farm which are not only entirely inaccurate but have been expressly pointed out to Officers previously as being incorrect.

These inaccurate statements have had a direct impact on the site allocations being proposed.

I have raised these concerns with Councillor Brown, and will be forwarding my concerns on to all Councillors on the scrutiny committee, and if they decide to take the plan forward in its current form I will include members of the full council.

I would appreciate confirmation of receipt of this communication.

Many thanks and regards,
Helena Griffiths

From: Helena Griffiths [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 8:13 AM
To: paul.brown@midsussex.gov.uk <paul.brown@midsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: linda.stockwell@midsussex.gov.uk <linda.stockwell@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Draft Site Allocations DPD - critical information omitted and inaccuracies present

Dear Councillor Brown,

I was pleased to see you at the Horsted Keynes Parish Council last night, but unfortunately wasn't able to catch you before you left the meeting. I totally agree with your conclusion that the Scrutiny Committee should not support the Draft Site Allocations Plan in its current form.

As a landowner promoting sites within the village, I have reviewed the Draft Site Allocations DPD and I am extremely surprised and frustrated to read the assessments made in respect of sites in Horsted Keynes. Having liaised directly with the Council's planning policy team extensively over the past year I am disappointed to see a number of statements made in respect of our sites at Jeffreys Farm which are not only entirely inaccurate but have been expressly pointed out to Officers previously as being incorrect.

One site that has been promoted by us, the landowner, and assessed by the planning team has been totally omitted from the housing sites documents, and thus consideration for the final allocation. This is site #69 (Land

to the north of Farm Buildings at Jeffreys Farm). A larger site that we are not promoting (site #780) has unfortunately been included, but this is not available. We have made it clear that we are not intending to develop this site and it is wrong for the Council to consider this site as available for development.

In addition to this, information on other sites (site #68 Jeffreys Farm Buildings, and site #971 Land to south of Jeffreys Farm Buildings) is also incorrect. The access is described as being limited due to 'physical constraints and third-party ownership'. This is categorically untrue and the Council's planners know that to be the case. The land enabling safe access is NOT in third-party ownership but IS owned by my family who are promoting the site. This was raised with the Council's planning officers in May 2019 and I have provided land registry documents confirming our ownership of the land. There are manifestly no third party ownership issues attached to these sites, so they should not be ruled out on this basis.

These omissions and inaccuracies are critical to the conclusions drawn in the assessment of these sites and having been through the process of positively trying to engage with the Council's officers to correct them, it is really very disappointing to see this information being perpetuated in the public version of this document. Officers have either ignored me and the information I have provided to them or there has been a significant error made in the production of this document. Either way, the DPD at present purports inaccurate and frankly false information and if this has occurred in the assessment of our sites, it begs the question, has the same occurred elsewhere in the document?

In addition, there is substantial evidence that the assessments made by the AONB Partnership are not robust or consistent assessments, when comparing sites in the village of Horsted Keynes. The AONB assessment lacks identifiable methodology resulting in any assessment being open to interpretation and ultimately criticism. The advice provided by the AONB Partnership is being heavily weighted in planning decisions and the Site Allocations DPD, and therefore needs to be robust and defensible.

The Site Allocations DPD is an important document that will heavily influence the future of many people's landholdings over the coming years. It is incumbent upon the Council to make sure that this document stands up to scrutiny. My previous attempts to try to correct the information relating to my sites has clearly been unsuccessful which is why I feel compelled to bring this matter to your direct attention now in the hope that you will consider a recommendation to amend the Draft Site Allocations DPD to present an accurate picture before it is released for public consultation.

I will be forwarding this email to all Councillors on the Scrutiny committee, and also the full council for consideration. In addition I will raise my concerns directly with MSDC planning department and the officers that I have been communicating with.

Should you want to discuss these matters directly please feel free to call me on 01825 790 401, or I am happy to meet up in person.

Many thanks and regards,

Helena Griffiths

(on behalf of the Griffiths family promoting sites at Jeffreys Farm)

The information contained in this email may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Unless the information contained in this email is legally exempt from disclosure, we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this email to a third party making a request for information about the subject matter of this email. This email and any attachments may contain confidential information and is intended only to be seen and used by the named addressees. If you are not the named addressee, any use, disclosure, copying, alteration or forwarding of this email and its attachments is unauthorised. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately by email or by calling +44 (0) 1444 458 166 and remove this email and its attachments from your system. The views expressed within this email and any attachments are not necessarily the views or policies of Mid Sussex District Council. We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise you to carry out your own virus checks before accessing this email and any attachments. Except where required by law, we shall not be responsible for any damage, loss or liability of any kind suffered in connection with this email and any attachments, or which may result from reliance on the contents of this email and any attachments.

The information contained in this email may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Unless the information contained in this email is legally exempt from disclosure, we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this email to a third party making a request for information about the subject matter of this email. This email and any

attachments may contain confidential information and is intended only to be seen and used by the named addressees. If you are not the named addressee, any use, disclosure, copying, alteration or forwarding of this email and its attachments is unauthorised. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately by email or by calling +44 (0) 1444 458 166 and remove this email and its attachments from your system. The views expressed within this email and any attachments are not necessarily the views or policies of Mid Sussex District Council. We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise you to carry out your own virus checks before accessing this email and any attachments. Except where required by law, we shall not be responsible for any damage, loss or liability of any kind suffered in connection with this email and any attachments, or which may result from reliance on the contents of this email and any attachments.

The information contained in this email may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Unless the information contained in this email is legally exempt from disclosure, we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this email to a third party making a request for information about the subject matter of this email. This email and any attachments may contain confidential information and is intended only to be seen and used by the named addressees. If you are not the named addressee, any use, disclosure, copying, alteration or forwarding of this email and its attachments is unauthorised. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately by email or by calling +44 (0) 1444 458 166 and remove this email and its attachments from your system. The views expressed within this email and any attachments are not necessarily the views or policies of Mid Sussex District Council. We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise you to carry out your own virus checks before accessing this email and any attachments. Except where required by law, we shall not be responsible for any damage, loss or liability of any kind suffered in connection with this email and any attachments, or which may result from reliance on the contents of this email and any attachments.