



Southbourne Parish Council

The Village Hall
First Avenue
Southbourne
West Sussex
PO10 8HN

01243 373 667

admin@southbourne-pc.gov.uk
www.southbourne-pc.gov.uk

Minutes of the Meeting of Southbourne Parish Council's Planning Committee held Thursday 11th January 2024

Present: Cllrs: A. Tait (Chair), T. Bangert, J. Money, N. Redman & J. Walker. Cllr S. Rosenberg joined the meeting at agenda item 4.

In Attendance: M. Carvajal-Neal (Deputy Clerk) 3 Representatives of One Church and 9 members of the public.

158. CHAIR'S WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked members of the public for their attendance. The meeting opened at 6.00 pm.

159. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Cllr Meredith due to work commitments.

160. TO APPROVE AND SIGN THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 30TH NOVEMBER 2023

Members **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes of the Planning Committee held on 30th November and they were signed by the Chair.

Cllr S. Rosenberg joined the meeting at 18:02.

161. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

161.1 Cllrs Tait and Bangert declared that they had met with a resident of Lumley regarding SB/23/02690/FUL, the Deputy Clerk and CDC planning officer were both present and no decisions or opinions were given, as such this will not impact on any decision required at this meeting.

161.2 Cllr Bangert has previously met with members of the One Church to get an understanding of the services they offer and the facilities they have. She does not believe this will impact on her decision making for the application.

No other declarations were made.

162. ADJOURNED FOR OPEN FORUM

The meeting was adjourned at 18.03.

162.1 A member of the public spoke against SB/23/02690/FUL including;

- He does not support the replacement of a bungalow with an 8-metre-tall house which he describes as offensive. Neither do many neighbours, there have been approximately 20 objections made on the portal.

- He would be more inclined to support the development of another bungalow which is in keeping with the area and more appropriate to the site.
- No site notice has been displayed.
- This application is seen to have been encouraged by a previously approved application for a 2-storey house which he believes also should not have been granted permission. The former application also received disapproval by nearby residents who at that time wrote to the local MP for support. The application was approved without a site visit by the case officer.
- He is concerned that the scale and dominance of the proposed dwelling will result in either loss of privacy and/or light to all neighbouring properties as well as obstruct the view for several properties.
- The case officer for this application has now visited neighbouring residents.
- He would like to see this application refused and the previously approved application (now expired) have its permission withdrawn and not be allowed to set precedence.

162.2 A member of the public spoke against 23/00024/OUT including;

- This amendment is a slight change to the application only.
- Drainage, access and traffic concerns have still not been addressed.
- Several items raised by other stakeholders and documented on the CDC portal have not been addressed. He would like to see these points answered.
- He would like to see that the decision on this application is not determined until the Southbourne NP process is completed.

The meeting was readjourned at 18:09.

163. CLERK'S UPDATE

163.1 It was **NOTED** that extensions for comments were given on all applications received over the Christmas period.

163.2 The Deputy Clerk advised that another email has been sent to CDC officers regarding the lack of proper notification of planning applications. This was escalated by Cllr Bangert who has now received a reply from planning managers relating to application SB/23/02690/FUL and this is being investigated further. The Deputy Clerk, Cllr Tait and Cllr Bangert were also able to meet with the Officer for this application and discuss their concerns. As a result it is hoped that the CDC Planning Administration Manager will be in touch with Clerk's and training may be available on the CDC portal and CDC planning processes.

164. ADJOURNMENT FOR PRESENTATIONS

The meeting was adjourned at 18.10.

Members of One Church presented regarding amendments to their application. They thanked the Parish Council for previous comments made and were confident that they had been able to make changes to alleviate any previously noted concerns including those made by Chichester Harbour Conservancy.

Changes from original submission:

- Lowered eaves and ridges lines with the height being lower than Winsley House
- Traditional materials and colour alignment with CHCC guidance, to match the rural setting within the AONB
- Reduced numbers of windows on South Elevation to avoid light spill.
- Glazing to be tinted for low light transmittance in compliance with dark skies guidance.
- Living wall on the South elevation.

The building will be designed and built to meet current passive building guidance and will incorporate –

- Compliance with Part J, Part L and Part F of the Building Regulations.
- Clean heat technology such as Air Source Heat Pumps
- Energy saving Lighting
- Outdoor living wall along the southern elevation.

- On-site habitat creation for example, Bats Boxes and enhancements to maintain the wildlife corridor.
- The Auditorium will be acoustically treated to prevent sound leakage.

They discussed the need for the new development, specifically that the current building is not fit for purpose and only has temporary permission until 2025. They discussed the importance of the work that they do, the support that they provide and the reach of their services both demographic and geographic.

The meeting was readjourned at 18.28.

It was **PROPOSED** and unanimously **AGREED** to change the order of business and consider the applications raised in Open Forum and Presentations in the following order; agenda item 8.4, 9.2 and 9.3.

165. AGENDA ITEM 8.4

SB/23/02690/FUL. Members of the Southbourne Parish Council Planning Committee considered this application and **AGREED** to **OBJECT** to the application for the following reasons and material considerations;

- This application does not conform with NP policy SB5 - 5.29 To meet/retain the character of surrounding buildings.
- This application does not conform with NP policy SB20 -(B) to demonstrate that all surface water does not leave the site. In addition, no drainage report is included with this application. It also does not conform with NP Policy SB20 - iv - separating surface and sewage removing combined network, this proposed development does not meet this requirement.
- This application does not conform with NP Policy SB14 - The site is the Lumley wildlife corridor so extra care must be taken.
- The HRA seems incorrect, the site is a new build and is 5.6 km from Chichester Harbour requiring Bird Aware mitigation.
- This application is in contrast to the following Material planning considerations:
 1. Overlooking/ loss of privacy- many of the neighbouring properties will be overlooked and as such lose their privacy.
 2. Loss of daylight/sunlight, overshadowing- The size of the proposed development will cast shadow and result in a loss of daylight to many of the neighbouring properties.
 3. Scale and dominance- The proposed scale of the development is excessive compared to both neighbouring properties and the size of the plot and position of the development within the boundary line. The proposed development will dominate neighbouring properties if it is permitted.
 4. Appearance & design- The appearance of the proposed development is not in keeping with the area or with neighbouring properties and is contrary to NP policy SB5 as it does not support the essential characteristics of the area.
 5. Drainage - no plans are included in the application, all surface water currently can run off onto Lumley Road and into the Ems (chalk stream) tributary and into Peter Pond. This is contrary to NP SB 20 – B which stipulates new development within or adjacent to the Lumley and Ham Brook Chalk Streams must demonstrate the measures that will be taken to ensure that polluted runoff (including suspended sediment) does not leave the site and enter the surrounding waterbodies during either construction or operation.
 6. Past applications include a refusal and appeal dismissal.
- This application is also contrary to NPPF policy (Dec 2023) 135, specifically paragraph C. that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities).
- Members are also concerned that this application was not sufficiently advertised; no site notice was displayed and immediate neighbours were not notified. This application was validated on 18 December 2023 but not published on the weekly lists until 4 January 2024 leaving inadequate time for comment.

In addition to agreeing to the above comments it was further **AGREED** to support Cllr Bangert in red carding this application as it was felt that the objections warranted that this application is either refused or is considered by CDC Planning Committee.

166. AGENDA ITEM 9.2

23/00024/OUT. Members of the committee re-considered this application in accordance with the amendments made and unanimously **AGREED** to **OBJECT** to this application. The amendments to the application did not address the concerns previously raised by the Parish Council. Members continue to have the following concerns:

- This application is contrary to NP Policy SB1 as the site falls outside of the defined settlement boundary of Hermitage and is therefore located within the countryside.
- This application site is not suitable for development. It is not within the broad development area designated by the Chichester District Council's Local Plan.
- This proposed development is not in conformity with the Housing Need survey undertaken for the Neighbourhood Plan.
- The housing mix is not acceptable, there is an overprovision of 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings which does not meet the housing needs of the Parish. SB3-B The provision of 1 or 2 bed dwellings suitable for younger households is encouraged to meet the significant local need for smaller dwellings.
- Only the one or two bedroom dwellings would meet the requirements of the First Home Schemes and this does not support the housing needs of the Parish.
- There is no requirement for 2.5 storey properties in the area. Which would affect the views/to/from SDNP.
- This proposed development poses risk to the Oak tree situated at the entrance to the site which is subject to a TPO.
- Access via Penny Lane to this site is not suitable or appropriate. The lane could not cope with the volume of traffic and the road conditions would not support the proposed increase in use.
- The desktop Traffic and Transport assessments are not accurate representations of the actual situation. Traffic and parking is an existing concern in the area. This development would exacerbate this issue.
- The access plan to expand public walkways by removing verges would exacerbate parking issues in Penny Lane and poses a risk to the TPO'd tree.
- This proposed development is not appropriate given the already existing issues of flooding. The Sustainable Drainage Report is not sufficient and does not reflect the extent of the existing and continuous flooding to the area and the proposed mitigations will not suffice given the actual extent of flooding in the area.
- The proposed plans are contrary to NP Policy SB20; this development would increase flood risk to this site. The combined sewage systems is not appropriate. Surface water cannot be sufficiently managed on site.
- Levels of discharge of wastewater already causes significant concern to residents. This site would aggravate the situation further and increase levels of discharge.
- Changes to NPPF stipulate that a 4year housing supply is now acceptable and CDC has this, so the tilted balance etc will not apply. With the 4 year supply this application should be refused.
- In addition, Members are not satisfied that concerns raised by Chichester Harbour Conservancy and Natural England have been addressed.

167. AGENDA ITEM 9.3

SB/22/02787/FUL. Members considered this application and unanimously **AGREED** to **SUPPORT** the application with recommendations.

- Members thanked the One Church for engaging with the Parish Council, taking on the comments made and attending the meeting to present the amended designs.
- Members were pleased to see the improved appearance of the new design and felt it was much more in keeping with the character of the area and the site.
- Members were satisfied with the amendments to meet passive building guidance.
- Members were pleased to see the reduction of roof lights to support the protection of wildlife.
- Members were satisfied with the smaller footprint, as well as the improved parking arrangements.

- Members recognised that the One Church is a great community asset.
- Members further commented that the south facing roof would be ideal for the installation of solar panels and battery charging.
- If planning is approved Members would like to see the following recommendations;
 1. Ornamental trees and plants are replaced with native ones.
 2. An increase in trees and planting on site, the creation of more wild areas to increase biodiversity.
 3. An extension of the concept to blend the building in with the natural surroundings, including additional planting and an extension of the green wall if feasible.

It was **PROPOSED** and unanimously **AGREED** to return to the order of business.

168. CONSIDERATION of Planning applications Week 48- Week 1

168.1 23/02593/DOM Members considered this application and **AGREED** that they had **NO OBJECTION** to the application.

168.2 SB/23/02559/DOM Members considered this application and **AGREED** that they had **NO OBJECTION** to the application.

168.3 SB/23/02586/DOM Members considered this application and **AGREED** that they had **NO OBJECTION** to the application.

168.4 SB/23/02813/PLD Members considered this application and **AGREED** that they had **NO OBJECTION** to the application.

169. CONSIDERATION OF AMENDED PLANNING APPLICATIONS

21/02460/FUL Members considered the amendment to this application and unanimously **AGREED** to sustain their **OBJECTION** to the application on the basis that not enough information has been provided to inform their decision. Specifically;

- Where is the external staircase to be located?
- What is the design of the staircase including materials to be used?
- What is the purpose of the external staircase, what is it to be used for?
- Will the installation of the staircase impact on the existing retail space including to the number of parking spaces or available outside space?
- What are the materials and design of the replacement windows?

In addition Members have asked to highlight that the comments in the letter written to the company who have occupied the retail space below this development were in relation to the appearance of the retail space and how the design is in keeping with the surrounding area, the comments have no bearing on any application for the space above as this has not yet taken place and no details have been provided as to the proposed appearance.

170. CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPEALS:

170.1 THORNHAM MARINA: DCLG REF NO: APP/L3815/C/22/3311612 APPLICATION NO: SB/19/00103/CONCOU. Members **NOTED** that there had been a change in Officer assigned to this application and that an application for this site for a static power crane and associated works has been received and will be on the agenda for the next meeting. Members **NOTED** that there had been no update regarding the appeal.

171. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN- TO RECEIVE AND NOTE ANY UPDATES REGARDING THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN AND TO CONSIDER ANY RECOMMENDATIONS.

Members **NOTED** that literature has now gone out for the referendum and the voting date is set for 25th January. Parish Councillors can vote as well as Members of the Public. The Chair proposed that Officers contact electoral services and request that a Member attends the count. This was **AGREED**. Officers to write to electoral services.

172. TO REVIEW ALL PERMITTED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS IN THE SOUTHBOURNE PARISH AREA.

Members **NOTED** any updates to the list. The Chair proposed that amendments are made to any applications considered prior to the NP passing examination to include NP3 policies. This was **AGREED**.

Cllr Bangert confirmed that the second application for The Sussex Brewery is now due to go to CDC planning committee on 7th February.

173. TO NOTE THE STOP NOTICE AND ENFORCEMENT NOTICE AS SERVED BY CDC TO THE OCCUPIER OF THORNHAM PRODUCTS.

This was **NOTED**.

174. NPPF- TO NOTE THE CHANGES AS CIRCULATED AND TO RECEIVE AND NOTE THE ADVICE NOTES FROM THE CONSULTANTS.

175. This was **NOTED**. The Chair recommended that a copy of the NPPF together with the Material Planning considerations is added to the electronic folder. This was **AGREED**.

176. TO NOTE DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING.

Thursday 1st February 2024, 6pm at St John's Church Centre.

The meeting closed at 7:28pm

Signed

.....

Dated

.....