

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 4TH April 2024

Present: Cllrs: A. Tait (Chair), T. Bangert, R. Humphreys (from agenda item 3), R. Robinson-Kyle (left the meeting at Agenda item 17), J. Money, S. Rosenberg and J. Walker.

In Attendance: M. Carvajal-Neal (Deputy Clerk)

17 members of public

1 representative from Friends of the Hambrook

222. CHAIR'S WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. The meeting opened at 6.02 pm.

223. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Cllr Meredith due to work commitments, Cllr Bangert due to being on leave and Cllr Redman due to a family commitment.

224. TO APPROVE AND SIGN THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 17TH MARCH 2024 Members **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes of the Planning Committee held on 17TH March 2024 and they were signed by the Chair.

Cllr. R Humphreys joined the meeting at 18.04.

225. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

226. ADJOURNED FOR OPEN FORUM

The Chair adjourned the meeting for Open Forum at 6.04pm and invited members of the public to speak.

No members of the public wished to speak but the Deputy Clerk read out a statement from a member of the public regarding the street naming proposal advising that she supports the name 'Millwood'.

The Deputy Clerk also asked members to note the email that had been circulated in relation to application SB/24/00631/PA1A including the photos.

The Chair re-adjourned the meeting at 6.04pm

227. CLERK'S UPDATE

No items

Chair of the Council: Cllr. Amanda Tait Clerk: Sheila Hodgson

Deputy Chair of the Council: Cllr. Neil Redman Deputy Clerk: Maria Carvajal-Neal

228. ADJOURNMENT FOR PRESENTATIONS

Members received a presentation from the Hermitage Resident group in relation to application: 23/0024/OUT.

- 228.1 3 Members of the group spoke in relation to their concerns about this development and the way in which CDC officers managed the application at the CDC planning meeting where the application was considered by CDC Council. They highlighted the concerns raised in their complaint letter to CDC (previously circulated to the PC) namely that officers had acted in an unlawful way and as such the decision made is not lawful. The group asked the PC for the following:
 - 1. To support their complaint.
 - 2. To ask other Parish Councils to support their complaint.
 - 3. To support the judicial action and to help fund the legal fees should the group pursue a judicial review.

The presentation ended at 18.23 and the Chair offered Members the opportunity to ask questions to the residents group.

228.1 A number of questions were asked by Members including the process and the funding of a judicial review.

The residents group described the process and explained that no one individual will be at financial risk. They clarified that they believed the importance of this particular site is that this site could set precedence for future applications in Southbourne and the rest of the Chichester District.

The Chair thanked the Resident Group for their attendance and their ongoing dedication to this issue.

The meeting was reconvened at 18.41.

229. TO CONSIDER ANY PROPOSALS RAISED BY THE PENNY LANE RESIDENTS GROUP.

Members considered the following proposals:

229.1 To support the Residents Group complaint (circulated ahead of the meeting).

Members considered this proposal and unanimously **AGREED** to support the residents Group complaint. The Deputy Clerk will compose a letter to CDC informing them of this decision. Members further **AGREED** for the Deputy Clerk to write to CDC officers, seeking an explanation for why the NP policies, particularly SB1- DEVELOPMENT WITHIN AND OUTSIDE THE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES, did not receive sufficient consideration to prevent the approval of this application (which lies beyond the settlement boundary).

229.2 To ask other Parish Councils to support their complaint.

Members considered this proposal and **AGREED** to advise the Residents Group to directly engage with the relevant Parish Councils, specifically to Westbourne and to Chidham and Hambrook. The recommendation is for the Residents Group to send their complaint letter, along with the PC's supportive letter, to the relevant Parish Councils.

229.3 To support the judicial action and to help fund the legal fees should the group pursue a judicial review.

Members considered this proposal and unanimously **AGREED** that they could not endorse funding for the judicial review, however they encouraged the Resident Group to apply to Full Council for a grant. The Deputy Clerk will initiate enquiries to ascertain whether the grant can cover legal fees and will subsequently advise the group.

230. CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS WEEKS 11-13

215.1 SB/24/00631/PA1A Members considered this application and **AGREED** that they **OBJECT** to the application for the following reasons:

- Permitted development status. Given the age of the building and the extent to which the proposed plans will alter the building Members were not satisfied that this application should be considered under 'permitted development' status.
- Members are concerned that significant building works have begun without permission.
- Layout and Density. Design, appearance and Materials. Members cannot consider these Material Considerations given that there is not enough detail in the application and as such must object until the details have been made available.
- Highway Safety. Noise. Dust and Fumes. Effect on trees and wildlife. Members cannot consider these
 Material Considerations that there is not enough detail in the application and as such must object
 until the details have been made available.
- Members request that either enforcement or building control visit the site and undertake an inspection to determine if an application under permitted development is adequate and appropriate.
- 215.2 SB/24/00663/ELD Members considered this application and **AGREED** that they had **NO OBJECTION** to the application.
- 215.3 SB/24/00191/DOM Members considered this application and **AGREED** that they had **NO OBJECTION** to the design or plans however Members felt that the double dropped kerb was excessive given that parking is limited in the area and parking concerns already exist. Members would recommend a single dropped kerb which gives access to off-street parking and would reduce the number of on street parking spaces that would be lost to this development. Members would also like clarity around the removal of the two existing disabled parking spaces. Are these disabled spaces no longer required?

231. CONSIDERATION OF AMENDED PLANNING APPLICATIONS

There were no items for consideration.

232. CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPEALS:

22/01005/FUL There was no update on the appeal, however it was **NOTED** that a second application to this site has now been approved.

233. TO NOTE THE RESPONSE FROM THE INFANT AND JUNIOR SCHOOLS AND CONSIDER ANY ACTIONS. Members **NOTED** the response.

234. STREET NAMING PROPOSAL. TO RECEIVE AND NOTE THE ASSOCIATED LITERATURE AND TO CONSIDER AND AGREE TO A RESPONSE.

Members **NOTED** the proposal together with the comments raised in Open Forum and **AGREED** to support the name 'Millwood'

235. TO NOTE THE MINUTES OF TWO MEETINGS HELD WITH NETWORK RAIL, VOLUNTEERS FROM THE NPSG AND THE PC. INCLUDING CONSIDERATION OF A PROPOSAL TO WRITE TO CDC TO REQUEST THAT THE PC AND NETWORK RAIL AND CONSULTED ON THE BLD.

Members **NOTED** the minutes and **AGREED** that the Deputy Clerk compose a letter to CDC to request that Network Rail and the PC are consulted on the BLD.

236. TO CONSIDER A PROPOSAL TO HOLD A PRE-APP MEETING WITH LUKEN BECK RE: COOKS LANE SITE AND TO HOLD A MEETING REGARDING PENNY LANE.

Members considered this proposal and **AGREED** to review the PC's policy on engaging with developers before any meetings take place. As such Members **AGREED** to defer this item until the policy had been reviewed and add the reviewing of the policy to a future agenda.

237. TO CONSIDER A PROPOSAL TO CONTACT METIS HOMES AND REQUEST A MEETING REGARDING AN UPDATE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HARRIS SCRAPYARD SITE.

Members **NOTED** that during site visits at Harris Scrapyard undertaken in 2023 Metis advised the PC that they would welcome the PC visiting the site (if permission was granted) at regular intervals throughout the build including during the initial stages of clearing and decontamination of the site. Members **AGREED** that Officers arrange a site visit after the policy on meeting with developers has been reviewed, as per Min ref 236.

Members also considered a proposal to invite other groups or agencies to the meeting including Friends of the Hambrook and a representative from the Rivers Trust. The Deputy Clerk advised that in order to invite other agencies, groups, or persons to attend meetings with developers the PC must have received a copy of their Terms of Reference (or other relevant document outlining their policies) in advance of the meeting and agree to support their policies at Committee before attending in collaboration. This was **AGREED**. As a Member of the Friends of Hambrook was present he agreed to take this back to the group.

Councillor R. Robinson-Kyle left the meeting at 19.44 due to illness.

238. TO CONSIDER A PROPOSAL TO APOINT NON-COUNCILLOR MEMBERS TO ATTEND MEETINGS WITH DEVELOPERS.

The Chair gave a verbal update on this. As Members had already agreed to review the policy on meeting with developers Members **AGREED** to defer this item.

239. TO CONSIDER A PROPOSAL FROM CLLR BANGERT TO INVITE GREYFRIARS TO ATTEND A COMMITTEE MEETING TO DISCUSS THE SERVICES THEY OFFER REGARDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Cllr Bangert was not present at the meeting however Members still considered the proposal and **AGREED** to Officers writing to Greyfriars.

240. TO NOTE THE DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING. Thursday 25th April 2023, 6pm at St John's church centre.

Signed	
Dated	

The meeting closed at 19.46.