



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 18th July 2024

Present: Cllrs: A. Tait (Chair), T. Bangert, L. Meredith, J. Money, S. Rosenberg and R. Taylor.

In Attendance: S. Hodgson (Parish Clerk), M. Banach, Admin Assistant, 2 Representatives from Metis Homes and 1 representative from Smith Simmons and Partners, 18 members of the public, CDC Cllr. O. Hickson.

The meeting started at 18:00pm

31. CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and read out the following statement:

"Thank you all for coming. I see we have a number of residents who wish to speak in Open Forum in regard to the Tuppeny Barn Application. Southbourne is a tight community and many of us as Councillors know a lot of the residents who submit planning applications, whether it is for small conversions or large dwellings so I think it appropriate, as Chair, to clarify Councillors position in this situation.

When applications come before us for comment, we consider them in our role of Councillors and the decisions are based on their conformity with the Parish Councils adopted policies. All decisions are based on

- Does the application conform with the Southbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan*
- Does it conform with the CDC Local Plan and emerging plan*
- Is it in line with the NPPF*
- And that any approval or objection sits within the material considerations.*

On a personal note, I have already made it known that one of the applicants is a friend of mine. Therefore, when that particular agenda item is being considered, I will express my opinion based on the points I have just mentioned but will leave the room for the vote.

I would also mention that the final decision on the application will ultimately sit with the planning authority, CDC, and I would urge all those in attendance to also lodge their comments on the planning portal."

32. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Cllr. Redman who is on leave and Cllr Humphreys due to a previous engagement
No Apologies had been received from Cllr. Robinson-Kyle

33. TO APPROVE AND SIGN THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 27TH JUNE 2024

Members **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes of the meeting held on 27th June 2024 and they were signed by the Chair.

34. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr. T. Bangert declared an interest in Agenda Item 8 as she is the Chair of Trustees at Tuppenny Barn. As such she will refrain from participating in any discussion on the matter and will not take part in any vote.

Cllr. Tait declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 8 and will not participate in any debate or vote

35. ADJOURNMENT FOR PUBLIC OPEN FORUM

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 18.06 for Open forum and reminded those in attendance that they would have 3 minutes to speak on any agenda item and asked that if any comments reflected those of a previous speaker, please just say they support and re-iterate the previous comments to avoid repetition and save time

The Chair further reminded members of the public that they will not be able to take part in the Metis application presentation as it is not a public consultation just a presentation to Council.

The Chair took comments relating to Agenda Item 8.1 first:

35.1 Paul White, Smith Simmonds and Partners, spoke in support of the Tuppenny Barn application. He spoke of the conformity of the application to the Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan SPC11 and the weight of the plan being more relevant than that of the emerging local plan. He further mentioned the landscape gap and no boundary which is what is required within SBNP and would take issue with the conservancy study.

35.2 Maggie Haynes gave a brief overview of Tuppenny Barns and the valuable work it does. She explained how her previous business partner now wishes to realise their investment. It has taken 5 years to come up with a mutually agreeable scheme which will enable the release of capital but still enable the charity to continue. Mrs Haynes spoke of the decision to appoint the developers Junnell Homes as they most reflect Tuppenny Barns ethics

35.3 Sarah O'Brien-Twohig said she recognises the need for financial restructuring but as a volunteer of the Southbourne Neighbourhood Steering Group she is concerned that the application contravenes key policies

35.4 Cllr Hickson wished to clarify that as a CDC Councillor she has "Red Carded" the application which means it will have to be determined by the CDC Planning Committee. She is conflicted as there are arguments for and against. She urged caution and felt SPC should not comment either way and leave to CDC.

35.5 Robert Lusty felt the housing was being positioned in the wrong place and should be in the back field where there is a gateway to the road and houses would be south facing

35.6 Adrian Pert spoke as a support volunteer and trustee of Tuppenny Barn. If the planning doesn't go ahead the whole process will fail and it would be a great shame if all the good work is lost. He totally supports the application.

35.7 Victoria Savage said planning does not come down to people and this application has become personal. The housing will be the slow erosion of Tuppenny Barn and a wonderful charity

The Chair thanked everyone for their comments and moved on to comment relating to Agenda Item 8.2

35.8 Ceri Stunt objected to the application on reasons of road safety. Inlands Road is not wide enough and the traffic survey unrealistic as it was undertaken during Covid. Construction vehicles already drive over the pathway. WSCC Highways report is inaccurate.

35.9 Adrian Pert said his property is adjacent to the site and was led to believe the trees would be saved but are already being trimmed. There is abundance of wildlife including bats that roost and feed. He also objected to the attenuation pond

35.10 Elizabeth Medlar said the Mettis application would have a devastating adverse effect on the bats, 10 species have been identified, as well as dormice and other species of wildlife.

35.11 Dave King fully supported Mrs Stunts position of the traffic. He further spoke on the danger to wildlife, the wildlife corridor and significant adverse impact on the ecosystem. The application offers no infrastructure or solution to the sewage problem.

35.12 The Clerk read out a written statement received in relation to Agenda 8.2

“On your website you say that you can enjoy your environment so why do you want to build houses on land which is a haven for wildlife. If you really care about the environment, why don't you turn it into a nature reserve so the community and future generations can enjoy the wildlife. You also say you care about the community but the local community is already at breaking point. It is near impossible to get a doctor's appointment with more and more people having to go to the hospital to see a doctor. If you really care about the community you could offer to build a new doctors surgery. That would show that you really do care about the community but of course there would be no profit in it.

It would be a real shame to lose this land. I have lived in the area for 50 years; it is a real haven for wildlife. The area is called Inlands Road but it is more of a lane and is not suitable for a large development. I already has a lot of traffic using it. As you are aware there is a new development in Cooks Lanse which means when the development is complete the traffic from those homes (200 I think) will use inlands road as a cut through to the main road. This will bean it will be even more busy. There is a long stretch of Inlands Road where it goes down to a single track as cars park creating long queues and when lorries and farm vehicles come down inlands Road they struggle to pass the parked cars . Safety is a real problem.

Can you arrange a survey to be done for the wildlife I have heard owls and seen bats and hedgehogs as well as other wildlife and flora.”

The Chair thanked everyone for their comments and re-adjourned the meeting at 18.45

36. CLERK'S UPDATE

There were no updates

37. PRESENTATIONS

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 18.43 to receive a presentation from Mettis homes regarding 49 dwellings at land east of Inlands Road ref: SB/24/01161/OUTEIA. She reminded members of the public that this was a presentation to Council not a public consultation

The presentation included information relating to:

- Approach to keep as much of green ring as possible to protect wildlife species
- Mitigation on impacts
- Vegetation
- Landscaping
- Benefits
- Design
- Testing to see if site supports 49 houses

The presenter will also take back feedback from Open Forum.

The Chair thanked Mettis for the presentation and reconvened the meeting at 19.03

38. CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS WEEKS 26-28

38.1 SB/24/01236/FUL Land at Tuppenny Barn

Before leaving the room Cllr Tait wished to make a comment and asked her fellow Councillors to take this into consideration as they would comments from the open forum when debating the item.

Having declared an interest under Agenda Item 4 Cllrs. Bangert and Tait left the room at 19.04.

In the absence of the Chair and the Vice Chair it was proposed and unanimously **AGREED** that Cllr. Meredith would take the Chair for Agenda Item 8.1

Cllr. Meredith asked Members for their comments which included:

- Undoubtedly Tuppenny Barn is a community asset everyone values even those who object are supportive of charity
- Will impinge largely on an area that currently has orchard and fruit beds
- Housing not in any way similar to eco developments
- Totally support Tuppenny Barn but application contravenes the Neighbourhood Plan
- Terrible conflict can see both sides of argument
- Concerned when looked at plan as drainage would be a problem, remember the issues at Parham Place
- Concerned about settlement boundary on NP only corridor that is green and concerned if agree to 7 houses will set a precedent to open door to applications in other areas.
- Whilst the ultimate decision falls elsewhere SPC are responsible for the Neighbourhood Plan which was supported and approved by public.
- Glad to see developers that are concerned with eco development
- Concerned about chimneys and pollution afforded by wood burners and woodfires
- Biodiversity issues

Following a lengthy discussion the Chair moved to a vote. There were 3 objections to the application , 1 abstention and none in support. Therefore, the objection was carried.

Members of the committee **AGREED** to **OBJECT** the application for the following reasons:

- NP3 policy SB1 - Development proposals within and outside settlement boundaries
- B. Development outside settlement boundaries are restricted to those which require a countryside location or meet an essential rural need.
- SB3 - Local housing needs
- While the number of dwellings is below the 10-dwelling threshold for affordable housing, the housing mix proposed do not meet the need for smaller 1-2 bed dwellings.
- SB14 - Biodiversity
- Removal of the orchard trees and part of the hedge for access will be damaging to the biodiversity on the site.
- SB17 - Because the current hedges etc. form a vital bat foraging route any external lighting must be downlight, low light and warm yellow. All roof lights must be internal shaded to minimise light pollution.
- SB20 - Water Infrastructure
- The fact that the drainage report is NOT site specific calls into question the validity of the findings. The area is subject to high ground water levels, and the Parham Place development properties to the north (close to the field behind, which is also behind Tuppenny Barn) We agree with the Coastal Drainage engineer that more work needs to be clarified.
- The proposal is also contrary to CDCLP 43,45 (emerging NE2, 10, 13) and the Landscape Assessment 2019.
- It must also be pointed out that NP3 policy SB11, to protect community facilities and shops, could be argued to protect and financially secure the charity.

Councillors Bangert and Tait returned to the meeting at 19.18pm and Cllr Tait retook the Chair.

38.2 SB/24/01161/OUTEIA – Mettis Homes Land East of Inlands Road and South of Railway Line Inlands Road Nutbourne

The Chair asked Members for their comments which included:

- Disappointed with Design Access statement felt it was saying something it was not
- Access built statement linking to Southbourne but dangerous for cyclist along inlands, no safe options for children and pedestrian
- Linking to pedestrian and cycle path – cannot find links on map
- Was pleased to hear link to Harris scrapyard
- Concerned about infrastructure
- Insufficient sewage measures
- Access says promoting cycling but can't see how
- Increase in traffic in will not encourage people to trust children to walk so will increase will drives to school creating serious problems at school gates and neighbouring roads
- Will drive traffic to inlands road railway crossing
- Like to see all have solar and heat pumps when come back – needed at point of delivery.
- Parking provision 1 bed = 1.4 spaces, 2 bed = 1.7 no household has one and a half cars most have more than 2
- visitor parking likely to be used by residents
- selling environment and biodiversity but no viability – just few trees
- CDC employed consultant to look at remaining needs so feel application is premature
- premature application if go forward could be detrimental to housing allocation
- Concern safety at level crossing have not seen any consultation with Network rail
- Drainage and flood risk – refer developers back to watershed report

Following a lengthy discussion Members unanimously **AGREED** to **OBJECT** the application for the following reasons:

- This speculative application is Premature to the DPD consultation and as such could damage the viability of the DPD allocation being able to be brought forward.
- **NP3 policy SB1** - the site is outside of the settlement boundary
- **SB3** - As no detail is provided on the housing mix, we cannot be certain the proposal would suit the needs of the parish.
- **SB14 -Biodiversity SB15 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows**
- The various ecological reports provided detailed a significant number of species, Bats, Dormice etc but recommends very inadequate mitigation of protection in the reports. No details for arboriculture retention/removal.
- **SB20 Water Infrastructure.**
- The site is crossed by 2 notable drain/water course features as detailed in the WSP Watershed report (map attached) These for part of the Ham Brook Chalk stream catchment area and mut be taken into serious consideration not only for the health of the stream which forms the Ham Brook Wildlife corridor, but the localised flooding on the site and it's immediate neighbours, but also potential contributions to the flooding downstream.
- We are also concerned that Network Rail has not yet commented of the safety of the access being so close to the Inlands Road level crossing.

38.3 SB/24/01312/PLD Members of the committee considered this application and **AGREED** to **SUPPORT** the application with no additional comments

38.4 SB/24/01313/DOM Members of the committee considered this application and **AGREED** to **SUPPORT** the application with no additional comments

38.5 SB/24/01357/TPA Members of the committee considered this application and **AGREED** to **SUPPORT** the application with no additional comments

38.6 SB/24/01318/DOM Members of the committee considered this application and **AGREED** to **SUPPORT** the application but would recommend that the roof lights are internally shaded to stop light pollution SNP 17

38.7 SB/24/01342/DOM Members of the committee considered this application and **AGREED** to **SUPPORT** the application with no additional comments

38.8 SB/24/01425/DOM Members of the committee considered this application and **AGREED** to **SUPPORT** the application with no additional comments

38.9 24/01171/ELD Members of the committee considered this application and **AGREED** to **SUPPORT** the application with no additional comments

38.10 24/01384/FUL Members of the committee considered this application and **AGREED** to **OBJECT** the application for the following reasons:

Material consideration

- Scale and dominance
- Appearance of design
- Impact on character and appearance of area
- Highway safety and parking issues

38.11 24/01440/DOM and 24/01441/LBC Members of the committee considered this application and **AGREED** to **OBJECT** the application for the following reasons:

Material consideration

- Effect on listed building and conservation area
- Appearance of design

38.12 24/01541/DOM Members of the committee considered this application and **AGREED** to **SUPPORT** the application with no additional comments

38.13 24/01530/FUL Members of the committee considered this application and **AGREED** to **OBJECT** the application for the following reasons:

Material consideration

- Noise and impact on neighbours
- Overlooking/loss of privacy

39. CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPEALS:

39.1 22/01005/FUL- THE SUSSEX BREWERY APP/L3815/W/23/3332093 (STILL ACTIVE)

39.2 22/01477/FUL- GATEHOUSE , INLANDS ROAD, NUTBOURNE APP/L3815/W/24/3337056 (NOT YET DETERMINED)

39.3 23/00891/FUL- BROOK COTTAGE, FARM LANE, NUTBOURNE APP/L3815/W/24/3339556

Members **NOTED** that there were no updates on the above appeals.

40. CONSIDERATION OF AMENDED PLANNING APPLICATIONS:

24/00814/FUL TIMBER COTTAGE

The application has been red carded by a CDC Councillor - no further comments

41. TO REVIEW ALL PERMITTED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS IN THE SOUTHBOURNE PARISH AREA AND TO CONSIDER ANY REQUIRED ACTIONS

Members **NOTED** the updates on permitted and pending applications.

42. TO CONSIDER A PROPOSAL TO WRITE TO THE PLANNING APPEALS INSPECTORATE REGARDING APP/I3815/W/24/3345297 21/01910/OUT WILLOWBROOK, TO REQUEST THAT THE INQUIRY BE MADE PUBLIC

Members **NOTED** that the Planning Appeals Inspectorate has agreed that the appeal will be decided on written statements. Following discussion Members unanimously **AGREED** to write to the Planning Appeals Inspectorate to request a Public Inquiry.

Due to the timescales, it was further **AGREED** that should this request be rejected, the Chair in liaison with the Clerk would prepare a written statement for submission based on the Councils associated policies. The Statement will be circulated to members to be Ratified at the next meeting.

43. TO NOTE THE DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING.

Members **NOTED** that the date and time of the next meeting is Thursday 8th August 2024, 6pm at St Johns Church.

The meeting closed at 20.08

Signed

.....

Dated