**SOUTHBOURNE PARISH COUNCIL**The Village Hall First Avenue Southbourne, West Sussex PO10 8HN   
Tel: (01243) 373667 e-mail: [clerk@southbourne-pc.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@southbourne-pc.gov.uk) Kate Bain - Locum Clerk to the Council

**To: all members of Southbourne Parish Council**You are hereby summoned to a meeting of Southbourne Parish Council on **Tuesday 12 October 2021 at 7pm.** This meeting will be held remotely.

***Members of the Press & Public are welcome & have a right to attend: Please contact the Locum Clerk for the link.***

**AGENDA**

1. Apologies for Absence
2. Declarations of Interests
3. Minutes of the meeting held 14 September 2021
4. Minutes of the Extraordinary meeting held 27 September 2021
5. Open Forum
6. Bourne Bus Project – update
7. Tuppenny Barn – update
8. Wine & Cheese evening - update
9. Finance   
   a) To note the income & expenditure since the last meeting:  
   b) To approve payments made & due   
   c) To note the bank balances at 31.08.21
10. Reports:   
    (a) District Councillors’ Report  
    (b) PCSO Report (Baylee Reed)   
    (c) Parish Council Reports:  
    (i) Finance and General-Purpose Committee:   
    - Vacancy on Committee   
    - Proposal for a Projects sub-Committee: (A. Tait, J. Brown, R. Taylor)   
    - Update on new Homes Bonus  
    - Proposal to consult a financial adviser regarding Council investments  
    - Proposal to change SiDs to 2-weekly re-siting.  
    (ii) Recreation Ground Advisory Committee:  
    - Paint for line marker  
    (iii) Staffing Committee:   
    - Vacancy on committee  
    - Update on staffing matters under Part II.   
    (iv) Allotments Committee   
    (v) Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group  
    (vi) Southbourne Environment Group:   
    (vii) Joint Burial Committee and Working Group   
    viii) Bournes Forum Report  
    ix) Drop-in session  
    (x) Outliers Reports
11. Correspondence received
12. Planning applications received

Signed:   
  
K. Bain – Locum Clerk & RFO

Date: 07.09.21

1. Exclusion of the Press and Public Part II That under the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960, the public and representatives of the press and broadcast media be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business as publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest because of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted

Signed: A close-up of a handwritten note

Description automatically generated with low confidence

K. Bain – Locum Clerk & RFO 07.10.21

Date: 07.10.21

Southbourne Parish Council 12.10.21 Agenda item 3)

**Minutes of the meeting of Southbourne Parish Council held on Tuesday 14th September 2021 at 7pm in Tuppenny Barn**

**Present: Parish Cllrs**: T. Bangert [TB]\*(vice-chairman) J. Brown [JB]\* C. Bulbeck [CB] J. Grant [JG] R. Hayes [RH] L. Hicks [LH] (Chairman) D. James – co-opted under item 6) [DJ] J. Jennings [JJ] A. Tait [AT] R. Taylor [RT] \*Also District Councillors.  
P. Thorne [PT]. **In attendance**: 6 members of the public, Locum Clerk – K. Bain [KB].

1. **Apologies for Absence**: Parish Councillor N. Redman
2. **Declarations of Interests**: TB recorded an interest as a trustee of Tuppenny Barn. RH & CB noted interests as trustees of the village hall.
3. **Minutes of the meeting held 13 July 2021:** Approved: Subject to the following amendments:   
   - Item 63 - Southbourne community website changed to Southbourne community facebook page.  
   - Item 65 – District Councillor removed from line 1.  
   - Item 69 - Addition to note that a vacancy had arisen due to the resignation of R. Murch.

Prop by: JB, seconded by TB and agreed by all Councillors present.   
RT asked if letters had been sent to residents of Flanders close regarding the new allotments; noted that KB would investigate and follow up with Hyde who should be doing this.  
107**. Open Forum: The following matters were raised:**- Update on the operation Watershed application; noted that the application still needed to be sent to WSCC and doubts have been raised about the completeness of the technical scope. The resident asked Council to follow up. Council was thanked for its work in dealing with the subsidence. TB reported that the application had now been submitted and a drainage engineer at CDC would be dealing with the technical scope report, so it is expected that the project will now move forward, she thanked the residents for their efforts.   
- Council was asked to clarify when responses would be provided to queries from the previous meeting: LH noted that items needed to be on the agenda to be discussed and the responses will be followed up.  
- A bench was requested for Stein Road.   
–Noted that there are issues with the water; and this could be solved by CDC and CHC removing the beach classification.  
- An update on the parking survey was requested.   
– It was noted that the Emsworth show causes traffic issues in the Parish.   
– Noted that there has been an increase in crime, particularly car break-ins and a Community warden is requested.   
– An update on the footpaths was requested: AT noted that the registrations have been submitted.  
- Noted that a resident had contacted the previous clerk re installing a Portaloo at Prinsted; LH confirmed this will be taken to Committee and followed up.  
 - Noted that the football club should be supported; LH noted that this is on the agenda and Council is committed to supporting the club.   
LH noted that any local issues should be sent to the Clerk.  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
108. **Delegation of powers to the Clerk**: Resolved. LH explained that this would permit remote meetings if required to ensure the safety of Councillors and essentially give the Clerk the power to carry out Council actions; it would be reviewed at the next Council meeting.  
Proposed by RT, seconded by RH and agreed by all Councillors present.  
  
***‘Resolution by Southbourne Parish Council to delegate decisions and actions of Council, Committees and working groups to the Clerk***

***that in response to the Covid-19 outbreak in the UK and in the event that it is not possible to convene a meeting of the council in a reasonable time, the Clerk shall have delegated authority to make decisions on behalf of the council, Committees and groups, where such decision cannot reasonably be deferred and must be made in order to comply with a commercial or statutory deadline. This will be carried out where possible by consultation with members by electronic means or telephone. The clerk will further consult with the chairman for guidance as necessary. The delegation does not extend to matters expressly reserved to the council in legislation or in its Standing Orders or Financial Regulations. Any decisions made under this delegation must be recorded in writing and must be published in accordance with the relevant regulations. This delegated authority ceases upon the first meeting of the council after the council meeting at which the delegation was put in place.’***

1. 109**. Co-option of Parish Councillor:** Proposed by JB, seconded by RH that LH adjourned the meeting to allow David James to address the Council. Further to this it was proposed by RT, seconded by RH and agreed by all Councillors present thatD. James was co-opted as a Southbourne Parish Councillor. He signed the acceptance of office form and took his seat.  
    LH noted that there was a vacancy on the Planning committee. Proposed by TB, seconded by RT; that DJ join. a vote was taken; RH voted against the appointment, all other Councillors present voted in favour; carried that DJ join the Planning Committee.  
   LH noted that there was a vacancy on the Recreation Ground Committee: Proposed by RT, seconded by RH and agreed by all Councillors present that DJ join this committee also.
2. **Bourne Bus Project:**

It was proposed by the F & GP committee that Council support this project: PT reported that Southbourne Parish Council has been asked for £5000 towards the website set up and also a further £6000 over the next five years; these donations will be made from the Cil monies held by Council. RH noted concern that Southbourne is being asked for a larger proportion than other parishes; TB explained that as, among other services, the bus would facilitate students to stay on at Bourne College for after-school activities, that Southbourne should be the lead Parish and donate the extra funds of £5000, Proposed by PT, seconded by JB and agreed by all Councillors present to support the project. The funds will be paid by £7000 in year 1, then 4 annual instalments of £1000.

1. **Tuppenny Barn**:   
   TB did not take part in this discussion as a Trustee. It was proposed by PT, seconded by AT and agreed by all Councillors present to grant 2 of £33.000 to the project. These funds will come from Cil monies and would be 1 instalment towards the set up costs this year and a further £33,000 next year for phase 2.
2. **Drop-in sessions**:  
   It was Proposed by LH, seconded by TB to reinstate the monthly drop-in sessions held on the 1st Saturday of each month, 10.30-12.30 LH suggested that the venue should for the 2nd October should be St Johns, after which different venues should be considered. Several Councillors volunteered to help and were thanked by LH. A vote was taken; 2 abstentions were made; all other Councillors present agreed these sessions should restart.
3. **Wine & Cheese evening**:  
   LH noted that it had been suggested by G. Hicks that Council arranged a wine & cheese to thank all the people who had volunteered in the Parish volunteers over the last 2 years. It was proposed to hold this on Saturday 16th October. Proposed by LH, seconded by TB and agreed by all Councillors present to set this up.
4. **Street naming:**  
   Noted that CDC Had consulted Council on naming of 2 roads in the development Land east of Breach Avenue. It was agreed to propose the following:  
   - Benjamin Drive  
   - Langley Close
5. **Finance**   
   a) to note the expenditure since the last meeting: Noted.  
   b) To review the Income & expenditure vs budget to 31.08.21: Noted  
   The payments were approved: Proposed by JB, seconded by DJ.  
   c) To note the bank balances at 31.08.21: Noted  
   d) Amendments to bank mandate signatories:   
   LH proposed to remove the previous Clerk and CB from the mandate and add KB & TB, seconded by RT and agreed by all Councillors present.
6. Appointment of Mulberry & Co as internal auditor: Proposed by PT, seconded by RH and agreed by all Councillors present that Mulberry be engaged as internal auditor.
7. **Reports**:   
    (a) District Councillors’ Report: JG noted under the Local Plan review item that:

‘*she had recently had sight of correspondence from a Cllr on CDC Planning Committee who stated that in his opinion, in view of the fact there will be little funding for infrastructure projects due to Covid.  Southbourne Parish should consider pausing their Neighbourhood Plan.  If we continue down this route of taking 1200 new homes, that is exactly what we will get.  The new figures could be significantly less. Because of the importance and impact it will have on Southbourne, it is imperative and democratic that the public are consulted and their views sought as quickly as possible. We have a responsibility to protect Southbourne for the next generation*. ‘  
JB noted that the district as a whole is vulnerable because the Local Plan is out of date, Southbourne is better defended because it has a Neighbourhood Plan, and to pause it could open the Parish to unwanted development. LH reminded Councillors that any Councillor could attend working group or committee meetings.  
(b) PCSO Report: None received; agreed that KB will follow up and request a report for the next meeting as it is difficult to respond to community concerns if Council does not have up to date information.   
c) Parish Council Reports:  
(i) Finance and General-Purpose Committee: As per the minutes of the meeting held on 24th August.  
JB noted an amendment to under the item – Feedback on IT systems that Midhurst *are* using 365, but not all the applications. LH noted an amendment under the Bourne Bus Project to change £500 to £5000;   
these changes will be made.   
(ii) Recreation Ground Advisory Committee: Noted that as a coherent report had not been circulated with the agenda the Proposal to accept the tender received from Longmeadows Landscaping for regular maintenance would be delegated to the F G & P committee to consider and make a proposal to council at the next meeting.  
- Draft licence agreement with football club:   
 - Noted that the fees would be reduced to £300 for the first year only and would increase to £600 the following year. The licence will be redrafted to state that fees will be reviewed annually and also in the event that any improvements are made to the pavilion or recreation ground. The licence will also clearly state that any fees received from other users would be paid to the Parish Council.

Proposed by RH, seconded by RT and agreed by all Councillors present that this would be implemented.

118. - **Pavilion project**: Agreed that F G & P would take this forward as a project.   
*RH left the meeting at this point.*(iii) Staffing Committee: Update on staffing matters under Part II.   
(iv) Allotments Committee: Circulated & noted.

(v) Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group: KB apologised for not circulating this report.   
(vi) Southbourne Environment Group: No meeting this month: No report  
(vii) Joint Burial Committee Working Group – under Part II

(viii) Outliers Reports: Noted.  
Review of concept & agreement on how to continue:  
LH thanked Councillors for their hard work on this and asked Council opinion about how to take this forward. It was noted that it is an important, useful system and should continue.   
TB will look at reallocating the areas to accommodate new Councillors. PT offered to draw up a template for the reports.

1. **Correspondence received**:  
   - Memorial Bench application: Agreed that more information will be requested as to the desired location as if it is not on the foreshore, it is a matter for CHC should be cons if on the foreshore, Council needs to consider if there is space.  
   - Chem route consultation; this finishes on 23rd September; agreed that LH would draft a parish Council response and circulate it for agreement before submission.   
   LH reported that she had met with the regional co-ordinator for south East England for ’20 is plenty’; he is recommending that all the communities along the A259 should push for a ’20 is plenty approach in the community centres. He will provide stickers and posters if required. Council did not agree to support this at the current time.
2. **Planning applications & decisions received:** Noted
3. **Date of Next Meeting:** Tuesday 12 October 2021

Chairman closed the meeting at 9.13pm for **PART II**
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**Minutes of the Extraordinary meeting of Southbourne Parish Council held on 27th September on Teams**

**Present: Parish Cllrs**: \*T. Bangert [TB] (vice-chairman) \*J. Brown [JB] R. Hayes [RH] L. Hicks [LH] (Chairman) D. James [DJ]   
J. Jennings [JJ] A. Tait [AT] R. Taylor [RT]. \*Also District Councillors.  
P. Thorne [PT]. **In attendance**: Locum Clerk – K. Bain [KB].

122. Apologies for Absence: C. Bulbeck [CB].  
  
123. Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests: None.

124. a} Proposal from F G & P committee to accept the quote from Longmeadows for maintenance of the Recreation Ground and the Triangle. Proposed by RT, seconded by NR and agreed by all Councillors present.  
b} Noted that the quotes for the allotments and Prinsted would be considered when confirmed.  
  
c} Agreement to give formal notice to the current recreation ground contractors. KB noted that the official notice period is 3 months but hoped this would be shortened as by a month or two. Proposed by RT, seconded by NR and agreed by all Councillors present.

125. Proposal from F G & P committee to accept the quote from Cloudy IT to provide Parish Council IT  
 PT Reiterated that all Councillors had been kept informed of the process and had sight of the information. She explained that F G & P committee thought that Cloudy IT was within budget and user-friendly in terms of the 365 applications and usage. She noted that the transfer would commence when the new officers are in post. Proposed by JB, seconded by PT and agreed by all Councillors present. LH thanked PT for all her hard work on this.

Meeting closed at 7.16pm

**PART II**

Meeting opened at 7.17pm.

**Exclusion of the Press and Public**  
That under the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960, the public and representatives of the press and broadcast media be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business as publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest because of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted

**PART II**

**Council consideration of the recommendation of the Southbourne Parish Council Staffing Committee for the appointment of a Clerk & RFO to Southbourne Parish Council.**

PT had circulated the statement below & noted that under GDPR she could not elaborate in this meeting.  
**‘Statement - private and confidential**

The Staffing committee would like to appoint Sheila Hodgson currently an assistance clerk and projects officer at Bognor Town Council and lives in Chichester, as our Clerk/RFO in accordance with the agreed terms of conditions of the post. Sheila's application form scored the highest, against the job specification. Sheila also scored the highest during the interview process which was marked (1-5) by 3 members of the interview panel, against 12 questions.

If agreed we will offer the position subject to references and then notify the other candidates they were unsuccessful.’

 RH asked if the salary is at the lower end of the scale: PT noted that it is at the lower end and the new Clerk will be doing less hours.  
-RH asked for a sample interview question: PT stated ‘What other challenges do you think Southbourne Parish will face in the next 5 years.’   
DJ asked if there is a reserve candidate: PT reported that there is a reserve.

Proposed by RT, seconded by TB that the recommended applicant is appointed as Clerk & RFO to Southbourne Parish Council, **agreed by all Councillors present.**

LH reported that, AS circulated by KB, that a complaint has been received regarding the land at Prinsted.   
  
J B outlined the complaint:   
- 1] The boundaries are unclear. He explained that the maps date back to the 1950’s and not technically accurate or clear, but the land registration has been submitted to the land registry and it is hoped this will clarify the matter.

2] The complainant states that the PC should be managing the land as an open space, not a car park; some legal advice has been received, but it needs clarification. This is being taken forward and Council will be kept informed

TB noted that there is an adviser through CDC who specialises in these types of matters.

JB noted that a report should be presented to Council and public this autumn, so the matter needs to pushed forward as a priority.

Meeting closed at 7.39pm
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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Payments & receipts | | | |
|  | PAYEE | DETAIL | £ |
| **PAYMENTS MADE** | S ROWLAND | Salary – Cemetery manager Sep ‘21 | On file |
| P RODEN | Salary Aug ‘21 | On file |
| E HARRISON | Salary Aug ‘21 | On file |
| K BAIN | Locum salary | On file |
| HALC | Advert for Clerk & RFO role | 48 |
| SLCC | Training course | 36 |
| VILLAGE HALL | Room booking for Clerk interviews | 31.50 |
| WSCC | 11 new trees | 1980 |
| ACE SHELTERS | Repair to bus shelter – 290 main road (1st damage) | 4260 |
| CAROL SMITH | JBC Administration | 112.50 |
| **PAYMENTS DUE** | NEILL HOMER | Neighbourhood Plan consultancy | 3900 |
| K BAIN | Reimbursement for paint | 69.60 |
| PLAYSAFE | Replacement of nest swing | 1159.20 |
| VISION ICT | Email hosting Oct 21-Sep 22 | 21.60 |
| BURLEYS | Maintenance Sep ‘21 | 463.20 |
| A TAIT | Expenses | 55.16 |
| EMSWORTH CORP SERVICES | Payroll Oct – Dec 21 | 180 |
| MULBERRY & CO | Deputy Clerk training course | 42 |
| MARIA | Taxi for laptop | 27 |
| TUPPENNY BARN | Hire for Sept meeting | 126 |
| **Receipts** | | | |
|  | **FROM** | **DETAIL** | **£** |
|  | AXA | Funds for bus shelter claim | 3300 |
|  | CDC | 2nd Precept Instalment | 100,226.00 |
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**Southbourne Parish Council – Tue 12th October 2021**

District Councillors’ Report

Tracie Bangert & Jonathan Brown

**Rough Sleepers**

CDC’s Rough Sleeper Outreach Team has been nominated to receive a Sussex Police Award Divisional Commendation for their work supporting vulnerable people during the pandemic. The awards recognise the contribution of those who have gone above and beyond what is expected of them to keep Sussex safe and protect the public.

**Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

We had a meeting of OSC on 14th September, where we were expecting Dr Sandeep, Chair of the Chichester Alliance of Medical Practices (CHAMP) (9 GP surgeries including Southbourne) to attend, but sadly he sent his apologies the evening before the meeting. A prominent member of the Clinical Care Group (CCG) did, however, attend the session. There were a number of questions from OSC, but also from some significant stakeholders in the community. What came out of the meeting was the general concern over the whole of the Chichester District at the performance of GP surgeries, particularly when it came to face-to-face consultations; and the seeming lack of provision for the growing population. My questions were:

1. Access to GP Surgeries. I imagine that many of us have received emails complaining about the difficulties of accessing GPs, which have been becoming more and more difficult since the end of lockdown. I have heard accounts from two of my ward residents about being rushed into A&E after trying unsuccessfully to get an appointment with a GP or to see a nurse. From one resident trying to get an appointment for one of their children: “We always hear that to avoid the patient waiting for extended periods of time, it is not possible to queue beyond a certain number of callers, so the call is terminated and you are asked to ring back tomorrow.” The bigger picture is that planning permission was granted for the White House Farm development six years ago, which was to have a GP surgery on the site. Something similar was supposed to happen at Graylingwell some years before. Like many areas, Southbourne is building many more houses but the current service cannot cope with the number of patients, even before numbers are greatly increased. My call is for the CCG to attend Overview and Scrutiny to explain to us how they intend to manage the growing chasm between the service and the number of patients.
2. The severity of the Covid-19 epidemic meant that it was necessary to emphasise the seriousness of the situation to the general public, which has led to reluctance to visit GP surgeries or hospitals, out of fear for the pandemic. How do we now move to mitigate this and enable the public to receive regular care and treatment from the NHS?
3. The availability of GP appointments has been brought to my attention on a number of occasions, and whereas dentists have been able to continue to provide a full service, the same has not been true of GPs – witness the large number of distressing stories on social media. What can be done to improve this situation?

These questions were answered by the member of the CCG present at the meeting, but in a rather perfunctory way (the formal answers will be published with the minutes). We expect the CCG to attend future meetings. (TB)

**HGV Driver Shortage: Impact on CDC Operations & Finances (Service Prioritisation Update)**

In recent weeks it has become increasingly hard to recruit new drivers and several existing drivers have resigned. This, combined with ongoing COVID impacts has made the daily task of providing a full waste collection service even more challenging. Contract Services’ management team are currently working with the HR department and the Senior Leadership Team to agree a plan of action to address this.

I fear there could be a substantial cost to the Council’s finances, on top of the unplanned hit to the budged from the Government’s recent Employers’ National Insurance hike. This is likely to impact the Service Review. (JB)

**Enabling Grant for Businesses**

A second round of funding has opened to new applications. The deadline for applications is midnight on 13 October 2021. Businesses who fit the grant criteria will be eligible to apply for one of the following three grants:

* Capital Projects: up to a maximum contribution of £2,000 from the council (50% match funded).
* Website/Social Media projects: up to a maximum contribution of £1,500 from the council (50% match funded).
* Start-up Awards: up to a maximum contribution of £500 from the council (non-match funded).

Applicants will receive a decision within six weeks of the application closing date.

For further information see: [www.chichester.gov.uk/enablinggrantscheme](http://www.chichester.gov.uk/enablinggrantscheme).

**Novium Visit**

I went to the Novium on 10th September to meet with Stephanie Thorndyke, the curator of the museum. She gave me a tour of the site which I found utterly fascinating. I was able to talk to her about the North Bersted “Mystery Warrior”, dating from the Iron Age which James Kenny, Archaeological Officer, described thus: “in more than thirty years of archaeology this is the most spectacular discovery that I have witnessed.” The “Mystery Warrior” dated from 194-57BC, was male, at least 45 years old, and 5’7” tall. The media campaign for the “Mystery Warrior” reached 133.5M worldwide, and there were 50,559 admissions to the museum. Stephanie has done an incredible job in making the museum not only an important destination for visitors to Chichester, but in the outreach programme, boxes of artefacts have been taken to many local schools, particularly to explain the Roman conquest and occupation of the area. The Novium also holds an eclectic collection of artefacts from the Late Medieval period onwards, recording ecclesiastical, Civil War, smuggling and industrial history. I hope that this City museum keeps on flourishing. (TB)

**Feedback to WSCC / National Highways Consultation on Chichester-Emsworth Cycle Route**

Both Tracie and I attended meetings with several different groups representing cyclists, pedestrians and heard from various residents. We submitted our own feedback to the consultation emphasising our support for the Parish’s response, particularly with regards to our very serous concerns about the proposal that pedestrians share pavement space with cyclists. This is dangerous, counter to national policy and good practice guidance and counterproductive to the aims of the scheme. (JB)

**Neighbourhood Planning**

We still await an update on when the examination will begin. Clearly the anticipated September start date has been missed, but it does appear that the examiner has begun to gather the information he will need. (JB)

**Milland Green Fair**

As Opposition Spokesperson on the Environment, I chaired a panel debate at Milland Green Fair on the subject of ‘Climate change: global challenge, local response - What can we as individuals and communities do?’ We had really interesting contributions from Nicola Peel (Environmental Solutionist who has worked in the Amazon), James Sebley (Portsmouth Greenpeace) and Tom Broughton (Energy Activist). Cllr Penny Plant, CDC Cabinet Member for the Environment was due to speak about the Council’s Climate Emergency Action Plan, but unfortunately was unable to make it due to the fuel shortages. CDC was represented at the Fair by Andrea Smith, the Climate Change Officer (and it was great to meet her for the first time since she joined the Council at the beginning of the pandemic). (JB)

**Kerbside Recycling Pilots Begin in Southbourne**

The first collections in our area for the new pilots begin on Monday 4 October (followed by 1 November, 29 November and 27 December). Bags need to be left out at 7am on the morning of collection on the boundary of properties. The bags are specific to this collection and if you have not received one please get in touch with CDC.

More information can be found here: [www.chichester.gov.uk/textileandelectricalrecycling](http://www.chichester.gov.uk/textileandelectricalrecycling) & [www.chichester.gov.uk/podback](http://www.chichester.gov.uk/podback).

**Tuppenny Barn**

Just a shout out for the fundraiser on behalf of the new community café. There is going to be a quiz on Friday 22 October at 7pm. Tickets available on the Tuppenny Barn website: [www.tuppennybarn.co.uk/event/barn-quiz-night-fundraiser-friday-22-october-2021/?event\_date=2021-10-22](http://www.tuppennybarn.co.uk/event/barn-quiz-night-fundraiser-friday-22-october-2021/?event_date=2021-10-22) (TB)

**Use of Priory Park in Chichester**

A motion was brought to Full Council by Cllrs Martyn Bell and Richard Plowman, to prevent Priory Park being used for any major concerts in future due to damage on the cricket pitch from a recent event (that has since been rectified). Although I supported the motion my response was as follows:

“In 1918 the 7th Duke of Richmond gifted Priory Park to the City of Chichester as a War Memorial. Over the decades it has been used for countless celebrations and sporting events. This place is not a graveyard but a memorial to all those young men who gave their lives in the Great War, and let us remember that they would never have the chance to play cricket or join in celebration again.

“I would agree further consideration needs to be given to the suitability of future events and prevention of damage to the park as experienced in the concerts of the 30th and 31st of July. I would suggest, however, that it is worth remarking that over 1,500 people attended, which brought life and commerce into our City, which is especially important after such dark times. I intend to support this motion but would suggest that my fellow councillors still consider Priory Park for suitable events, as well as seeking an alternative venue for larger musical concerts.”
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**Minutes of the Southbourne Parish Council** **Finance and General Purposes Advisory Committee held on Wednesday 22 September at 7pm on Microsoft Teams**

Present Parish Cllrs: J. Brown [JB] C. Bulbeck [CB] R. Hayes [RH] L. Hicks [LH] A. Tait [AT] R. Taylor [RT]   
P. Thorne (Chair) [PT]. In attendance: Locum Clerk – K. Bain [KB].

*It was noted that this meeting had originally been scheduled for 21.09.21 but had been rescheduled to allow the requisite 3 clear days from agenda publication.*

1. **Apologies:** None.
2. **Declarations of Interests:** RH & CB each recorded an interest in item 8 as trustees of Southbourne Village Hall.
3. **Minutes of the meeting held on 24.08.21:** Approved: A*greed by all Councillors present.*
4. **Action List:**

– SIDs review: PT thanked AT & RT for researching the WSCC policy it appears that WSCC would approve a 2- weekly, rather than 1 week schedule.

It was agreed that changing the schedule to 2-weekly, would be the best way forward, i.e. 2 weeks Westerly, then 2 weeks Easterly.  
KB will contact the relevant chap who moves the SIDs, if he agrees and WSCC also approves, this will be implemented.

For the record RH noted that he has seen vehicles slowing at the signs.   
- Workshop with Rialtas & JBC: This will be set up shortly.   
- PC Zoom Licence: Proposed by PT, seconded by AT that KB would purchase a multi-user zoom licence for Council. *Agreed by all Councillors present*.  
- Portaloo project: Agreed that this would be added to the projects list and should be accessible for disabled users. Proposed by AT, seconded by RH and *agreed by all Councillors present.*  
 - Wine & cheese event – budget: Agreed this will come out of Community events which has an allocated budget of £600. AT noted that there may be some funds in the SEG budget which could be used if required.  
 LH asked for volunteers to arrange the event; RT offered to assist, and RH noted that crockery could be borrowed from the village hall.  
- RH asked if a defibrillator for Age Concern could be added to the projects list on the next agenda.

1. – **To Agree the contractor for the recreation ground maintenance:** Proposed by RT, seconded by RH that it would be proposed to Full Council to accept the Longmeadows quote no: QU-0027, for regular maintenance of the recreation ground and the triangle. Noted that the cost is within the recreation grass cutting budget. Also noted that there are several other areas which require maintenance, such as allotments (existing & new) Prinsted, Holm Oak and Tesco’s, but these would be looked at when requirements are clarified, with a view to implementing a whole Parish general maintenance contract. It will be considered in due course if the different areas should be under separate or one umbrella contract. The proposal to accept the current quote would be added to the agenda for the extraordinary meeting of Council on 27 September, along with a proposal to terminate the Idverede (Burleys) current contract for the two quoted areas.
2. It was noted the notice period required is not clear, but was agreed that an overlap would be acceptable.

PT proposed that the Recreation Advisory Committee should look at the progression of the maintenance contract for the other areas; seconded by CB and *agreed by all Councillors present.*

1. **Agreement to task Pavilion quotes to Maria:**It was agreed that Maria – the new Deputy-Clerk would be tasked with the pavilion renovation project.
2. **Payments to be approved August/September:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **PAYEE** | **DETAIL** | **NET** | **VAT** | **GROSS** |
| 1} | WSCC | 11 new trees: This is over- budget as WSCC raised the prices & there was a local issue. The extra cost will be allocated £1500 from the business plan budget & £150 from the SEG budget. 1: AT, 2: PT. A*greed by all councillors present* | 1650 | 330 | 1980 |
| 2} | ACE SHELTERS | Repair to the *first* damage to the shelter at (290 main road, by St. Johns). (Noted that this invoice has been outstanding since November 2020 (but AXA has only just paid the monies of (£3300- the net invoice amount, minus the excess of £250 to the parish Council. KB will investigate the situation regarding the other damaged shelters. **1: PT. 2: AT***. Agreed by all councillors present (*exception of RH who abstained as absent for this item) | 3550 | 710 | 4260 |
| 3a-c} | S ROWLAND | September salary (JBC manager) **1: PT 2: RT.** A*greed by all councillors present* | On file | | |
| 4} | SEA SCOUTS | Noted that the Sea scouts have been in contact regarding grants towards new flooring & a life ring. LH reported that Council had not specifically agreed to pay for a ring, just to see if CHC might supply one, AT will follow this up. LH also reported that the Sea Scouts had been advised that they should apply for a grant towards flooring. Agreed that KB will send the grant application form to the Scouts & clarify that SPC is investigating a ring and that they should submit the grant application for consideration by full Council. Proposed by PT, seconded by RT and *agreed by all Councillors present.* | | | |
|  | SVH | Room hire for Clerk interviews. 9RH & CB confirmed interests).  **1: JB, 2: RT**, *agreed by all Councillors present.* | 31.50 | 0 | 31.50 |
|  | HALC | Advertisement for Clerk & RFO. **1: LH, 2: RH**, *agreed by all Councillors present.* | 40 | 8 | 48 |
|  | BOURNE BUS | It was noted that the first payment to the project of (£4000) might be due for payment shortly; this has been agreed by full PC. KB will request necessary paperwork | | | |

Payments as above agreed by all Councillors present.

1. **I & E report for August 21**: Noted that this is up to 31.08.21 and the 2nd instalment of the precept is due in September.
2. **Decision on Parish Council IT company:**   
   PT noted that of the quotes and systems considered, the most suitable quote is the one from Cloudy IT, which is within the agreed budget of £6000. In addition, there is £3000 in the budget for upgrading the website. She reported that the monthly cost will be £525 & the initial set up £3525; the system will give Councillors access to SharePoint, Outlook shared calendars & Teams; officers will have full access to all the applications.  
   AT noted that going forward a budget could be considered for Councillors to have a specific laptop for Parish Council matters; PT noted that a key part of the new IT system would entail storage of Parish Council files on the shared cloud, so alleviating the need for Council information to be stored on personal laptops.

Proposed by PT, seconded by RH and *agreed by all Councillors present*, that this item should be added to the agenda for the extraordinary meeting of Full Council on 27 September. If agreed by full Council, it will be actioned when the new staff are in place.

1. **Approval of Project funding requests template**:   
   PT noted that this should be used for Community organisations who applied for larger funding, principally from CiL monies, but it could be used for grants from Council reserves. JB suggested that a line for ‘Expected contribution from SPC’ be added & also a note to stating that extra information is provided on a separate page*.*AT noted that the form would not apply to S106 funds as these are pre-allocated. When finalised it will be published on the website & sent out as required. Approved: Proposed by JB, seconded by RT.   
    *Agreed by all Councillors present*. PT was thanked for her work on this*.*
2. **Set up of project sub- committee:**PT noted that the aim of setting this up would be to keep the minutiae of project progression detail separate from the main committee meetings. It was agreed that membership should be open to all councillors as well as F G & P members, in addition, if appropriate, members of the public. It was clarified that the sub-committee would be separate to F G & P and would work closely with Maria to help share the project workload; it will report t back to Committee and Council. Proposed by JB, seconded by RT that this proposal, along with the vacancy on the F G & P committee, would be proposed to full Council at the October meeting.

*Agreed by all Councillors present.*

**13. Consideration of Council savings account**:

LH has talked to Barclays & PT has looked at Unity bank; neither appears to offer suitable facilities for SPC at present. It was suggested that an option could be to invest in a secure bond but agreed that the matter should be progressed when new staff are in place and a financial adviser would be consulted. LH noted that another matter was the possibility of a Council debit card. PT suggested that all a list detailing all requirements should be drawn up for discussion with the adviser. PT proposed, LH seconded that this would go to full Council in October.

It was agreed that a report should also be drawn up detailing the amounts in each reserve. *Agreed by all Councillors present.*

*Meeting closed at 8.40pm*

14. **Date of next meeting: Tuesday 19 October @ 7pm.**
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**Minutes of Southbourne Parish Council Staffing Committee held on Friday 24th September @ 4pm in Southbourne Village Hall**

Present: Parish Cllrs: T. Bangert, L. Hicks, R. Taylor, P. Thorne (Chair). In attendance: Locum Clerk – K. Bain.

1. **Apologies:** None. It was noted that J. Grant had resigned from the Parish Council.
2. **Declarations of Interests**: None.
3. **Actions from previous meetings**:

* Appoint 3 members for the interview panel & agree questions: Completed.
* Advertise Clerk & RFO role on Indeed, WSALC & HALC, shortlist & interviews: Completed.
* Review of contract for Deputy Clerk: P. Thorne is in discussion with WSALC regarding this.
* Review of Caretaker role & contract: Completed; noted that a mobile telephone for the caretaker would be arranged by the new Clerk.
* Review of litter picker role: Noted that K. Bain has not been able to contact the litter picker as yet; T. Bangert & P. Thorne will follow up on this.

1. **Minutes of the meeting held on: 23.08.21.** An amendment was made to note that C. Bulbeck was not on the staffing Committee. Subject to this the minutes were ***approved: Proposed by P. Thorne, seconded by R. Taylor.***
2. **Consideration of interviews held for the post of Clerk & RFO to Southbourne Parish Council:**

Committee noted that 2 interviews had been held and both applicants had scored well against the job specification and in responding to the interview questions. One candidate had scored highest, and Committee agreed that the position would be offered to Sheila Hodgson, subject to references. This will be proposed to Full Council at the Extraordinary meeting scheduled for Monday 27th September. If agreed by Council KB will contact Sheila. If the offer is accepted and references are approved, the other candidate will then be thanked and informed that their application has been unsuccessful.

1. **Deputy Clerk:**A programme for the Deputy Clerk’s first week was proposed as follows:   
   **Monday 4th October:** Meet with K. Bain to at the Village Hall at 9.30am for a general induction and laptop handover.

**Tuesday 7th 11am:**  Meet with Amanda Tait, Chair of Planning.  
**Wednesday 6th: Time TBC- Further** meeting with K. Bain.

**Thursday 7th:** Working from home – online training.

**Friday 8th:** Morning meeting with L. Hicks Chair of SPC.
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**Southbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan – Chairman’s Report to SPC on 12th October 2021**

07 October 2021

I ask the Parish Council to note the summary report which follows and to approve the following four recommendations:

1. Approve for payment our consultants’ invoice for work carried out to 30th September 2021.
2. Confirm that we wish to retain our consultants for help in the coming months with the Neighbourhood Plan examination; with preparing for and then participating in the masterplanning process and with planning applications / development management issues that may arise from the Planning process.
3. Consider requesting monthly invoicing for our consultants’ services to enable us to have greater clarity over costs.
4. Confirm the delegated authority of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (which includes all Parish Councillors) to take appropriate action to progress the Examination and Masterplan Preparation.
5. **ONH Invoice for Work to 30th September 2021**

Circulated separately, the invoice covers all costs relating to the work carried out by our consultants, Oneill Homer, to 30th September 2021. It includes:

* Post Reg 15 SPNPR support / Overview of Reg 16 submissions (3 days)
* Preparation and attendance at Core Group Masterplanning meeting (1 day)
* Development Management advice (1 day) Four Acres, Willowbrook (Reside), Gosden Green & Wayside.

Please note that ONH have had to work on responding to a question by the Examiner since the invoice was produced.

1. **Retaining Oneill Homer for help with the Examination, the Masterplanning process and with development management / responding to planning applications as necessary.**

Councillors will have received a quotation for future work from ONH, which is accompanied by a description of their ‘Aftercare Service Offer’. As it contains confidential financial information it is not being published with this report and if any member wishes to discuss the pricing we will need to exclude the public from the meeting and go into Part II.

I know that Councillors have struggled (myself included) to get our heads around exactly what level of support we may need and what that might cost. I asked Jon Dowty to provide some further detail that might help us anticipate what to expect re: examination support and he has provided the following:

“In broad terms our time spent in support of the Blandford examination which I cited as an example in the quote consisted of about 25% of our time (3 days) preparing and attending an exploratory meeting followed by a full day examination hearing including site visits. The remainder of the time (9 days) was spent preparing submissions to respond to the examiner’s questions. However it should be noted that at Blandford the Local Planning Authority were fully supportive of the NP, the relationship was collaborative and the principle planning officer took on a significant proportion of drafting of submissions... [Jon doesn’t believe CDC will be able to offer the same level of support.]

You might find it helpful to have a look at their examination website to see what was involved <https://blandfordplus.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan-version-2/home-bnp2/>. Note the examiner’s initial questions (EQ1) required a very detailed 12 page response: <https://blandfordplus.org.uk/blandford-neighbourhood-plan-2011-2033-examination/>. And a further supplementary submission was requested following the hearing.

In addition to the time spent by OH on the examination itself, the Town Council also funded a post 2 days a week for about 4 months to manage the examination. The email below outlines the time spent by Sally in this role. Having someone at your end to administer the examination will be essential, particularly if a hearing is called.”

I anticipate having a better idea of what kind of support may be required in relation to preparing for the Masterplanning following an initial meeting with Barton Willmore, expected to take place shortly.

1. **Consider Requesting Monthly Invoicing**

Oneill Homer last invoiced SPC in February and in the months since have received a lot of communications from us and provided a lot of support. Councillors have also expressed to me frustration at not having a clear understanding as to what we need and are paying for. I suggest we consider requesting ONH to invoice us on a monthly basis as this will enable us to see closer to the event what support we are using. It is not practical for ONH to quote in advance as there are so many unknowns. For example, they have had to draft a response to a question from the Examiner this week that neither we nor CDC anticipated being asked.

1. **Delegated Authority**

The Parish Council has previously delegated authority to the Steering Group to make minor changes to the Draft and then the Submission Neighbourhood Plans. Any future changes to the Neighbourhood Plan can and will only be made by the Examiner. In that respect it is now out of our hands. The Examiner may well have a substantial number of questions for us however, so I would like to request that the Council similarly delegates authority to the Steering Group to respond appropriately.

Likewise, while we are not yet at the stage of making decisions on the Masterplan, we need to be able to talk to the Consortium, put a considerable number of questions and requests for investigations into various issues and to agree upon the process for taking things forward. We are likely to need to talk with other key stakeholders including WSCC, Highways England, Network Rail, etc.

**Where We Are & What Next?**

**The Submission Plan**

The Southbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan Review 2021 completed it ‘Regulation 16’ public consultation in June of this year. The Plan, the supporting evidence and background papers can all be found on the Parish Council’s website here:

[www.southbourne-pc.gov.uk/Southbourne\_Parish\_Neighbourhood\_Plan\_Review\_2019-2037\_Submission\_Plan\_36886.aspx](http://www.southbourne-pc.gov.uk/Southbourne_Parish_Neighbourhood_Plan_Review_2019-2037_Submission_Plan_36886.aspx).

Chichester District Council submitted it for examination and Christopher Lockhart-Mummery QC began his examination this week. CDC will publish updates here:

[www.chichester.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplan](http://www.chichester.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplan).

**The Examination**

At the time of writing this report we don’t know whether the Examiner will hold a public hearing or not. We don’t know whether he will pause the examination until there is more certainty surrounding CDC’s significantly delayed Local Plan Review and the challenges it faces. Our Neighbourhood Plan is a large one (i.e. it deals with a large housing allocation and contains some major infrastructure objectives) so we can expect the examination to be complicated and perhaps quite lengthy – if the Examiner is content to proceed.

**Southbourne’s Current Housing Allocation & Strategy**

Arguably the most significant policy in the Neighbourhood Plan Review is SP2, which allocates land located to the east of Southbourne for a single masterplanned development of 1250 dwellings. Critical to the success of the Neighbourhood Plan and of any development in the Parish is that it be masterplanned and the Steering Group are currently arranging to meet with Robin Shepherd of Barton Willmore who acts on behalf of the consortium of landowners that make up most of the allocation. The purpose of this meeting/s is to agree upon a framework for conducting further investigations, technical studies, evidence gathering, etc. to inform the masterplanning process. This cannot be delayed, as while the Neighbourhood Plan gives the community real influence over development proposals that are supported, it also comes with a duty to advance the planning process. It provides protection from speculative, *unplanned* development precisely because it guides and supports *planned* development and the delivery of new infrastructure. If we were to suspend cooperation with consortium it would undermine the Neighbourhood Plan at Examination and beyond.

**The Context: Chichester District’s Delayed Local Plan Review**

Since last July Chichester District has been without an up-to-date Local Plan. This means that the District is faced with a huge housing target and that when it considers planning applications it is required by law to apply a ‘tilted balance’ in favour of permitting new developments even where they run contrary to existing development strategies and public wishes. The District has seen a flood of planning applications from developers hoping to take advantage of this situation. Southbourne has been relatively protected due to the advanced status of our Neighbourhood Plan. (As a NP progresses it gains more ‘weight’ in the planning system.) It has successfully resulted in certain speculative planning applications being refused and caused other developers to back off from submitting plans that would be highly likely to be rejected. It has also encouraged the landowners who make up the consortium to work with each other and to work with the community on a masterplanned development. (The alternative would have been piecemeal applications with no relation to each other and without any significant infrastructure improvements.)

**Uncertainties Caused by Infrastructure Constraints (the A27 & Southern Water)**

Over the past three months, there have been two significant developments at a District level which have the potential to impact upon Southbourne’s allocation of 1250 dwellings and/or the smooth delivery of the Neighbourhood Plan:

1. CDC has stated that infrastructure constraints (A27 capacity) mean that there is no feasible means of delivering the District’s housing target and so a Local Plan will be submitted in due course that plans for a reduced amount of development.
2. Southern Water will shortly be releasing a Position Statement with CDC that states that Thornham WWTW only has capacity remaining for under 400 new houses. (This treatment works serves Southbourne, Chidham and Hambrook and Emsworth.) Any upgrade to the site will not be delivered before 2027 at the very earliest.

These beg the questions: will Southbourne’s allocation be reduced from 1250? And should we suspend the Neighbourhood Plan until the picture is clearer?

**CDC’s New Spatial Development Strategy**

CDC is required to ‘leave no stone unturned’ in delivering the maximum quantum of development. This could mean some parishes being required to take *more* housing than under current proposals. (I will say that I don’t think this is likely for Southbourne.) Although an overall reduction in housing numbers for the Plan area is expected, it does not follow that there will be an across the board reduction. Indeed, this is quite unlikely, given the requirement to maximise development. Sufficient land for thousands of new dwellings in Southbourne Parish was promoted through the HELAA, and the village remains a ‘settlement hub’ so it would not be wise to bet on Southbourne’s allocation being reduced. The (sole) justification for reducing the Local Plan housing number is overburdening the A27. The transport evidence is that development to the south and east of Chichester puts greater pressure on the junctions than development to the west (due to traffic heading towards Havant and Portsmouth for work). So there will be greater pressure to reduce housing delivery in this part of the District than along the A259.

**Lack of Capacity at Thornham Waste-Water Treatment Works (WWTW)**

Until Thornham WWTW reaches capacity, its impending overload makes no difference to the Planning system. CDC is obliged to treat planning applications on a case-by-case basis, judging each one on its individual merits and taking no regard for the cumulative impact on the infrastructure. CDC is not allowed to prioritise ‘approved’ or ‘preferred’ development (whether that be defined in a Neighbourhood Plan or any other way). Essentially, Thornham’s remaining capacity will be used up on a ‘first come, first served’ basis.

Once Thornham WWTW reaches capacity, the expectation is that CDC will be able to refuse *new connections* to the foul water system. Note: new connections, not new permissions / new developments. As long as new developments make alternative provision for the disposal of sewage, a lack of capacity at Thornham will not impede development. Alternative arrangements could include on-site treatment, trucking waste to another treatment plant or (less likely) a pipe to a different plant. If ‘improvements’ to the system will result in increased capacity, then presumably these would also allow new connections (e.g. new storage to control flow could be built for existing properties).

Southern Water will submit a bid to upgrade Thornham WWTW in next round of funding. Any upgrades will take several years to deliver, but not decades. i.e. A lack of capacity at Thornham may *delay* housing delivery in its catchment area (including Southbourne). But it is highly unlikely to prevent it.

**Could Southbourne’s Allocation be Reduced from 1250?**

It is technically *possible* that Southbourne might end up with a smaller allocation if we withdraw the Neighbourhood Plan and keep our fingers crossed for a reduction as part of the Local Plan Review. However, the new Local Plan will not be submitted before Spring 2022 at the earliest. Southbourne Parish would lose the protection from speculative development that we have benefitted from to this point. New planning permissions would undoubtedly be granted, in places that would otherwise be protected and/or which might make continuing with our current strategy impossible. (Not that the area currently allocated would be left undeveloped, rather, parts of the area could be developed in such a way as to make masterplanning and the delivery of important community infrastructure impossible.) While capacity constraints at Thornham WWTW may delay the delivery of new housing, they are unlikely to prevent significant planning permissions from being granted in locations we would have no control over.

We would lose the opportunity to work constructively with the consortium. It is highly unlikely that work on the current Neighbourhood Plan Review could be resumed at a later date from where we left off. Rather, a new Plan would have to be produced from scratch, and it is unlikely that houses granted permission in this time would count towards our eventual allocation so it is possible, even likely, that we would end up with more development than we bargained for. Even if that doesn’t happen, a major expansion of Southbourne and Nutbourne (and possibly Hermitage too) could occur without masterplanning and without the infrastructure improvements that we hope we will achieve through our Neighbourhood Plan. New houses permitted in this time would only be required to meet the current (woefully inadequate) national standards.

**Conclusion**

For the reasons outlined above, the Steering Group believes that the best course of action for the Parish is to press on with our Neighbourhood Plan Review, and to seek to positively plan development that we can be sure will come sooner or later. We cannot eliminate uncertainties, but the Neighbourhood Plan remains our surest defence against unplanned development and our best chance of achieving significant infrastructure improvements.

Jonathan Brown

Chair, Southbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Southbourne Parish Council Agenda item 10viii)

**Report for Southbourne Parish Council October 2021 on Bournes Forum Meeting 29 September 2021-10-03**

The Bournes Forum meeting on Wednesday, 29th September, 2021 was held virtually. Reports had been circulated from the five Working Groups and these formed the basis for the meeting’s discussion.

**Harbour access:** fewer issues arising fromvisitors even in fine weather. Main concerns relate to water quality (see below) and illegal shellfishing.

**ChEm route consultation:** the main points objected by PCs in relation to the proposed HE NMU route were the shared pedestrian/cyclist paths and the two-way cycle path (safety concerns). Most parishes supported the 20 mph at pinchpoints. Once the HE consultation results are published (towards the end of the year) a meeting will be arranged with Joy Dennis and WSCC Highways officers.

**Effect of Covid-19 on Communities and Businesses:** it was felt that local government and businesses would have ongoing financial challenges. Most PCs are meeting face-to-face, advice on designated powers needs clarification.

**Roads:** agricultural traffic causing concern. Issues with speeding, tractors travelling in groups, not allowing overtaking, tractors no longer numbered for identification. Progress is possible through a farm liaison group.

**Water quality:** this newly formed group is chaired by Penny Plant. It is mainly to ensure that information is shared and understood. Particular concerns with where testing is carried out, are some areas of the harbour safe for bathing/water sports? Need for notices/posters to be put up asking people to be aware the Harbour is not tested as a beach; report pollution – simple information that could be used by all Harbour Villages. Capacity at Thornham is low, waiting for position statement. Would Southbourne Parish Councillors like to receive the Water Quality Group Meeting notes?

Invite CHC (RA/RC) to next meeting to discuss a range of topics including Chapron (Chichester Protection and Recovery of Nature).

Next meeting Wednesday, January 26th, 2022 (virtual).

**Lyn Hicks – Chair, Bournes Forum**
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**Southbourne Parish Council Drop-in Session Report**

**2 October 2021**

The Southbourne Parish Council drop-in sessions were suspended in March 2020 at the start of the Covid-19 Pandemic but the Parish Council agreed that they should be restarted in October 2021. In spite of the pouring rain the first session was attended by six local residents who all appreciated that we were available to listen to a range of concerns.

One visitor was concerned about repeated planning applications for development within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty south of the A259. Otherwise all the issues raised related to traffic, roads, crossings for pedestrians, speeding, parking/cycling on pavements and congestion in Stein Road at school drop-off/pick-up times. Some of these points will need to be followed up by the Bournes WSCC Councillor once elected. It was gratifying to note that most of the residents came up with suggestions for solutions as well as highlighting problems.

Finally, one resident who had previously lived in Southbourne - moved to Kent for three years and missed West Sussex so much they had just moved back - wanted to catch up with what was happening in our community.

Lyn Hicks

David James
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Oct 2 2021 – Nutbourne outlier and drop in session report

Cllr. Amanda Tait

Oh, the weather outside was frightful but the Seabrook’s garage and hospitality delightful.A house with balloons in the front

Description automatically generated with low confidence

And we had some 13 very hardy and passionate residents in Nutbourne. Firstly, who DO NOT like being called West…

I also had Andrew Kerry Bedell drop in to answer questions if they arose about the Bourne Bus project. He was invited on the proviso of NO election canvassing, and none was made.

In general, all the attendees have one over-riding concern, it is not something that is within the SPC remit, but as soon as we get a new WSCC councillor we must hammer them with making WSCC Highways see sense about the speed limits along the A259, especially at the pinch point near the Esso station. General feeling is that the speed limit from Bosham – Emsworth MUST be 30mph continuous. The argument that as the A27 relief road it must have higher limits, for when the A27 packs in, is ludicrous. We all know when the A27 has an incident as the A259 becomes a parking lot. And Highway code does say streetlights and houses is a 30mph zone. There is also consensus that the HE proposal for ChEm route is laughable/undeliverable and needs a serious rethink. Suggestions include a cycle route along the rail line, leaving the pavements for pedestrians. Speaking of pavements, many are upset that Southbourne does not seem to register at WSCC for the maintenance of their roads and pavements as their condition, as is well known around the parish are abysmal.

With speed limits and road safety, queries were made about speed cameras, or at least downloading the data from our SIDS (as well as getting more) to prove better management/enforcement is needed and see if that helps WSCC to get a grip. Not to mention the current chaos of panic buying at the petrol station, parking on the pavement, buses/lorries driving down the wrong side of the road to pass those queuing for petrol.

A red car on a road
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2 of the residents from Elm Grove were most anxious about their carpark at Meadow View. Mr. Van der Wee has apparently been most unpleasant in dealing with their enquiries. Cllr. Bangert with CDC hat on, has been hammering away at this issue on behalf of those residents and they all Thanked her for the efforts. I have told one that I will also pursue the matter with the planning officer as they are concerned that what was permitted in the S106 (pg 21, para 8Text

Description automatically generatedis not what is currently on site and they are worried about the size of the site, security, and how others will be prevented from using it. I will action this, copying in Cllr Bangert to make sure we do all we can to get a satisfactory response for the Elm Grove residents.

Another resident was most unhappy about the precept rise and wanted to know what they were getting from the parish for their money. I explained more staff, a better IT system, tree planting, community grants, etc. Perhaps we need to bullet point our reason within the budget to explain ourselves better?

Finally, 2 residents of the Inlands Road group came. It was pleasant and polite, but they simply will not understand the consequences of not having a NP, or how much worse it will be for Inlands Road without it. I reminded them, that even with a NP at 1250, our HEELA and landowners have promoted land circa 3-4000 houses, that IF the numbers went down, we would be protected from all the rest as well in the future. Not to mention our being “greedy” suggesting passing the referendum because of CIL money. This is for the future community wants and needs of the whole parish and having CIL capped at £650K, without a made NP, would mean the loss circa £800K and the SPC would not be in the financial position to assist. However, both are hopeful at being invited at joining in the Master Planning discussions when they start in earnest. One wishes to join the Southbourne Environment Group as well.

All in all, a very wet, windy, and successful drop-in session. Residents of Nutbourne have been feeling neglected and are very appreciative of the SPC’s endeavours to be more open and actioning. (We currently do not fare well in their comparison to Chidham & Hambrook.) I have been asked to do this again, so I must have done well.

Kind Regards,

Amanda Tait
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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Correspondence** | | |
| FROM | DETAIL | ACTION |
| BOURNE COLLEGE | Request for continued financial support for the Family link worker | To consider |
| BOURNE COLLEGE | Concerns over safety at the railway station | To consider |
| MOORES AUDITOR | AGAR form 2021- signed & approved | Note/ put on website/file |
| ST JOHNS CHURCH | Request to close the SPCC bank account & transfer funds of £91.57 to SPC | To consider |
| WSCC | Consultation on School Safety Zone proposal outside of Southbourne Infant and Junior School. | Comments by 18.10.21 |
| MR GREEN | Photos showing proposed location of Merv Skidmore memorial bench (as noted at PC meeting on 14.09.21) | To consider |
| PARISHIONER | Queries on foreshore benches | To consider |
| Public Sector Network | Queen's Jubilee Beacons – 02.06.21 | To consider |
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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning applications received** | | | |
| SB/21/01902/DOM | 22 Gordon Road Southbourne | Proposed 2 No. Front Dormers | No objection |
| SB/21/01835/DOM | 26 Manor Road Southbourne | Replacement roof, infill first floor extension and loft conversion. | No objection |
| SB/21/02318/DOM | Brent Knoll 95 Stein Road Southbourne | Single storey side extension to provide two additional rooms and an ensuite shower room | No objection |
| SB/21/02689/DOM | The Warren Nutbourne Park Nutbourne | Removal of rear conservatory and erection of single storey extension, removal of front conservatory to form a bay window and removal of and replacement of porch | No objection |
| SB/21/02301/DOM | Highview House Linwood Close Nutbourne | Proposed double garage extension to existing property. Proposed porch and single storey extension to rear. | : No objection |
| SB/21/02532/TPA | 31 Russet Gardens Hermitage Southbourne | Crown reduce by 2.5m (back to previous pruning points) and removal of north-west facing limb (diameter of 20cm) overhanging extension on 1 no. Oak tree (T12) subject to SB/94/00896/TPO. | Objection |
| SB/ 21/02603/OUT | 1 Green Acre Inlands Road Nutbourne | Change of use of the land to use as a building site compound (Variation of Condition 1 from Appeal Decision ref. PP/L3815/C/19/3233587 - to extend the time within which the use must be discontinued and to include the alternative use of the land for agricultural purposes). | Objection |
| SB/21/02756/DOM | Pippins 9 Priors Close Southbourne | Single storey rear extension. Change use of loft space to habitable accommodation to extend over new extension including new dormer, and associated works. Replacement garage.  Comment | Objection |
| SB/21/02460/FUL | 306 Main Road Southbourne | Alterations and conversion of first floor accommodation to two-bedroom flat | Objection |