

Clerk to the Council  
Sheila Hodgson  
[clerk@southbourne-pc.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@southbourne-pc.gov.uk)

[www.southbourne-pc.gov.uk](http://www.southbourne-pc.gov.uk)

---

## **Minutes of the Meeting of Southbourne Parish Council's Planning Committee held 14<sup>th</sup> July 2022**

**Present:** Cllrs: A. Tait (Chairman), T. Bangert, P. Green, and R. Taylor

**In Attendance:** M. Carvajal-Neal (Deputy Clerk) 4 members of the public, 2 representatives from Metis Homes and 2 representatives from Bloor Homes.

### **52. CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION**

The Chairman welcomed everyone and opened the meeting at 6.02pm

### **53. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence had been received from Cllrs Riddoch and Bulbeck.

### **54. TO APPROVE AND SIGN THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 23<sup>RD</sup> JUNE 2022**

Members **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes of the Planning Committee held on 23rd June and they were signed by the Chairman.

### **55. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **56. ADJOURNED FOR OPEN FORUM**

*The meeting was adjourned at 18:04 for the next two agenda items. Open Forum and to receive a presentation from Bloor Homes.*

**56.1** A member of the public spoke against application SB/22/01314/DOM and gave the following reasons;

- The location is Nutbourne not Southbourne.
- The development is out of character with neighbouring properties.
- There is no mention in the reports of the railway crossing and safety concerns regarding the proximity of the development to the crossing.
- Parking issues.
- Visibility and accessibility issues.
- Inaccurate transport study relating to Woking and out of date study completed in 2013.

**56.2** A member of the public spoke against application SB/22/01314/DOM and gave the following reasons;

- Supported all the above-mentioned objections.
- The development is overbearing and does not allow sufficient hard standing space for the number of parking spaces required.
- The size of the property is out of keeping with the surrounding properties, particularly in height.
- There has been no response from Network Rail.

**56.3** Two representatives from Metis Homes spoke in support of application SB/22/01283/FULEIA.

Their statement included comments regarding;

- The production of 112 new homes, 34 of which will be affordable. A new nursery.
- The design of the development, having no standard house styles.
- The benefits of the decontamination of the site including the prevention of further contamination.
- Drainage improvements.
- CIL funding.
- The benefits of the development outweighing the perceived negatives.

**56.4** A member of the public spoke in objection to application SB/22/01283/FULEIA and gave the following reasons:

- She thanked Metis for recognising that the site is in Nutbourne not Southbourne but stated that some reports and documents still indicate Southbourne.
- A number of concerns relating to wildlife; there is no acknowledgement in any of the documentation regarding the preservation of Water voles, a protected species. The introduction of new predators to the area, specifically cats.
- Concerns regarding water drainage, including the seeping of weedkiller and pesticides into the Ham Brook if used in domestic gardens.

*The Chair highlighted the importance of members of the public formalising their comments to CDC planning authority via the planning portal.*

## **57. TO RECEIVE A PRESENTATION FROM BLOOR HOMES REGARDING: 22/00157/REM**

**57.1** Bloor presented an update on the amended plans for the reserved matters on the Cooks Lane site.

The update included;

- Bloor have tried to accommodate the Parish Council's comments from 10<sup>th</sup> March 2022 planning meeting Min. 79 refers.
- They have amended the drainage strategy by not elevating the site to the extent previously proposed. There will remain a slight gradient of 600mil across the site and as such, less import and export of matter will occur.
- Biodiversity net gain has been acquired at 12% and evidenced in the report.
- Nitrate neutrality achieved and evidenced in the report.
- The design has been modified to reflect comments made by the Committee regarding Open Spaces.
- Chimneys have been added to the design in 50% of the dwellings.
- The window placement has been modified to allow more windows to overlook the street.
- EV charging has been included into the design and individual dwellings have been designed to accommodate future installations.
- Bloor homes are designed to go above and beyond building regulation standards, including, but not limited to; Extra PV and waste water heat recovery.
- The design has been modified to increase connectivity, including segregated cycle routes across the site and connections to prospective future sites have been included.
- The CEMP had been updated and Bloor are confident it was sufficient but advised the Committee can ask that CDC request additional changes if required.

**57.2** Members received the presentation and made the following comments:

- There is nothing in the plans that indicates how the entrance to the site will appear. The hedgerow at the entrance to the site from Cooks Lane is ancient; detailed on maps as early as 1640 and, as such, requires protection. Can Bloor, re site it and/or the soil?
- There are concerns nationally regarding management companies and the exorbitant charges to residents for maintenance and landscaping. Can Bloor choose their management company with this in mind?

**57.3** Bloor responded:

- They will speak to their ecologist and get advice regarding the matter of the hedgerow.
- They are aware of issues around management companies and their charges and believe that the companies they use will deliver upfront rates that are affordable. They have at other developments,

*including Berewood, declined offering the management services to a company they felt were not affordable and are prepared to do the dame for this site.*

*The Chair wished to thank Bloor for engaging with and listening to the Committee and modifying the plans to reflect concerns and comments raised. The Committee are very happy with the current design.*

*The meeting was re adjourned at 18:33*

#### **58. TO CONSIDER THE AMENDED PLANS IN RELATION TO APPLICATION 22/00157/REM.**

Members **AGREED** to support the application and make the following comments;

**58.1** There is nothing in the plans that indicates how the entrance to the site will appear. The hedgerow at the entrance to the site from Cooks Lane is ancient; detailed on maps as early as 1640 and, as such, requires protection. The Committee requests that the hedgerow be re-sited.

**58.2** The Committee requests that consideration is given to the Management Company appointed to deal with maintenance and landscaping; that an affordable contract is provided to residents.

#### **59. CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS WEEKS 25-27.**

*All decisions made will be uploaded to the CDC planning Portal.*

Week 25

##### **59.1 SB/22/00754/DOM**

Members considered this application and **AGREED** to support the application. There were no objections.

##### **59.2 SB/22/00841/FUL**

Members considered this application and **AGREED** to support the application. There were no objections.

##### **59.3 SB/22/01283/FULEIA**

Members considered the application and posed the following questions and comments to Metis:  
- The Chair read out a report completed by a member of the NPSG which will be uploaded to the CDC portal. The main points discussed were;

-Members have concerns about the levels of contamination in the ground, that the reports provided are inadequate in evidencing that the ground will be suitably decontaminated in order to be safely habitable.

*Metis replied that there will be a full program of remediation in line with the comprehensive investigations that they have undertaken. Metis felt that the decontamination part of this proposal was a major advantage of this application. Metis offered to send "chapter and verse" of their decontamination investigation.*

-Members questioned a statement on a previously circulated leaflet regarding public feedback. Members asked Metis to clarify what feedback they have received from the public.

*Metis advised that there has been good, constructive public expedition and a full statement of community involvement is in their reports*

Members have real concerns regarding drainage of the site. The site incorporates the original watercourse of the Ham Brook and, as such, is prone to flooding. Members are concerned that the on-site sewage system is not suitable, as supported by the Environment Agencies (EA) report, and that there is and will not be capacity at Thornham.

*Metis responded that Southern Water has a legal obligation to provide a connection to the sewage works after 2 years and that the on-site treatment solution is a temporary one. Metis stated that the EA report did not object to the on-site sewage system but advised that Metis must exhaust all discussions and options with Southern Water before an on-site system is installed.*

*Metis advised that the proposed sewage system is a well-recognised efficient system in dealing with wastewater which is a viable system to use until there is capacity at Thornham.*

Members additionally commented;

-The Ordnance Survey in the reports is inaccurate as indicates that it was undertaken in West Hampnett.

-The site does not promote good connectivity with other prospective sites and it does not include any cycle paths.

Members considered this application and unanimously **AGREED** to object to the application.

Members gave the following reasons:

- Drainage, the site is prone to flooding. Thornham do not have sufficient capacity. The on-site sewage system is not sufficient.
- Contamination, the reports provided do not evidence that the site will be sufficiently decontaminated.
- Connectivity-The site has not been 'future proofed' and does not allow for connectivity with prospective sites. There are no proposed cycle routes.

#### 59.4 **SB/22/01314/DOM**

Members considered this application and unanimously **AGREED** to object to the application for the following reasons:

- The dwelling is now overdevelopment of the site.
- The development is out of keeping with the area.
- The design is out of character with neighbouring properties and does not fit in with the street scene.

#### 59.5 **SB/22/01477/FUL**

Members considered this application and unanimously **AGREED** to object to the application for the following reasons:

- The proposal is significant overdevelopment of the site.
- The development is out of keeping with the area.
- The design is out of character with neighbouring properties and does not fit in with the street scene.
- There are not sufficient parking spaces for the number of cars. There are existing parking problems on the neighbouring road, Inlands Rd, which will be exacerbated by a lack of parking spaces at this site.
- Access to the site is not adequate and visibility in and out of the site is not sufficient.
- There has been no response from Network Rail however members felt that the site was too near to an active railway crossing.
- There is no affordable housing proposed at this site.

Week 26

#### 59.6 **SB/22/01492/DOM**

Members considered this application and unanimously **AGREED** to support the application.

#### 59.7 **SB/22/01562/TPA**

Members considered this application and unanimously **AGREED** to support the application.

#### 59.8 **SB/22/01583/PLD**

Members considered this application and unanimously **AGREED** to object to the application for the following reasons:

- The proposal is overdevelopment of the site and is overbearing to neighbouring properties and to the site itself.
- The proposal is not in keeping with neighbouring properties.
- The proposal requires the loss of a tree which members oppose.
- There is no statement of AONB.

- There are no details with regards to the materials or the design and as such the committee must object.

#### Week 27

##### 59.9 **SB/22/01051/DOM**

Members considered this application and unanimously **AGREED** to support the application.

##### 59.10 **SB/22/01373/DOM**

Members considered this application and unanimously **AGREED** to support the application.

##### 59.11 **SB/22/01433/LBC**

Members considered this application and unanimously **AGREED** to support the application.

Members additionally commented that they were pleased to see that the applicant had sought advice from the Chichester Harbour Conservancy. Members would like to see the windows shaded to reduce light pollution.

#### **60. AMENDED PLANNING APPLICATIONS.**

No applications received.

#### **61. CONSIDERATION OF ANY PLANNING APPEALS.**

**61.1** Members **NOTED** that an appeal hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> July 2022 at 10am for: DCLG Ref NO: APP/L3815/W/22/3296444 APPLICATION NO: SB/21/03665/FUL

Members **AGREED** that the Chair of the committee will attend and feedback to members.

**61.2** Members **NOTED** that there have been no updates regarding DCLG Ref No:

APP/L3815/W/21/3289451 APPLICATION NO: 21/02238/FULEIA

**62.** Members **NOTED** that there have been no updates regarding DCLG ref no:

APP/L3815/D/22/3296842 APPLICATION NO: SB/21/02363/DOM

#### **63. TO NOTE THE UPDATE REGARDING SB/22/01188/TPA**

Members **NOTED** the update.

#### **64. TO CONSIDER AND AGREE A PROCEDURE ON HOW TO PROCEED WITH CONTINUED REQUESTS FROM DEVELOPERS AND REPRESENTATIVES WISHING TO MAKE PRESENTATION TO THIS COMMITTEE RELATING TO THEIR PLANNING APPLICATIONS.**

The Chair asked the Deputy Clerk to make a recommendation on how to proceed. The Deputy Clerk made the following recommendation:

**64.1** Members determine that a minimum number of dwellings per application be set to determine if the application qualifies for a representative to make presentation to the committee.

A maximum number of minutes is given and is limited to one representative only.

Representatives of all other non-qualifying applications may speak within the open forum and are given the allotted amount of time in accordance with the Parish Council standing orders.

Any requests for presentations which are received after the issuing of the agenda are declined but the applicant be invited to speak within the Open Forum for the maximum given time.

Following discussion, Members requested that they have additional time to consider this recommendation and **AGREED** to defer this item.

#### **65. TO RECEIVE AND NOTE THE MINUTES FOR THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP INCLUDING TO CONSIDER ANY RECOMMENDATIONS.**

**65.1** Members received the minutes and considered the following recommendations:

**65.2 MEMBERS RECOMMENDED THAT A PROPOSAL IS MADE TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE TO REQUEST AN UPDATED WATER SURVEY UNDER OPERATION WATERSHED. THIS ADDITIONAL REPORT HAS ALREADY BEEN BUDGETED FOR. IT IS AN ESSENTIAL REQUIREMENT TO THE NP3 AS THE PREVIOUS REPORT IS SIGNIFICANTLY OUTDATED HAVING BEEN CARRIED OUT IN 2015.**

One Member expressed concern that there would not be sufficient time to have the survey carried out. A previous report carried out for the production of the NP2 took a considerable amount of time to be completed. Additionally, the Member advised that enquiries first need to be made to determine if the funding is still accessible and if the company who carried out the report are still operating. It was requested that it is first determined if it is possible to have the survey carried out in good time before agreeing to officers requesting it.

Following discussion, it was **AGREED** that the water survey be carried out. One Member abstained from the vote.

**65.3 RECOMMENDATION: THAT THE DRAFT NP3 IS REFERRED TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR APPROVAL FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION.**

One Member expressed concern that the NPSG Implementation Group, assigned to review the NP3, has not yet met and, as such, have not reviewed the draft NP3. It was felt that the NP3 could not be approved for public consultation given that it has not yet been appropriately examined.

Following discussion, it was **AGREED** that the Draft NP3 is approved for Public Consultation. One Member abstained from the vote.

**66. TO NOTE DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING.**

The Chairman closed the meeting at 19.35pm

Signed.....

Dated.....