

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 25<sup>th</sup> August 2022**

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

**In Attendance:** M. Carvajal-Neal (Deputy Clerk) S. Hodgson (Clerk) 46 members of the public, 1 representative from Four Acres and 1 representative from Savills (representing PNH Properties).

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

The Chairman welcomed everyone and opened the meeting at 6.00pm. The Chairman read out the following statement:

*It has come to our attention that some residents have received a leaflet which relates to a Request for an EIA Screening Opinion of land North Of Penny Lane, Southbourne, in relation to a proposed residential development of 85 units.*

*The Parish Council has received a number of telephone calls, emails and messages from members of the public who were of the impression that the leaflet had come from the Parish Council and was an invitation to attend and discuss this matter tonight. Please be advised that the Parish Council have not issued this leaflet and were not aware of it's content. We have not received a request from any consultants or developers in relation to this application to either attend or to present at tonight's meeting.*

*As with all planning applications, the Planning Authority, CDC, has offered Members of the Planning Committee the opportunity to consider this application and to vote to either Support, Object or remain Neutral. The outcome of the vote and any relevant comments made by Members will be issued to the Planning Authority.*

*Members of the public are welcome to speak in relation to any planning application within the Open Forum and are given a maximum time of 3 minutes to do so. The Committee may take into consideration any comments made when considering the application. However, members of the public are urged to submit their own comments in writing to CDC directly via the online portal or via email. The Parish Council is unable to submit comments on behalf of the public.*

*Given the number of requests to speak tonight within the Open Forum it may not be possible to hear from all. Can we kindly ask that if you do choose to speak tonight that your comments are concise and not a repeat of any points which have already been raised and that you do not exceed your given time.*

*If you wish to direct your comments directly to the planning authority and require the contact details, please request these from the Deputy Clerk.*

*Thank you*

## **80. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence had been received from Cllr Riddoch due to illness and Cllr Bulbeck due to annual leave.

## **81. TO APPROVE AND SIGN THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 4<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2022**

Members **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes of the Planning Committee held on 4<sup>th</sup> August and they were signed by the Chairman.

## **82. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **83. ADJOURNED FOR OPEN FORUM**

*The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 18:08 for Open Forum.*

*The Chairman asked if anyone present wished to speak regarding the Penny Lane development. No one present wished to speak. The Chairman asked if anyone present was in support of the Penny Lane development. No one present was in support of the development.*

83.1 One member of the public spoke regarding application 22/00157/REM, specifically the lack of information provided regarding vehicle access. They also spoke regarding application 22/02061/EIA with concerns regarding the 4.8m width entrance.

83.2 One member of the public spoke on behalf of another resident who has had a property built within 12 inches of her boundary line (ref 21/02301/FUL) without any prior notice from the Planning Authority. The member of the public wished to raise his concerns around the process of the Planning Authority not sufficiently notifying local residents of nearby developments.

83.3 One member of the public advised that residents can register with the planning portal and opt to receive alerts for any applications received within a given area.

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

*The Chairman reconvened the meeting at 18.18 pm*

Members Resolved to change the order of business and take Agenda Item 7.6 at this point.

## **84. CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

### **84.1 SB/22/02061/EIA**

Members considered this application and **AGREED** to object to the application. Members gave the following reasons:

- The volume of traffic caused by the site will be significant and not viable in an area already experiencing parking and traffic issues.
- The site entrance will not be wide enough and there should be no attempt to remove the TPO Oak at the site gate.
- The increased recreational impact on the coast caused by the proposed development will not be sustainable.
- There is potential that this site holds significant historical and archaeological value, and this must be determined prior to any work being carried out. A desktop study is not sufficient, this site must be visited and assessed fully.
- The proposed development is contrary to NPPF 174;
  - a) Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils.

b) Recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services, including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland.

-Morcumbs Caravan site is incorrectly described as holiday lets. This caravan park is a permanent residential site.

-A significant amount of the supporting documents are copies from an earlier application and, as such, are out of date. Members question the validity of the studies having undertaken their own studies as part of the Neighbourhood Plan which do not support the findings.

-The transport studies were carried out during the pandemic and, as such, are inaccurate.

*The Clerk and 40 members of the public left the meeting at 18:25*

## **85. PRESENTATIONS**

*The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 18:26 for presentations*

### **85.1 PNH PROPERTIES GROUP REGARDING SB/22/01903/OUT FOUR ACRE NURSERY, COOKS LANE SOUTHBOURNE.**

Members received a presentation from Eleanor King, Savills, on behalf of PNH Properties.

The presentation was an update on details of the application, specifically why the reasons for refusal are now no longer applicable, including:

-Achieved 30% affordable homes

-Incorporation of a Green Buffer zone

-Pedestrian access routes to the north

-The hedgerow does not meet the required ecological criteria to be classified as a protected hedgerow.

-New access from Cooks Lane

-Further details to come after the Outlining stage

*The Chairman readjourned the meeting at 18:36*

Members Resolved to change the order of business and take Agenda Item 7.5 at this point.

## **86. CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

### **86.1 SB/22/01903/OUT**

Members considered this application and **AGREED** to object to the application. Members gave the following reasons:

-Members felt that there was no evidence to support the claims made regarding the hedgerow not meeting protected status. The Parish Council's own surveys indicate the contrary.

-The increased recreational impact on the coast caused by the proposed development will not be sustainable.

-There is potential that this site holds significant historical and archaeological value, and this must be determined prior to any work being carried out.

-The reports indicate that a quarry has been located at the western part of the site. No further information has been provided regarding this and members consider this insufficient.

-The Planning Committee cannot support piecemeal developments that do not contribute to local infrastructure.

-Members fully support the objections made by both Natural England and Chichester Harbour Conservancy.

In addition, Members **AGREED** to make the following requests:

1. To view the evidence relating to the status of the hedgerow.
2. If the hedgerow, or any part of it, is to be removed that consideration is given to re-siting of both the existing hedgerow and the soil base.
3. Consideration is given to a dual entrance with the neighbouring site, this would mitigate the impact on the hedgerow and that of the mast.
4. That further information is provided regarding the quarry.

*Eleanor King left the meeting at 18:45*

## **87. PRESENTATIONS**

*The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 18:46 for presentations*

### **87.1 JUNNELL HOMES REGARDING SB/22/01751/FUL: LAND NORTH WEST OF 139 MAIN ROAD SOUTHBOURNE.**

Members received a presentation from Tim Ash on behalf of Junnell Homes.

The presentation was an update on details of the application, including:

- Some redrawing to front elevations
- Enhanced character of the designs and aesthetic improvements
- 5 additional single garages added to the design and 2 parking spaces

Members made the following comments:

- The plans on the application do not show the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor.
- Velux windows and roof lights should be internally shaded.
- The area is prone to flooding, a similar local development where reports showed flooding occurs on average once in 100 years flooded within 5 years of completion.
- The plans must include access to maintain ditches.
- Members were pleased to see that the existing hedgerows had been retained and the site still had a 'countryside feel' to it.

Tim Ash responded:

- He showed members the plans for the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and could not account for why they were not on the portal as he states they have been provided to the Planning Authority.
- Windows will be fitted with electronic blinds.
- The proposed driveway material is porous specifically to mitigate water surface run off and reduce flooding.
- He indicated on the plans where access has been incorporated in order to maintain the ditches.

*The Chairman re adjourned the meeting at 18:49*

Members Resolved to change the order of business and take Agenda Item 7.4 at this point.

## **88. CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

### **88.1 SB/22/01751/FUL**

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

Members **AGREED** to comment that they would like to see shading to roof lights and windows to mitigate any light pollution specifically to wildlife, including bats.

## **89. CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS WEEKS 31-33**

### **WEEK 31**

#### **89.1 SB/22/01432/DOM**

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

#### **89.2 SB/22/01741/DOM**

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

#### **89.3 SB/22/01743/DOM**

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

Members **AGREED** to comment that they would like to see shading to roof lights and windows to mitigate any light pollution specifically to wildlife, including bats.

**89.4SB/22/01751/FUL**

Min. 88.1 refers

**WEEK 32**

**89.5SB/22/01903/OUT**

Min. 85.1 refers

**WEEK 33**

**89.6SB/22/02061/EIA**

Min. 84.1 refers

**90. AMENDED PLANNING APPLICATIONS  
NO APPLICATIONS RECEIVED.**

**91. CONSIDERATION OF ANY PLANNING APPEALS AND TO NOTE ANY UPDATES  
REGARDING CURRENT APPEALS**

**91.1 LAND EAST OF PRIORS ORCHARD**

**TO NOTE UPDATE FROM THE CHAIR REGARDING THE HEARING FOR; DCLG REF  
NO: APP/L3815/W/22/3296444 APPLICATION NO: SB/21/03665/FUL**

The Chairman updated members that Seawards has presented to the examiner a Swept Path diagram and that the examiner had agreed to receive comments regarding this. Members **AGREED** this diagram can be circulated via email and any comments can be made in writing to the Chairman.

**91.2 GOSDEN GREEN, 112 MAIN RD.**

**TO NOTE ANY UPDATE REGARDING DCLG REF NO: APP/L3815/W/21/3289451  
APPLICATION NO: 21/02238/FULEIA**

There were no updates.

**92. TO NOTE ANY UPDATE REGARDING METIS HOMES' REQUEST TO MEET WITH  
MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE IN AN INFORMAL MEETING  
REGARDING APPLICATION SB/22/01283 HARRIS BREAKERS YARD**

The Deputy Clerk reminded members to respond to the invitation.

**93. TO RECEIVE AND NOTE THE MINUTES FOR THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN  
STEERING GROUP**

No notes available.

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

15<sup>th</sup> September 2022 18:00 at St John's Church Centre.

Signed.....

Dated.....