

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 27<sup>th</sup> October 2022**

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

**In Attendance:** M. Carvajal-Neal (Deputy Clerk) and four members of the Public and 1 representative of Metis Homes

*Cllr Tait left the meeting for agenda item 7.5*

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

The Chairman welcomed everyone and opened the meeting at 6.00pm.

### **116. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **117. TO APPROVE AND SIGN THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 6<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2022**

Members **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes of the Planning Committee held on 6<sup>th</sup> October and they were signed by the Chairman.

### **118. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.**

Cllr Tait declared a pecuniary interest in agenda item 7.5 which relates to a planning application for land owned by Cllr Tait. Cllr Tait advised that she will be leaving the meeting for this item and it was **AGREED** that the Vice Chair, Cllr Bangert, would be appointed as Chair for this item.

### **119. ADJOURNED FOR OPEN FORUM**

*The Chair adjourned the meeting at 18:04 for Open Forum.*

**119.1** One member of the public spoke regarding her objection to Willow Brook 21/01910/OUT specifically relating to the application being within the wildlife corridor with no mention of this within the application. The Chair clarified that within the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan the area was recognised as being within the wildlife corridor. The Chair made reference to agenda item 9: the response from Natural England regarding the planning committee querying why no consideration and no mention was made of the Wildlife corridor in their response to the application.

**119.2** The same member of public spoke regarding her objection to Harris Breakers Yard 22/01283 specifically the reference to the geographical location as Southbourne *not* Nutbourne. Additionally, the transport study being insufficient having been carried out during a period of Lockdown.

**119.3** A member of the public spoke against 22/01941/FUL and raised a number of objections including;

- The application being outside of the settlement boundary.

- The area is a known flood risk area.
- The details of the application evidencing that the buildings are being rebuilt *not* converted.
- The application being incomplete in terms of the details regarding the full use of the site and its additional buildings.
- There being a right of way very near to the proposed works.

**119.4** The Deputy Clerk read out an email from a member of the public who was not able to attend the meeting:

*There is no viable reason to accept this application on the basis that:*

*1. It is at odds with the neighbourhood plan, outside the curtilage of the village (since its separation from Thornham House) and is a single dwelling which does not create any additional social housing or economic benefit for the area. There is no legal evidence to support the view expressed that the link between Thornham House and the Barns is "spent" and that therefore Mr Wrennall can do whatever he wishes with the Barns. This would certainly never have been the intention. No properties should be built in Flood Zone 3, per NPPF, and a lack of formal report in this regard as part of the application is concerning. The proposal represents a material change of use away from agricultural. A floating floor would be a complex fete of engineering involving the need for water and wiring to move with the movement of the floor - there is no mention of this aspect in the application. The prospect of a 2 bedroom house with stables for 4+ horses seems fanciful. No residential garden, just grazing away from the property, and part of that alongside open ditches which allow for drainage of neighbouring agricultural fields. The cost of converting the existing Barn and separating the existing stables must, I assume, be prohibitive and in due course I would expect that Mr Wrennall (who has form in this area) will opine that that it is impractical but having potentially got this permission effectively under false pretences this will open the door to him gaining residential permission to build multiple homes. And if a livery is planned then the increased volume of large traffic, noise, nitrate waste etc is extremely damaging for the local area, the harbour and particularly troublesome for the residents of Thornham House. The engineers report refers to "binding the soil particles to form a concrete like material that will secure the lateral support posts. There will be no structural alterations to the existing Superstructure, **but works to provide decking over the bottom boom of the trusses and staircase flights, in already prepared openings, for access to the upper floor will be done. Lightweight, non load bearing partitions will be installed to form the accommodation layout**". The application refers to a single story house but yet here they are no doubt preparing for a future upper floor. The land shown is not appropriate for the grazing of horses. The narrow strip to one side adjoins open ditches and is heavily planted with trees, and I would argue does not qualify for grazing. The larger field across the road from the property regularly floods during autumn/winter seasons. I dispute their references to compliance with various policies including but not limited to s45, 46 of CLP. This application should be refused*

**119.5** The Chair recommended that comments are uploaded to the LA Planning Portal.

*The meeting was re-adjourned at 18:13*

## **120. ADJOURNED FOR PRESENTATIONS**

The Deputy Clerk advised that there had been no requests to present.

## **121. CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS WEEKS 40-42**

### **121.1 SB/22/01950/DOM**

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

### **121.2 SB/22/02310/LBC**

Following discussion Members highlighted some concerns regarding the size of the proposed property, particularly in relation to the footprint of the plot and to the size in comparison to neighbouring properties. There was some discussion regarding whether or not the proposed extension was in conformity with neighbouring properties.

Members considered this application and **AGREED** to support the application. There were 2 objections. Members **AGREED** to further comment that they would like to see internal shading to roof lights to protect wildlife including bats.

### **121.3 SB/22/02362/ELD**

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

- Members felt that there was not sufficient information in the application to make a determination, specifically with regard to land ownership and dates listed appeared to be conflicting. For this reason Members could not support the application.
- Additionally, Members fully supported all of the objections raised by The Chichester Harbour Conservancy and cannot support the application for the same reasons listed in their objection. Specifically, lack of evidence of residential curtilage and the site being outside a settlement boundary and in an AONB.

#### **121.4 SB/22/01941/FUL**

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

- Members queried why there was no flood assessment report given that the site is in a flood zone 3.
- Members would like to see further information regarding the additional outbuildings, specifically their intended use.
- Members **AGREED** that the Chair would circulate additional comments in relation to NPPF policies and that the full objection would be uploaded to the planning portal.

#### **121.5 SB/22/02400/DOM**

*Cllr Tait left the meeting at 18:32 for this item and the Vice Chair chaired this item.*

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

*Cllr Tait returned to the meeting at 18:35 for agenda item 7.6*

#### **121.6 SB/22/02533/FUL**

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

#### **121.7 SB/22/02567/TPA**

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

### **122. AMENDED PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

#### **122.1 To NOTE the correspondence from Natural England regarding Willow Brook 21/01910/OUT.**

Members **NOTED** the response from Natural England regarding this application

#### **123. Willow Brook 21/01910/OUT- To NOTE the correspondence received from Democratic Services and to AGREE if Members wish to take any action including to respond to the email and to attend the meeting.**

The Chair clarified the situation and expressed her disappointment in the response from Democratic Services.

Members **NOTED** the correspondence and **AGREED** for the Chair to attend and speak at the CDC planning meeting. Members are welcome to attend and observe also.

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

#### **124.1 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 Deputy Clerk advised that there remains no update for this appeal. This was **NOTED**.

#### **124.2 GOSDEN GREEN, 112 MAIN RD.**

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

The Deputy Clerk advised that there remains no update for this appeal. This was **NOTED**.

**125. SB/22/01283 HARRIS BREAKERS YARD – MEMBERS ARE ASKED TO RECEIVE AND NOTE THE CGI IMAGES OF THE DEVELOPMENT PLANS AND TO RECEIVE AND NOTE THE CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING THE PLANNING COMMITTEE’S FORMAL RESPONSE TO THE JULY CONSULTATION, MEMBERS ARE FURTHER ASKED TO AGREE TO A RESPONSE**

A representative from Metis was in attendance at the meeting. Cllr Bangert reminded him that they had advised they would be issuing paper copies of the design plans to the office.

Members considered the correspondence. Following discussion Members unanimously **AGREED** against withdrawing their objection to the application. Members further **AGREED** to the Chair drafting a formal response for Members to agree via email and ratify at the next meeting.

**126. TO AGREE A RESPONSE TO THE STREET NAMING CONSULTATION- 30 FIRST AVENUE**

Members unanimously **AGREED** to support the Proposal of Darley Dale Close. Officers to update CDC.

**127. TO RECEIVE AND NOTE ANY NOTES FOR THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP AND TO CONSIDER ANY RECOMMENDATIONS**

There were no notes available.

**128. THORNHAM MARINA- TO NOTE THE CORRESPONDENCE FROM A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC REGARDING ALLEGED PLANNING BREACHES AND TO NOTE THE RESPONSE FROM THE ENFORCEMENT MANAGER AT CDC**

Members **NOTED** the correspondence and the update from the enforcement manager.

**129. TO RECEIVE AND NOTE THE CORRESPONDENCE FROM LUKEN BECK ON BEHALF OF SEAWARDS RELATING TO A PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT PENNY LANE**

Members **NOTED** the correspondence. The Chair confirmed that she had attended the meeting as had Cllr Green. Cllr Taylor had given apologies. Seawards has since been in contact with the Chair and Deputy Clerk and would like to attend a planning committee meeting to present and potentially a site visit also. Officers to arrange.

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

Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> November, 6pm at St Johns Church Centre.

Signed.....

Dated.....