

PLANNING 4th AUGUST 2022 REPORTS

AGENDA ITEMS 1 & 2

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION, WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Members are reminded that apologies for absence should be submitted to the Clerk ahead of the meeting and the reason for non-attendance

AGENDA ITEM 3

TO APPROVE AND SIGN THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING ON THE 14th JULY 2022

Minutes of the Meeting of Southbourne Parish Council's Planning Committee held 14th 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 23RD 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- Inaccurate transport study relating to Woking and out of date study completed in 2013.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 10th 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 wastewater 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 same 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.

SB/22/00841/FUL

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

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.

CONSIDERATION OF ANY PLANNING APPEALS.

60.1 Members **NOTED** that an appeal hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday 19th 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.

60.2 Members **NOTED** that there have been no updates regarding DCLG Ref No:
APP/L3815/W/21/3289451 APPLICATION NO: 21/02238/FULEIA

61. Members **NOTED** that there have been no updates regarding DCLG ref no:
APP/L3815/D/22/3296842 APPLICATION NO: SB/21/02363/DOM

62. TO NOTE THE UPDATE REGARDING SB/22/01188/TPA Members **NOTED** the update.

63. 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:

63.1 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.

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

64.1 Members received the minutes and considered the following recommendations:

64.2 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.

64.3 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.

65. TO NOTE DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 19.35pm

AGENDA ITEM 4

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members and Officers are invited to make any declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and/or Ordinary Interests that they may have in relation to items on this agenda and are reminded that they should re-declare their Interest before consideration of the item or as soon as the Interest becomes apparent and if not previously included on their Register of Interests to notify the Monitoring Officer within 28 days.

AGENDA ITEM 5

ADJOURNMENT FOR PUBLIC OPEN FORUM

The Chairman will adjourn the meeting for the Open Forum. During these sessions members of the public will be permitted to speak and ask questions.

Members are asked to note that no decision can be made during this time and any item requiring further discussion will need to be deferred to a future agenda.

AGENDA ITEM 6

CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS WEEKS 28 -30 Members are asked to consider the following planning applications presented to the committee via the local planning authority. Members are further asked to **AGREE** to support, reject or remain neutral and **AGREE** to any comments to be submitted to the local planning authority.

Week 28

6.1

SB/22/01775/PA16A - Case Officer: Freya Divey

MBNL

Telecommunications Mast Cooks Lane Southbourne West Sussex

20m Telecommunications lattice tower with 6 antennas, 4 DI secure compound of 100m2 with 2m high palisade fencing.

O.S. Grid Ref. 477227/106139

To view the application use the following link;

<https://publicaccess.chichester.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=RENH3VER10R00>

6.2

SB/22/01732/DOM - Case Officer: Rebecca Perris

Mr and Mrs Sivieri

2 Priors Orchard Southbourne West Sussex PO10 8GE

Proposed single storey rear extension and part change of use of garage to habitable accommodation.

O.S. Grid Ref. 477425/105600

To view the application use the following link;

<https://publicaccess.chichester.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=REJCVAERIFY00>

WEEK 29

No Applications for consideration

WEEK 30

6.3

SB/22/01309/FUL - Case Officer: Emma Kierans

Mr A Ward

6 St Johns Road Southbourne West Sussex PO10 8PB

Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 2 no. semi-detached chalets.

O.S. Grid Ref. 476512/106184

To view the application use the following link;

<https://publicaccess.chichester.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=RC4U9HERGN900>

6.4

SB/22/01828/DOM - Case Officer: Rebecca Perris

Mr & Mrs Gower

1 Fairview Cottages Prinsted Lane Prinsted Emsworth

Demolish existing single storey rear extension and replace with a one and a half storey rear extension.

O.S. Grid Ref. 476642/105410

To view the application use the following link;

<https://publicaccess.chichester.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=RF00SMERIVC00>

AGENDA ITEM 7

AMENDED PLANNING APPLICATIONS

No Applications received at time of circulation

AGENDA ITEM 8

CONSIDERATION OF ANY PLANNING APPEALS AND TO NOTE ANY UPDATES REGARDING APPEALS

8.1 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 Committee Chairman attended the hearing and will give a verbal update at the meeting.

8.2 Gosden Green, 112 Main Rd.

To **NOTE** any update regarding DCLG Ref No: APP/L3815/W/21/3289451 Application No: 21/02238/FULEIA

Current Status – In Progress not yet decided

8.3 Slipper Mill Cottage

To **NOTE** any update regarding DCLG ref no: app/l3815/d/22/3296842 application no: SB/21/02363/DOM

Appeal Allowed – the Planning Inspectorate Report will be circulated separately with this report.

AGENDA ITEM 9

TO CONSIDER AND AGREE A PROCEDURE ON HOW TO PROCEED WITH CONTINUED REQUESTS FROM DEVELOPERS AND REPRESENTATIVES WISHING TO MAKE PRESENTATION TO THE COMMITTEE RELATING TO THEIR PLANNING APPLICATIONS - DEFERRED FROM MEETING 14th JULY 2022 Min. 64 & 64.1 REFERS

Members are once again asked to consider and advise Officers how they wish to manage the continued requests from developers and representative who wish to make presentations to this Committee relating to their planning applications.

Possible Options

1. Allow a 15/20min presentation from developers on dwellings/units over an agreed number (for example, 10 units or over) for applications that are on the Agenda
2. Any applications with less than 10 dwellings/units to be received during open forum that are on the agenda
3. Do not allow any presentations but allow to speak during open forum

Officers are requesting clear direction to enable them to manage these requests quickly and uniformly and would ask Members for a decision on how they wish to proceed.

AGENDA ITEM 10

TO CONSIDER AND AGREE A RESPONSE TO METIS HOMES' REQUEST TO MEET WITH MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE IN AN INFORMAL MEETING REGARDING APPLICATION SB/22/01283 HARRIS BREAKERS YARD

Metis Homes have requested an informal meeting with Members outside of a Planning Committee Meeting to discuss their application and any SPC concerns. It should be Noted that any meeting would be informal and no decision or resolution can be given. Members may also like to consider if the Neighbourhood Steering Group should be included.

Members are asked to advise how they wish to proceed.

AGENDA ITEM 11

TO RECEIVE AND NOTE THE MINUTES FOR THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP MEETING HELD 2nd AUGUST 2022, IF AVAILABLE, INCLUDING CONSIDERATION OF ANY RECOMMENDATIONS

These notes will be circulated ahead of the meeting if available. Alternatively, a brief report will be tabled at the meeting including any recommendations.

AGENDA ITEM 12

TO NOTE DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for 25th August 2022 @ 6.00pm