

PLANNING 17th NOVEMBER 2022
REPORTS

AGENDA ITEMS 1

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION

Chair's statement:

Tonight's meeting will include a presentation from Seawards, representatives of a proposed development in Penny Lane, Southbourne. Public attendance at our meeting of 25th August for consideration of the EIA, highlighted that this proposed development has created significant interest in the community. A number of people in attendance at that meeting had wanted to speak in relation to this development but, as consideration of the planning application was not on the agenda and no members or representatives of Seawards were in attendance, those members of the public were advised to return to a future meeting when the application or development was due for consideration.

To be clear, tonight's meeting will not include consideration by Members of the planning application for this development. However, representatives of Seawards are in attendance and will be presenting under agenda item 6.2 for a maximum time of 15 minutes. This item will include a presentation only, Members of the committee will be afforded the opportunity to direct questions to Seawards but will not be offering any comment or opinion on the application itself.

Members of the public may comment or direct questions towards Members of the Committee during the Open Forum only. According to our standing orders the Open Forum shall not exceed 15 minutes, as such, each person wishing to speak will have a maximum of 3 minutes to do so and we ask that you do not repeat any statements or questions which have already been mentioned. Once the Open Forum has been concluded Members of the Public will no longer have the opportunity to speak.

As always, if you do wish to make comment on an application, we encourage you to do so formally via the local planning authority's website. The Planning Committee cannot make comment on your behalf. Please ask the clerk for further information if you require it.

AGENDA ITEM 2

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 27th OCTOBER 2022

Minutes of the Meeting of Southbourne Parish Council's Planning Committee held 27th 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 6TH OCTOBER 2022

Members **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes of the Planning Committee held on 6th 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 it's 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 feat 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 17th November, 6pm at St Johns Church Centre.

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

ADJOURNMENT FOR PRESENTATIONS

The Chairman will adjourn the meeting for presentations. During these sessions developers and representatives on applications of 5 dwellings/units and over may present to Members with a

maximum time of 15 minutes providing that Officers have received a request in writing prior to the issuing of the agenda. 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. Where the presentation relates to an application due to be considered within the same meeting, Members may agree to change the order of business and formally consider the application as the next agenda item, in which case the Chairman will readjourn Standing Orders.

6.1 Rego Property- Hamcroft, Nutbourne

6.2 Seawards- Land North of Penny Lane. Members are asked to **NOTE** that all members of the public who previously contacted the Deputy Clerk regarding this item have been notified of tonight's meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 7

CONSIDERATION OF A REQUEST FROM SEAWARDS TO ATTEND A SITE VISIT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND NORTH OF PENNY LANE DEVELOPMENT

Members are asked to consider the request and **AGREE** to a response. The following proposed dates have been provided by Seawards:

W/C 21st November or 28th November.

AGENDA ITEM 8

CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS WEEKS 43-45 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, object to or remain neutral and **AGREE** to any comments to be submitted to the local planning authority.

WEEK 43

8.1 SB/22/02367/DOM - Case Officer: Rebecca Perris

Mr Orchard

5 Gordon Road Southbourne West Sussex PO10 8AZ

Single storey annex, flat roof attached to the main dwelling.

O.S. Grid Ref. 475739/105680

To view the application use the following link; <https://publicaccess.chichester.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=RIE8TOERLGZ00>

WEEK 44

8.2 SB/22/02490/DOM - Case Officer: Eleanor Midlane-Ward

Mr & Mrs Vincent

11 First Avenue Southbourne West Sussex PO10 8HN

Single storey rear extension.

O.S. Grid Ref. 476682/105903

To view the application use the following link; <https://publicaccess.chichester.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=RJ6N45ERM3400>

8.3 SB/22/02641/TPA - Case Officer: Henry Whitby

Mrs Dawn Griffiths

139 Main Road Southbourne West Sussex PO10 8EY

Fell 3 no. Ash trees within Area, A1 subject to SB/96/00903/TPO.

O.S. Grid Ref. 476104/105745

To view the application use the following link; <https://publicaccess.chichester.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=RK1I9RERMPS00>

8.4 SB/22/02671/TPA - Case Officer: Henry Whitby

Mrs Frost

The Sanderling Gordon Road Southbourne West Sussex

Crown reduce by 1.5m all round (back to previous pruning points) on 1 no. Horse Chestnut tree (quoted as T1, TPO'd nos. T2) subject to SB/97/00906/TPO.

O.S. Grid Ref. 475676/105670

To view the application use the following link; <https://publicaccess.chichester.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=RK97B0ERMVO00>

WEEK 45

8.5 SB/22/01632/DOM - Case Officer: Freya Divey

Mr And Mrs Everard

The Chestnuts 30 The Drive Southbourne Emsworth

Change use of loft space to habitable accommodation with 1 no. dormer and 1 no rooflight. Single storey rear extension and internal alterations.

O.S. Grid Ref. 476819/105839

To view the application use the following link; <https://publicaccess.chichester.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=RDZ6IUER12Q00>

8.6 SB/22/02313/DOM - Case Officer: Miruna Turland

Mr H Rochez

94 Main Road Southbourne West Sussex PO10 8AX

Loft conversion including hip to gable conversion and rear dormer. Replacement porch and associated alterations. Solar panels to existing flat roof.

O.S. Grid Ref. 475715/105718

To view the application use the following link; <https://publicaccess.chichester.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=RHYOURERL5R00>

8.7 SB/22/02756/PA3R - Case Officer: Rebecca Perris

Bulbeck

Old Chicken Sheds Southbourne Farmshop Main Road Southbourne

Conversion of former chicken sheds to office use.

O.S. Grid Ref. 477052/105553

To view the application use the following link; <https://publicaccess.chichester.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=RKQ135ER0ZU00>

AGENDA ITEM 9

AMENDED PLANNING APPLICATIONS

9.1 Willow Brook 21/01910/OUT- to NOTE any update on this application.

AGENDA ITEM 10

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

10.1 Land East Of Priors Orchard

To **NOTE** any update regarding the hearing for; DCLG Ref No: APP/L3815/W/22/3296444 Application

No: SB/21/03665/FUL

Case Details		Dates	
Case Type	Planning Appeal (W)	Start Date	04 May 2022

Local Planning Authority	Chichester District Council	Questionnaire due	11 May 2022
		Statement(s) due	08 Jun 2022
Case Officer	Pauline Dun	Interested Party Comments due	08 Jun 2022
Procedure	Hearing	Appellant/LPA Final Comments due	N/A
Status	In Progress	Inquiry Evidence due	N/A
Decision and Outcome	Not yet decided	Event Date	19 Jul 2022
Case Link Status	Not Linked	Decision Date	Not yet decided
Linked Cases	0		

10.2 Gosden Green, 112 Main Rd.

To **NOTE** any update regarding DCLG Ref No: APP/L3815/W/21/3289451 Application No: 21/02238/FULEIA and to **AGREE** to a response to Southern Planning Practice's correspondence (document circulated separately labelled agenda item 10.2)

Case Details		Dates	
Case Type	Planning Appeal (W)	Start Date	06 May 2022
Local Planning Authority	Chichester District Council	Questionnaire due	13 May 2022
		Statement(s) due	10 Jun 2022
Case Officer	Neale Oliver	Interested Party Comments due	10 Jun 2022
Procedure	Written representations	Appellant/LPA Final Comments due	24 Jun 2022
Status	In Progress	Inquiry Evidence due	N/A
Decision and Outcome	Not yet decided	Event Date	Not arranged
Case Link Status	Not Linked	Decision Date	Not yet decided
Linked Cases	0		

AGENDA ITEM 11

TO NOTE ALL PERMITTED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS IN THE SOUTHBOURNE PARISH AREA

Members are asked to **NOTE** the current list of permitted and pending applications within the Parish. Members are further asked to **AGREE** if this is to be a permanent agenda item going forward.

22/01751/FUL	Wayside	permitted	8	
20/01898/REM	Breach Ave	permitted	36	part built
22/00157/REM	Cooks Lane	permitted	199	
21/01910/OUT	Willow Brook	pending	67	
22/01477/FUL	Gatehouse	pending	6	flats
22/01903/OUT	4 Acres	pending	40	
22/01284/FULEIA	Harris Scrap yard/Oak Farm	pending	112	
22/00593/FUL	South Lane	pending	8	
21/01543/OUT	Nutkin Barn	pending	3	

22/02061/EIA	Penny Land	EIA screening	85
	Hamcroft	public consultation	120
21/02282/FULEIA	Gosden Green	awaiting appeal	29
21/03365/FUL	Priors Orchard	awaiting appeal	9
	Hallam/Behind Tuppenny		
21/00596/EIA	Barn	pending	110

832

AGENDA ITEM 12

HARRIS SCRAPYARD- TO RATIFY THE RESPONSE TO METIS HOMES' REQUEST TO RECONSIDER COMMENTS REGARDING THE SB/22/01283 HARRIS BREAKERS YARD APPLICATION AND TO CONSIDER A FURTHER RESPONSE. TO NOTE WHETHER METIS HAS NOW SENT THE REQUESTED BROCHURES OF THE SITE. CONSIDERATION OF A REQUEST TO ATTEND A SECOND SITE VISIT AT OAK FARM.

12.1 Members are asked to **RATIFY** the previously circulated response to Metis Homes and to consider a further response:

Parish council response: After further consideration, at our planning meeting on the 27 October, I can confirm that Southbourne Parish Council Planning Committee have unanimously agreed not to remove our objection to the proposed development at Harris Scrapyard. We will, hopefully, continue a dialog with yourselves and we await the invitation to visit Oak Farm where the housing and nursery are to be built.

Response from Patrick Barry, Nova Planning on behalf of Metis: We put a significant amount of time and effort into dealing with the specific concerns cited in the original objection and I went away from our meeting on site with the feeling that, at the very least, we had addressed the drainage and contamination issues in full. I was also reassured by the positive feedback from Councillor Bangert on the proposed design.

Our design team has subsequently been working on a plan to show the alternative east-west cycle connection that I discussed with Councillor Brown and yourself, on the basis that this too could be reported as an item which was addressed.

I accept that the Parish Council has decided to maintain an objection. However, It would be helpful if the Parish Council could clarify for us what remains as the basis for that objection. I would find it frustrating and very deflating if all of our recent work has been completely in vain.

Members are asked if they wish to respond and to **AGREE** to the response.

12.2 Members are asked to **NOTE** that hard copies of the brochures have not yet been received.

12.3 Members are asked to consider and **AGREE** on a request to attend a second site visit at Oak Farm.

AGENDA ITEM 13

TO RECEIVE AND NOTE THE COMMUNICATION FROM CPC PLANNING REGARDING 22/01005/FUL SUSSEX BREWERY

Members are asked to **NOTE** the correspondence between CPC and the Deputy Clerk. As comments for this application are now closed there is no decision needed:

02/11/2022 CPC Planning:

Dear Clerk and Members

Please excuse the direct approach.

I am Punch Pubs & Co's planning agent and I'm writing in connection to the above planning application.

We note your objection to the planning application and would like to invite Members to a site visit so that we can explain the scheme in some more detail and address any concerns you may have.

If you would like to talk, please feel free to use the office number below.

03/11/2022 Deputy Clerk's response:

Thank you for your email. The closing date for comments on this application is 4th November. That would not leave sufficient time for you to meet with Cllrs. Cllrs have made their decision based on the information provided to us via the CDC portal. I would recommend that if there is any additional information that you feel is relevant to the application but is not evident on the portal that you advise CDC of this.

03/11/2022 CPC Planning:

Thank you for coming back to me. I understand that Cllrs will feel they have drawn a line under the matter, but I must point out the factual errors in their objection.

First, the outbuilding was built in the c. 1970s and is of no historical or architectural merit. The submitted Heritage Statement points out that the outbuilding has a plastic damp proof course running through one of the lower brick courses and that the roof is supported by a large steel supporting beam. These features help us to identify the building's age and the age of the outbuilding is important, because to be curtilage listed a building must either a) be constructed prior to 1948 and within the curtilage of a Listed Building, or b) be physically connected to the main Listed Building. The outbuilding at the Sussex is neither and so it is nonsensical to suggest that Listed Building Consent is required.

Second, the Parish may disagree with our Transport Statement, but West Sussex County Council's Highway Officer does not. In their consultation response the Officer states that: "Any overspill parking that may occur as a result of the loss of two parking spaces for the public house can be accommodated on-street. There are comprehensive parking restrictions in place on nearby roads that prohibit parking in places that would be detrimental to highway safety". It is also important to note the highly sustainable location of the Sussex; it is a short walk from Emsworth Local Centre and serves an immediate catchment of residential properties, and whilst some patrons may drive to visit the public house, a considerable amount more will be walking to the pub to enjoy a drink without having to worry about their car.

Third, and perhaps the main reason why it would have been beneficial to visit the site with Cllrs, the outbuilding is not a community facility. It is currently used to store the bins for the public house and general bric-a-brac. Cllrs will note that the proposed landscape plans indicate a new purpose-built bin store is to be located in the car park, with the general bric-a-brac moved to within the Sussex's already ample cellar / store. Insofar as the Arts Trail is concerned, it is highly questionable as to whether the outbuilding in its current state could be used as a venue. Notwithstanding this, the point of the Arts Trail is that it has multiple venues and so the loss of one stop will not be felt by visitors when experiencing the Trail in its completeness. I would also be happy to mention to my clients the potential of using the Sussex itself as a venue for the Arts Trail if this would allay Cllrs concerns.

It's a shame that we couldn't have discussed these issues during a site visit, where I could have responded to questions from Cllrs, but I wanted to raise these concerns with Cllrs and give them the

opportunity to respond before formally rebutting the concerns with CDC. I am still open to meeting with Cllrs if they feel this would be prudent.

I trust the above is useful, if you would like to discuss any of the above please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

03/11/2022 Deputy Clerk's response:

Thank you for your email and I shall pass your comments on to Cllrs as an update, however, as previously advised, your invitation for a site visit has come to us too late in the consultation period. As such, it would not be possible for Cllrs to meet with you before the deadline. Had we received an invitation from you earlier on in the consultation period we would have extended an invitation to you or the applicant to attend our committee meeting and speak within the Open Forum. Members would have had the opportunity to ask any questions regarding the application at that point.

Additionally, it is not our policy to meet with developers regarding applications for less than 5 dwellings. This is due to the volume of applications that our planning committee is asked to consider. However, where possible, Cllrs do attend sites under consideration and, as stated above, we do welcome engagement with developers or applicants during the Open Forum at our committee meetings. I know that in the case of your application Cllrs did visit the site prior to making a decision on the application.

Consideration of planning applications must be determined at a committee meeting in line with legal guidelines and our own standing orders. As such, councillors must make a decision based on the information that has been provided to us at the time of the meeting for which the application is considered. Cllrs cannot make a determination on any application outside of a committee meeting. We hold regular planning committee meetings in order to comply with timescales determined by the local planning authority. Once provided with the information we have a limited time (usually around 3 weeks) in which we must consider an application, for this reason Cllrs can only consider an application at the next scheduled committee meeting which, in this case, was on 27th October.

For future reference you may wish to check our website to see when an application is due to be considered and request that you speak within the open forum.

AGENDA ITEM 14

TO NOTE THE CORRESPONDENCE FROM CDC TREE OFFICER RE 20/00203/TPO WHICH IS LOCATED AT THE SITE OF THE LAND NORTH OF PENNY LANE DEVELOPMENT

Members are asked to **NOTE** the correspondence in relation to Councillor Tait raising a matter that a member of the public had stated that the tree subject to a TPO was being inspected by a company alleging that it was in ill health.

Members are further asked to make a recommendation to Greenspace and Community Services Committee regarding clarification of the Tree Warden role, as per Terms of Reference Tree matters are the responsibility of that Committee.

08/11/2022: Dear Miss Tait

Ref: SB/22/00315/TE, SB/21/01708/PREM and SB/20/00203/TPO

The Oak tree (T1) in question subject to SB/20/00203/TPO is located adjacent to a gate leading into a field between Fair View Penny Lane and 44 Penny Lane at the above-mentioned location and the owner/developer's Agent (Landscape Architect) brought the Oak tree to my attention late last month.

I advised if they had concerns about the tree that they should have it properly assessed by a qualified expert/Arborist and then there are potentially three options;

Submit appropriate expert (arboricultural) evidence concerning the health/status of the Oak tree and if an imminent threat the matter could be reviewed under 5 day notice exception .

Or with appropriate expert evidence submit a tree application to propose necessary tree works (felling/pruning).

Or the tree is sustainable as it is and no further action required.

At present I have heard nothing since my exchange of emails with the Agent and I await their expert's assessment of the tree prior to any action being considered/carried out on the tree.

AGENDA ITEM 15

TO RECEIVE AND NOTE THE NOTES OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP MEETING, IF AVAILABLE, INCLUDING CONSIDERATION OF ANY RECOMMENDATIONS

There are no notes available.

AGENDA ITEM 16

CONSIDERATION OF A DRAFT LETTER TO DEVELOPERS TO ACCOMPANY OUR POLICY ON ENGAGING IN EARLY DISCUSSIONS

Officers are continuing to receive requests and enquiries to engage with developers. Despite forwarding our policy, officers continue to receive questions about this process. Additionally, some developers are contacting officers after Member's comments have been added to the portal and officers are having to deal with enquiries regarding this. Members are asked to consider the draft letter template and **AGREE** for it to be issued to any developer making enquiries in an attempt to reduce the volume of contacts from developers:

RE: Southbourne Parish Council's Policy on Engaging in Early Discussions on Development Projects

To Whom it may concern,

Southbourne Parish Council Planning Committee recognises that, such as the importance of some sites, there may be development projects which would benefit from further engagement between the Planning Committee and developers/representatives. There are several ways that developers can engage with the Planning Committee;

Projects of any size:

Via the Open Forum at Committee meetings whereby attendees may speak or ask questions for a maximum of three minutes.

Projects consisting of 5 or more dwellings:

- 1. By presentation to the Committee whereby presenters may speak for a maximum of 15 minutes. By written request only to the Clerk at least 5 working days ahead of the Committee meeting.*
- 2. In person or online, normally for a maximum of 1 hour. By written request and by prior agreement of the Planning Committee only. Requests must be received in writing at least 5 working days ahead of the Committee meeting to which the requested is to be considered. If agreed, the meeting will then be scheduled by the Clerk.*

It is normal practice that the Planning Committee considers planning applications only when the Local Planning Authority (LPA) invites us to do so. Consideration on planning applications takes place during our Planning Committee meetings only which are normally held every 3 weeks. As such, we would encourage developers or representatives to attend the meeting in which their application is scheduled to be considered, Members will not make comment on an application which is not

scheduled for comment. Please check our website to see if/when your application is due to be considered: [Southbourne-pc.gov.uk](https://southbourne-pc.gov.uk) Link: [Planning Committee Meetings](#)

The consultation period timescales set by the LPA may determine whether or not the Planning Committee can accommodate additional engagement with developers, therefore developers are encouraged to determine in good time the closing date for comments to the LPA on their applications.

For further information on our Policy on engaging with Developers please see overleaf.

Should you wish to make representation or require any further information regarding this matter please contact the Deputy Clerk:

AGENDA ITEM 17

TO NOTE THE CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING THE A27 ROAD CLOSURE

No decision is required therefore this information is for noting only.

Dear stakeholder

A27 Havant to Chichester resurfacing – Monday 7 November 2022 to Monday 9 January 2023

We'll soon be carrying out resurfacing and improvements to the A27 between Havant and Chichester. We'll also be taking the opportunity to resurface and improve the slip roads at Warblington. This will maintain safety and improve the journey for road users, while reducing the need for unplanned closures.

We'll carry out this work on weeknights, when there's less traffic, but there will be closures in place to keep everyone safe and allow us to carry out as much work as possible between Monday 7 November 2022 and Monday 9 January 2023.

Closure information

The A27 between Warblington (junction with the A259 and Emsworth Road) and the Fishbourne Roundabout will be closed overnight (8pm to 6am) Monday to Friday only, between Monday 7 November and Tuesday 20 December 2022, then again between Tuesday 3 and Monday 9 January 2023.

During the closures, a signed diversion will be in place in both directions via the A259.

We're contacting properties with access directly off the A27 within the closure, to advise them of the support we're providing so that they can continue to access their home or business safely during the closures.

We'll be working through the night, and there may be some additional noise, please accept our apologies in advance for any inconvenience or delays this work may cause.

If our work is taking longer than planned or we find anything unexpected, we may need to close the road overnight at weekends too. Keep an eye on our [Twitter](#) (@HighwaysSE), and we'll also post the latest information on our webpage: nationalhighways.co.uk/se-maintenance – just look for A27 Havant to Chichester resurfacing.

Please note, times and dates of this work are subject to change if there's adverse weather or any other unforeseen circumstances.

Where you can find out more

To find out more, visit our south east maintenance webpage: nationalhighways.co.uk/se-maintenance – just look for A27 Havant to Chichester resurfacing.

If you have any questions, you can also call our contact centre on 0300 123 5000 (open 24/7), who will pass your queries to the team, or email: info@nationalhighways.co.uk.

AGENDA ITEM 18

CONSIDERATION OF THE STRATEGIC FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT (SFRA) FROM CDC

Members are asked to consider the information provided below and **AGREE** if they wish to comment.

Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing from the Planning Policy Team at Chichester District Council with regard to the draft Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), which the Council has commissioned from expert consultants JBA. This is an integral piece of the evidence base which supports the production of the new Local Plan. In light of the latest Environment Agency guidance the planning policy team is carrying out a technical consultation on the draft version of the SFRA documentation, which is available via the link below: (not available for public viewing)

This is a focused consultation (including all parish councils within the CDC Local Plan area along with local interest groups and technical consultees such as the EA), the purpose of which is to allow stakeholders to review the draft documentation and provide comments on the report and/or associated maps in order to help inform the final version of the SFRA. Please note, any comments should focus on the technical and/or factual aspects of the documentation itself.

Clearly, the SFRA will be a significant consideration which will inform the preparation of the new Local Plan, and will underpin decisions regarding the spatial strategy and allocations. However, those decisions will need to be taken on the basis of a range of factors and informed by other relevant processes/evidence such as the sustainability appraisal. The outcome of those decisions will be consulted upon as part of the Regulation 19 consultation (which is a full public consultation on the submission version of the Local Plan), and will be supported by the full range of relevant evidence. Consequently, at this stage we are only seeking comments regarding the technical and factual issues contained within the SFRA documentation, rather than the merits of any particular decisions which would flow from the flood risk issues assessed.

Another important thing to note is that a key issue which has arisen recently concerns the ramifications of recent changes to the Government's Planning Practice Guidance with respect to flood risk. These changes strengthen the importance of flooding related issues in relation to planning applications and the local plan process. These changes have considerable implications for the SFRA, which is very difficult to incorporate at this late stage in the process, and a version which fully responds to all the new requirements will take many more months. However, the Council is very aware of the concerns of local residents in relation to the delays with the SFRA, and hence is intending to complete the current SFRA as an interim version, which will help inform consideration of relevant applications and the progression of the Local Plan, and in the meantime prepare a version which accords with the latest PPG guidance. This is seen as being the best way of responding to the concerns of local residents while also allowing the local plan process to continue as quickly as possible. Clearly if the final version of the SFRA necessitates any changes to the Local Plan the Council will respond to that at the appropriate time.

Also, please note that this consultation relates to the Level 1 version of the SFRA. A level 2 version is also being prepared which contains some more detailed analysis and will be consulted upon as part of the Regulation 19 consultation on the Local Plan.

Finally, please note that as has been referred to above, this is not a full-scale public consultation at this stage, so please do not circulate the documents more widely. The full public consultation will happen as part of the Regulation 19 consultation on the Local Plan generally, and the full suite of documents will be made available at that point.

Please can I receive any comments you do have on the documents by 14 November. If you have any queries or would like to discuss in more detail then please feel free to contact me.

AGENDA ITEM 19

TO NOTE THE UPDATE FROM CDC REGARDING THE PROPOSED NUTKIN BARN DEVELOPMENT

Members are asked to **NOTE** the update below:

07/10/2022: Thank you for your email regarding this application. I can advise that the application is still under consideration and as yet the recommendation has not been finalised. In light of recent appeal decisions where the Council's Housing Land Supply has been found to be short of 5 years, I will be raising this case with my team leader next week to discuss the likely recommendation and then bringing the item to committee.

31/10/2022: Thank you for your email. I am hoping to bring the application to the December planning committee, at this stage I am still to draft the report and finalise the recommendation, but will update you once drafted.

AGENDA ITEM 20

TO NOTE DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for 8th December 2022 @ 6.00pm