

Clerk to the Council
Sheila Hodgson
clerk@southbourne-pc.gov.uk

www.southbourne-pc.gov.uk

SOUTHBOURNE PARISH COUNCIL
Committee Meeting held 8th FEBRUARY 2022

Present: Cllrs: L. Hicks (Chairman), T. Bangert, J. Brown, D. James, J. Jennings, N. Redman, A. Tait, P. Thorne, and R. Taylor (Cllr. P. Green from Minute 214)

In Attendance: S. Hodgson (Clerk and RFO)
M. Carvajal – Neal (Deputy Clerk)
11 Members of Public in the Public Gallery
Cllr. Kerry-Bedell - West Sussex County Councillor

209. CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The Chairman welcomed everyone and opened the meeting at 7.01pm

The Chairman read out the following statement:

“As you may or may not be aware, there has been a lot of activity recently on the Southbourne Community Facebook Page where Southbourne Parish Councillors have referred to or made comments on posts. Whilst I am sure these comments have been made as individuals it has been highlighted on the site that they are Councillors which can understandably lead to their opinions being thought of as those of the Council.

The Southbourne Community Facebook page administrator has asked Councillors not to comment on the page and I would respectfully urge ALL Southbourne Parish Councillors to now adhere to this request and refrain from further engagement. The Parish Council has its own Facebook page and should any member of the public wish to ask a question or make a comment relating to Council business this would be the appropriate site to do so. Continued engagement as individuals could be misconstrued as being endorsed by the Parish Council.

Whilst we are all keen to engage with members of the public, we have a duty to ensure that we do so as a corporate body and follow the code of conduct.

May I also remind Members to be cautious when engaging on **any** social media site
Thank you for your anticipated cooperation.”

The Chairman asked for the Parish Council's Facebook address to be added to the Minutes:

<https://www.facebook.com/Southbourne-Parish-Council-West-Sussex-106519154263355/>

210. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Cllr. Bulbeck due to Covid.

211. TO APPROVE AND SIGN THE MINUTES OF THE SOUTHBOURNE PARISH COUNCIL COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 11th JANUARY 2022

Members **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes of the Southbourne Parish Council Meeting held on the 11th January 2022 and they were duly signed by the Chairman.

212. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

There were no Declarations of Interest.

213. ADJOURNMENT FOR OPEN FORUM

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 7.08pm

Members of the public were invited to read out their statements and put their questions to the Council:

Marc Davis and Racheal Perri attended as representatives of Friends of Hambrook. Part of the group's undertaking is to document wildlife, achieve formal recognition of the area within the Local Plan, work with and educate local landowners, encourage bio-diversity, increase bat and bird boxes and enhance the space. They would welcome and invite people to join the group and asked SPC for their support.

Cllr. Bangert congratulated them on the work they were doing and suggested they link up with the Parish Council's Southbourne Environment Group.

Sarah O'Brien-Twohig spoke in relation to Agenda Item 14, regarding a pre-application for planning from Cornerstone a Mobile Infrastructure Service Company in relation to a Mobile Phone Base station. She commented that she was not against masts but was concerned that there was no mention of anything technical within the reports and referred to health studies data. She asked Members to consider this data when making their decision.

Cerri Stunt asked Members about housing allocation numbers. Can SPC confirm receipt of the Southbourne allocation and was there a challenge to the numbers. Given this why was the Neighbourhood Plan not halted.

David King asked will SPC reconsider and now withdraw the Neighbourhood Plan review? The joint position has changed, and further modifications will be required to alleviate traffic. He was aware that in 2018 some parishes "pushed back" and saw a reduction in their allocation numbers.

Ann Moss spoke in reference to Agenda Item 18 the Prinsted Area. She asked Councillors to stop shooting the messenger regarding the misinformation that needs clarifying. It is not her fault that certain documents came to light, and she is only trying to help. She believes SPC are continuing to withhold information. She welcomed the idea of a Task & Finish Group.

Ruth Heelan thanked the Chairman for drawing attention to the Facebook Page in her Opening Statement. As Administrator of the Southbourne Community Facebook page, she does not allow any adverse comments and will remove them immediately.

Mrs Heelan also raised a suggestion put forward by a fellow resident who was not present for the SPC to consider erecting a flagpole outside the chemist which could be part of the Jubilee celebrations and a flag raised for other relevant occasions during the year.

Philip Green spoke about his application to become a Co-opted Councillor for Southbourne Parish Council. (Agenda Item 6)

Mr Green has been a resident for many years but felt Southbourne had lost its identity and pride. If he were to be co-opted, he would listen to and take on board public comments and assist where he could.

The Clerk read out an email received from John Franck as follows:

"As a resident of Southbourne, I wonder what the Parish Council's view is of the eye sore patch of weeds and brambles that greet you to Southbourne at the north exit of Southbourne Station. Most house owners in this area make an effort to keep their front gardens tidy and souple with the Parishes' efforts to plant trees in the area the overgrown patch of ground by the station is so out of place."

A response will be sent to Mr Franck

The Chairman thanked members of the public for attending and welcomed their comments, questions and suggestions.

The meeting was re-convened at 7.39pm

214. TO CONSIDER THE APPLICANT FOR THE ROLE OF CO-OPTED MEMBER TO SOUTHBOURNE PARISH COUNCIL AND FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF RECRUITMENT

Members considered the application for the role of Co-opted Member and unanimously **AGREED** to appoint Mr. Philip Green as co-opted Member.

The Chairman invited Mr. Green to sign his Declaration of Acceptance and join his fellow Councillors for the remainder of the meeting.

215. CLERK'S UPDATE

Members received updates from the Clerk relating to Operation Watershed – Parham Place, Flanders Close Allotments and Tree Protection Orders.

The updates were for information only and did not require any decision.

216. TO RECEIVE AND NOTE THE FOLLOWING REPORTS IF AVAILABLE: WSCC COUNCILLOR'S BOURNE PARISHES REPORT, CDC COUNCILLOR'S REPORT, SOUTHBOURNE ENVIRONMENT GROUP REPORT, PCSO'S REPORT, OUTLIERS REPORT, WSALC CHAIRMANS FORUM REPORT, BOURNES FORUM REPORT, CLLR DROP-IN SESSION REPORT

216.1 WSCC Councillors Bourne Parish Report

The WSCC Bourne Councillor's report had only been received by the Clerk an hour prior to the meeting so there had not been time to circulate in advance. Therefore, the Chairman invited Cllr. Kerry-Bedell to give a brief verbal update. The report will now be circulated and will be uploaded to the website.

216.2 CDC Councillors Report

The CDC report was **NOTED** as previously circulated.

Cllr. Bangert added to point 2, Bramley Gardens, and reported that the site had now been cleared and there had been a lot of support from residents.

Cllr. Brown added to point 7, Bird Aware and reported he had joined a working party at Meadow View to clear a ditch.

Cllr. Brown apologised for not having submitted to report in advance and referenced CDC's Climate Emergency Plan. He felt CDC were doing a good job in reducing its carbon footprint

on its own estates but area wide it was lacking. He also reported that CDC were not involved with the Electric Charge Point Project.

216.3 PCSO's Report

The PCSO's Report was **NOTED**.

The Chair and Vice-Chair are hoping to have a meeting with PCSO Baylee at the end of his paternity leave.

216.4 Outliers Report

The Outlier's Report was **NOTED**.

Cllr. Taylor reported that the fencing at the Camping & Caravan site had now been replaced and the site re-opened.

The Chairman thanked Cllr. Taylor for his work relating to Outliers. Members further **NOTED** that the allocation of areas for reporting will be discussed at the March meeting.

216.5 WSALC Chairman's Forum Report

The Chairman's report was **NOTED**.

Cllr. Tait referred to CDALC meeting scheduled for the 10th February 2022. She was unaware of the meeting and had not received any information or an invite to attend. Cllr. Tait is the SPC representative for CDALC. The Clerk will make the necessary arrangements for her to be included.

216.6 Bournes Forum Report

The Bournes Parishes Report was **NOTED**

216.7 Cllr. Drop-In Session Report

The Cllr. Drop-in Session Report was **NOTED**

The Chairman thanked Councillors for their help and attendance and hoped that more would be involved at the next one.

217. TO RECEIVE AND NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE RECREATION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON THE 19th JANUARY 2022 INCLUDING CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED TERMS OF REFERENCE AND TO CONSIDER A QUOTATION FOR THE INSTALLATION OF 2 BENCHES ON SEPARATE CONCRETE BASES AT A COST OF £550.00 + VAT

The Minutes of the Recreation Committee Meeting held 19th January 2022 were **NOTED**.

The Chairman thanked Cllr. Redman for his work as Chairman and was sorry that he had stepped down but was glad he was continuing to sit on the Committee.

Members considered the Terms of Reference for the Recreation Committee and **AGREED** to adopt them as proposed.

Members considered the quotation for the installation of benches. The Chairman asked if other quotes has been obtained by the Committee. This was confirmed.

Members **AGREED** to accept the quotation and for the costs to be funded from the Recreation Committee Improvement Budget.

218. TO RECEIVE AND NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON THE 27th JANUARY 2022

Members **NOTED** the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meetings held on the 27th January 2022

219. TO RECEIVE AND NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE JBC MEETING HELD ON THE 10th JANUARY 2022 AS DEFERED FROM THE SPC MEETING 11th JANUARY 2022 MIN. 203 REFERS

Members **NOTED** the minutes of the JBC meeting held on the 10th January 2022.

Members further **NOTED** the resignation of Cllr. Bulbeck from the JBC Committee.

220. TO RECEIVE AND NOTE THE MINUTES FROM THE STAFFING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 31st JANUARY 2022

Members **NOTED** the Minutes of the Staffing Committee Meeting held on the 31st January 2022

221. CONSIDERATION OF AN APPLICATION FOR GRANT AID FOR A DONATION TOWARDS A TARGET AMOUNT OF £4,000 TO ENABLE AN EXPLORER SCOUT OF THE 1ST SOUTHBOURNE SEA SCOUTS TO REPRESENT THE UK SCOUTING MOVEMENT AT THE NEXT WORLD SCOUT JAMBOREE IN KOREA IN 2023

Cllr. Jennings was very supportive of the scouting movement and felt the Council should be generous in their support. Members **NOTED** the remaining budget of £1,095.00 and following discussion **AGREED** to contribute £1,000 to help kickstart the fund raising. The recipient will also be invited to raise funds and her profile at the Big Lunch. The Clerk will arrange for all the necessary paperwork to be completed. Members also asked for the Sea Scout to be invited to attend a SPC Meeting after the event to hear all about it.

222. CONSIDERATION OF A PRE-APPLICATION FOR PLANNING FROM CORNERSTONE A MOBILE INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICE COMPANY IN RELATION TO A MOBILE PHONE BASE STATION AS PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED

Members **NOTED** the reports as previously circulated.

The planned location is within an area designated for housing development and Members felt there was insufficient information to judge whether the proposal was acceptable. If the mast has to remain on site, it should be repositioned further north away from Cooks Lane to be less visible. Members further felt that there was not enough technical information especially with the related data on health that had been brought to their attention.

Following discussion Members **AGREED** for the comments as minuted above be relayed to Cornerstone.

223. CONSIDERATION OF AN APPLICATION FROM SOUTHBOURNE SCHOOL FOR A CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS THEIR TARGET OF £117,844.41 (£36,344.41 FOR SOUTHBOURNE INFANTS AND £81,500 FOR SOUTHBOURNE JUNIORS) TO BE FUNDED FROM THE CIL BUDGET

The Business Plans for Southbourne Infants and Southbourne Juniors were **NOTED** as previously circulated.

During the discussion some of the comments were as follows:

- An amazing project and desperately needed but why aren't WSCC paying for this?
- Passionately supportive of this and the Special Educational Needs facilities would really benefit the young people
- Young people are our future and cannot think of a more worthy cause
- Have we explored Section 106/CIL money?
- SPC have a CIL specific project template. This should be completed so Members can receive more detailed information and identify the benefits and intended outcomes

- Have other funding opportunities been explored by the school
- This is the sort of project CIL should support but it is a substantial proportion of the fund
- Worthy of consideration but more information required
- SPC do not have to meet all the cost – could part fund

Following discussion Members **AGREED** the following:

- For the School to complete the CIL project application template
- For the Bursar to be invited to give a presentation to Council to include a Q&A session
- For Members to give some thought to possible levels of funding

224. Update on Queens Jubilee Big Lunch Event on Sunday 5th June 2022 including: Content and format for the event and consideration of any costs - SPC 11th January 2022 - Min 204 refers, recommendation from the Recreation Committee - 19th January 2022 - Min. 11 refers, and consideration of a CDC Grant for Parishes up to £250.00

224.1 Members were asked to consider some guidance notes prepared by Cllr. James and as previously circulated.

Following discussion and consideration Members **AGREED** the following:

- Members **AGREED** that the event would be held between 11.00am and 3.00 pm
- Members **AGREED** there would be no charge for entry
- Members **AGREED** to investigate costs for entertainment
- Members **AGREED** to an ice cream van, a coffee wagon and The Deck to provide refreshments for members of the public to purchase should they wish
- Members did not support having items for sale
- Members **AGREED** that the remaining £366.00 from this financial year Community Events budget be made available for the event and **NOTED** that the proposed Community Events budget for 2022/23 could also utilised for this event
- Members **AGREED** to delegate authority to Cllr. James in association with the Clerk to continue with the arrangements and report back to SPC monthly and further **AGREED** that Cllrs. Bangert and Thorne would also assist.
- Members **AGREED** to include a dog show within the programme
- Members considered the quotation for portable toilets and **AGREED** to provide 5 portable toilets and 1 disabled toilet for the event and further **AGREED** to fund the cost for these from the Community Event budget. The Clerk will make arrangements and advised Members that measures would need to be put in place to ensure the units were locked and kept safe before and after the event

Further discussion included the need to make arrangements for parking, advertising, provision of a PA System, tables and chairs and the need to advise/liaise with associated authorities in regard to rubbish, first aid and security. Residents of Bourne View Close would also need to be informed of the event.

224.2 CDC Grant for Parishes

Members **NOTED** the accompanying report.

Following discussion Members wanted to further investigate a proposal from a member of the public for a mosaic. It was felt a mosaic as a tribute to mark the Queen's Jubilee would be a fitting installation for the new pavilion wall.

It was **AGREED** that the Clerk should contact the member of public to discuss the idea further and try to determine costs of production. It was further **AGREED** the Clerk should start the grant application process if appropriate and noting that additional funding would be required to cover any shortfall.

225. Neighbourhood Plan including: Update on Examiners Hearing on 14th January 2022, notes from the Consortium Inception Meeting held 28th January 2022 and to note the correspondence from CDC regarding the local plan as previously circulated

225.1 Examiners Hearing

Cllr. Brown read a statement relating to the hearing which is appended to these Minutes (**Appendix 1**)

225.2 Consortium Meeting held 28th January 2022

Members **NOTED** the notes from the consortium meeting as previously circulated and along with the correspondence from CDC regarding the local plan.

226. PRINSTED AREA INCLUDING: TO RECEIVE A REPORT FROM CLERK AND DEPUTY CLERK FOLLOWING AN ON-SITE MEETING AND CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND ISSUES RAISED WITHIN THE REPORT

The Chairman thanked the Clerk and Deputy Clerk for their time and effort in producing the report on such a complex issue.

Members acknowledged there was a vast number of issues and topics within the report to think about and the Chairman felt it was important for them to address and consider carefully.

It was acknowledged that there had been some delay in tackling some of the issues but that now was the time to “get a grip” and start to make some progress. Some of the points raised within the report were extremely complex and would take time to resolve but working with residents and local groups who use the area may afford an opportunity address these more expediently.

It was proposed and seconded to appoint a Task & Finish Group to focus on the area. The Task & Finish Group would hold no more than 3 meetings to establish the need for a more formal committee approach and to set the Terms of Reference. Cllrs: Hicks, James and Thorne would sit on the Group attended by the Clerk.

It was therefore **AGREED** to appoint a Task & Finish Group for the Prinsted area. The aforementioned Members will meet with the Clerk for a preliminary meeting to establish which stakeholders should be involved and set a date for the first meeting. The Task & Finish Group will report back to Full Council.

227. TO CONSIDER AND APPROVE REVISED STANDING ORDERS FOR SOUTHBOURNE PARISH COUNCIL

Members **NOTED** the draft Standing Orders as previously circulated which are based on the NALC model. Members were asked to consider some minor amendments as highlighted within the draft copy that were related to Southbourne’s requirements.

Members **AGREED** to formally Adopt the Standing Orders for Parish Council as proposed.

228. TO NOTE THE DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday 8th March 2022 at St Johns Church Centre.

The Chairman closed the meeting @ 9.38pm

APPENDIX 1 MINUTE 225.1 REFERS

SPNP Steering Group Chairman's Report to SPC on the Examination Held on 14 January 2022

It was a tough, and overall frustrating process. The agenda was set by the Examiner and essentially consisted of him proposing all the worst case interpretations of all the thorny issues for the Plan. I don't know if that's normal, though I see the logic in it, even if it did feel it was being framed in a very negative way.

The Hearing is the Examiner's event, to run as he likes. Our consultants (and Robin Shepherd, speaking on behalf of the Consortium) were pretty astonished that given the scale and complexity of what we were dealing with he didn't call an exploratory meeting before the Hearing, he didn't allow written submissions and isn't allowing any follow up afterwards. When he finished by asking if anyone felt they'd not had the opportunity to say anything, I pointed out that we'd been very willing to provide further information, and one of the final acts of the day was Neil Homer noting that it was highly unusual for an Examiner to take this approach.

It felt to me like he was completely unaware of or ignoring how the real world works – approaching the subject like a lawyer looking at the law and how things should be by the book, rather than a planner looking at how planning works in practice, with a constant weighing up of contradictory law, guidance and practice. It was just weird the way he seemed to be concerned about us planning for a number of dwellings higher than the 350 in our first NP, as if we were all delighted to be doing so, even though he must know that the planning system favours speculative planning applications in the absence of an up to date Local Plan and a 5 Year Housing Land Supply. (i.e. He must have known – we told him! – that applications for hundreds of units were working their way through the system and would likely be granted permission despite not being included in the current Local Plan.)

We (me, our consultants and Robin Shepherd) felt that within the above constraints there wasn't really anything more we could have done or said differently. It was good that Roy Seabrook got the opportunity to make a great point about the awfulness of the way the waste water industry works – or doesn't. And I have to say that the representatives of the objectors spoke very well and made their case very professionally, despite a lack of familiarity with how the process works. I hope they felt they had a fair hearing.

It was very frustrating listening to Toby Ayling, representing CDC. Having allocated us 1250 dwellings, I would have hoped for a more robust defence of their own position. We've always known they have been and still are in a difficult situation with the Local Plan, and we knew they weren't going to be able to say without any equivocation that everything was brilliant... But we did hope that they would say more in support of our plan and their own plan-making process. To be fair to him, we would also have hoped that the Examiner would have actually explored the context in more detail, including the many communications we have had from CDC since the 2019 conversation he chose to focus on. He actually asked CDC very few questions and gave them very little opportunity to explain their thinking and progress with the Local Plan.

It was also disappointing that some of the questions were brushed over very quickly indeed – e.g. the climate change policies and the Local Green Spaces were only covered very briefly.

I've never done one of these before so have nothing to compare it to, but overall, it was a frustrating experience. Especially knowing that we have an application on Cooks Lane (Four Acres) at appeal and the land behind Inlands Road about to go through the planning system. I think the community would feel that it would be very unfair if the Examiner were to remove our ability to plan development that is coming anyway.

He did say that he expected his report to be published around mid-February, but given how complex this all is, I would not be surprised if it is delayed.