



Southbourne Parish Council

The Village Hall
First Avenue
Southbourne
West Sussex
PO10 8HN

01243 373 667

admin@southbourne-pc.gov.uk
www.southbourne-pc.gov.uk

Minutes of the Meeting of Southbourne Parish Council's Extraordinary Planning Committee held Wednesday 4th December 2024

Present: Cllrs: A. Tait (Chair), L. Meredith (Vice-Chair) and K. Sivyver.

In Attendance: M. Banach (Administrator)

The meeting started at 12.03.

138. CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

139. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from N. Redman, J. Money, M. Wheeler, R. Humphrey.

140. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

141. ADJOURNMENT FOR PUBLIC OPEN FORUM

There were no speakers present.

142. FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THE CDC SOUTHBOURNE ALLOCATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT TO REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION AND TO AGREE THE RESPONSE FROM SOUTHBOURNE PARISH COUNCIL AS DEFERRED FROM MEETING 21ST NOVEMBER 2024 MIN.133 REFERS

Members **AGREED** on the responses to be made to CDC regarding the Southbourne Allocation Development Plan, as stated below.

Main Document - <https://chichester.oc2.uk/document/56>

4.11. Question for Reg.18 consultation:

Q1. Do you agree with the vision and objectives set out? If not, please set out how you think they should be amended.

No.

Objection to Transport – The Consultation only indicates the train station with no reference to road users, bus links etc or the impacts on congestion into, out of and around Southbourne including barrier congestion on Stein road.

5.22. Questions for Regulation 18 consultation:

Q2. Do you agree with the list of benefits or challenges set out above?

Yes.

Q3. Are there other benefits or challenges that you think should also be included?

Benefits:

- GP Surgery
- Pharmacy

Challenges:

- Inadequate sewage capacity
- Water extraction
- Congestion (particularly onto the A259 and around the new proposed schools).

Q4. In this scenario, what do you think would be the challenges or issues if there wasn't a vehicular bridge over the railway line?

If there is no bridge, there should be no new houses!

There is only one North/South running road in Southbourne and during peak times, gates are closed 30 mins of every hour. It would not be an acceptable or sustainable option to build houses without a road bridge.

5.34. Questions for Regulation 18 consultation:

Q5. Do you agree with the list of benefits and challenges set out above?

Yes

Q6. Are there other benefits and challenges that you feel should also be included?

Benefits

- GP Surgery
- Pharmacy

Challenges

- Placement of Community Centre, it is placed on a junction of 3 roads that aren't wide enough to sustain the level of traffic. Obstructs the gap between Southbourne and Nutbourne. – Location for 'West' Proposal is much better
- Inadequate sewage capacity
- Water extraction

-Congestion.

Q7. In this scenario, what do you think would be the challenges or issues if there wasn't a vehicular bridge?

If there is no bridge, there should be no new houses!

It is part of the catchment of the Wildlife Corridor and is an area prone to flooding from the Ham Brook catchment.

5.46. Questions for Regulation 18 consultation:

Q8. Do you agree with the list of benefits and challenges set out above?

Yes

Q9. Are there other benefits and challenges that you feel which should also be included?

Benefits:

- GP Surgery

- Pharmacy

Challenges:

1. Placement of Community Centre
2. Inadequate Sewage Capacity
3. Water extraction
4. Congestion – Moreso than the other options. This WILL cause more congestion that will have a big impact on all of Southbourne. There is only one North/South running road in Southbourne and during peak times, gates are closed 30 mins of every hour. It would not be an acceptable or sustainable option to build houses without a road bridge.

5.47. Question for Regulation 18 Consultation

Q10. Which scenario do you feel should be selected as the preferred option for allocation? Please rank from 1st (most preferable) to 3rd (least preferable).

1st – WEST

2nd – EAST

3rd - MIXED

Assessment Framework - <https://chichester.oc2.uk/document/55>

2.39. Question for Regulation 18 consultation:

Q11. Do you agree with the list of opportunities or constraints set out above?

Yes

Q12. Are there any others which should be mentioned in relation to either category?

- There is insufficient evidence that Southern Water have the sewage capacity for this number of houses, and it does not appear that Southern Water have been consulted.
- Existing narrow lanes particularly to the east of the village (Cooks Lane, Inlands Road, Prior's Lease Lane) which are going to cause traffic congestion. Some of these are only wide enough for one car and can cause dangers to cyclists and pedestrians on overtaking. Frustration caused by traffic jams will increase the likelihood of pedestrian and cyclist accidents.

3.12. Question for Regulation 18 consultation

Q13. Do you have any comments on the infrastructure requirements set out above, including how they could/should be most effectively delivered?

Enforceable phasing and Implementation Plan PIP is needed with the development carried out with a systematic approach. Without this, the entire project would be undermined.

Transport

- A vehicular bridge should be a sine qua non not '**Road level crossing improvements or replacement with road bridge**'. This should read '**road level crossing improvements and a new vehicular bridge.**'

Health

- **Community healthcare facilities:** phases for improvement and expansion needed – this improvement and expansion needs to predate the development. It is already extremely hard to get a doctor's appointment and the developments going out and likely to go ahead in Cooks Lane are going to exacerbate this. Infrastructure must be in place before new residents move in.

Social

- New shops, pharmacy, café, take away, etc as part of the hub so residents go to one area to do many things.
- Support and expand the current Library.
- Age Concern to be added to the community hub. Keeping a variety of shops, cafes etc within one area. Consideration/suggestion of a U3A for greater provision for the older population.

Utilities – Wastewater treatment 'reinforcement needed'. This is an **understatement**. Expansion of Thornham for capacity increase must happen before houses are built. Consultation about wastewater treatment should predate building.

There is no mention of flood prevention – this should be a major infrastructure consideration. Keeping the surface water separate from foul water. Chichester Harbour water quality is already in decline and an increase in housing will only intensify the problem.

4.28. Question for Regulation 18 Consultation

Q14. Do you have any comments on the assessment methodology?

Yes – there is no attempt to weight the considerations in order of importance. This consultation shows the need for the provision of houses outweighs all other considerations.

6.1. Question for Regulation 18 consultation

Q15. Do you have any comments on the site assessment scoring set out above?

Yes – there is no attempt to weight the considerations in order of importance and in general, the assessment has overweighted benefits of the mixed scenario. Specific points noted below.

Integrated, Well-Serviced Community - #2 -Reduce The Barrier Effect Of Rail Tracks

- This should be graded as – Strong/Very Poor/Very Poor not Very Strong/Very Strong/Reasonable
- Scenario 1 West – a pedestrian/cycle bridge alone will help a very limited number of people. Those who live in the west of the village who wish to access the new hub. A definite commitment to a vehicular bridge would make this Very Strong as it would undoubtedly reduce the impact of traffic caused by new building.
- Scenario 2 East - a pedestrian/cycle bridge alone will help a very limited number of people. Those who live in the east of the village (essentially Prior's Orchard) who wish to access the new hub. There is very little opportunity realistically to build a vehicular beach in the east as the land is owned by multiple landowners, there is already an application pending regarding the relevant land south of the railway, the area is subject to flooding.
- Scenario 3 Mixed – There is no bridge and so not a viable option.

Support delivery of a community hub – a 'Heart for Southbourne'

- This should read Reasonable/Very Poor/Very Poor instead of all being Reasonable.
- The same argument applies for both Scenarios 2(East) and 3 (Mixed). The location of a separate hub to the east of the village would impact the separation of the villages (Southbourne and Nutbourne West).
- The proposed East hub is not closer to the existing facilities than the proposed West hub as stated, and it would be better if the new hub was a genuine consolidation of all facilities. So those going to the Leisure Centre could also access all the new facilities. Making another separate hub just splits up the facilities more so that people will drive from one location to another, increasing the traffic in the village. The main route to the new hub in the east from those living to the south (except Prior's Orchard/Harris Scrapyard development) would be along Cooks Lane into Prior's Lease and that road does not take two-way traffic.

Promote access to nature and open space

- It is overstated in all categories. All categories should be classed as 'Reasonable' as the nature provided within the green ring will be limited compared to that of open space that is currently enjoyed within the village. Access to nature and open space beyond the development must be considered.

Support local employment opportunities

- Overstated in all three scenarios. There has been very little evidence provided of what these employment opportunities might be. The assessing of Scenarios 2 and 3 as being stronger than 1 is based on the previous misassumption that a hub in the east is better than a hub in the west. As we have shown, that is not the case. So, we assess the grading to be Reasonable/Poor/Poor.

Housing for all

Site Capacity to meet 800 homes delivery requirement

- This should read Reasonable/Very Poor/Poor as the problems relating to the construction of a vehicular bridge in the east impacts Scenarios 2 and 3.

Transport and Sustainable Travel **Providing active travel connectivity**

- All of these should be reasonable rather than strong. None of the existing routes through the existing village can be improved to make walking and cycling safer especially in relation to young people going to and from school and the railway station. People already think it is too dangerous to let their children cycle – once there are increased cars in the village, that will get worse, not better.

TRANSPORT AND SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL

- **Providing active travel connectivity** – All of these should be reasonable rather than strong. None of the existing routes through the existing village can be improved to make walking and cycling safer especially in relation to young people going to and from school and the railway station. People already think it is too dangerous to let their children cycle – once there are increased cars in the village, that will get worse, not better.

Improvements in pedestrian/ cycle access to the train station – At the moment the only route between the pedestrian cycle bridge to the train station is via Cook's Lane and Stein Road. This means the bridge 'adjacent to the station' as stated in the assessment is only reliant on the Elivia Site going ahead, so the grading of this category should be Reasonable, Reasonable, Reasonable, not Reasonable, Strong, Strong.

Climate Change, move towards net zero carbon living

Potential to create buildings to high environmental performance and meet Future Homes Standard

- No current developments do this – how do CDC plan to ensure this happens?

Green ring for people and wildlife

- The provision for the green ring for people and wildlife is a major point of our neighbourhood plan. Of the scenarios, there is no set outline of where the green ring goes, it is not a circle around the village. It must access open green space as well as connect all parts of the village with safe cycle and pedestrian routes. Scenario 3's weighting of 'Very Strong' is wrong as the green ring is more than just a footpath around the village and for scenario 2 and 3, the development site is mostly in Nutbourne and therefore not part of the green ring's area. With the Cook's Lane development, the east end of the green ring is already being constructed now.

Protect and/or mitigate existing wildlife and biodiversity

- All should be very poor due to the loss of land and habitat.

Development location within Flood Zones

- All should be **very poor** as all are going to have knock on effect on flooding as per NPPF Dec 2023 para 165, 166. Scenarios 2 and 3 threaten all of the east down to the sea. It is not enough just to think of the actual land that the houses will sit on, it is also important to think of the land that lies downstream. Scenarios 2 and 3 will negatively impact the Ham Brook and everything that the river runs through.

Character

Impact on views to and from Chichester Harbour

- All should be Poor. It is a massive change in size for the village – what currently appears as greenery will be urban.

Retention of landscape gaps between villages and settlements

- All should be very poor. If all the building goes ahead in Cooks Lane and Inlands Road as well as either Scenario 2 or 3, the gap is lost. It is disingenuous of this Consultation not to take pending and pre-apps into consideration.

Growth of the village sympathetically to its existing form and structure – We would alter the ranking of this category to Reasonable, Reasonable, Poor. In scenarios 1 and 2, the new road links proposed would create new spines in the village creating a new shape. This new shape would reduce congestion in the village. In scenario 3, the current structure of the village would be maintained, but would limit vehicle traffic to 1 main road creating enormous congestion. The new 2 spine shape of scenarios 1 and 2 is better suited to a larger village/town.

In section 6, the deliverability (viability) considerations do not match the score given in Section 5. In section 5, the scores are Poor, Poor, Poor and in section 6, they are given as Very Poor, Very Poor, Reasonable. This should not be the case and must be rectified.

Section – Deliverability (viability) Considerations

We consider Scenarios 2 and 3 should be ranked Very Poor due to the potential lack of communication between multiple landowners.

Southbourne Allocation DPD Reg 18 Interim Sustainability Appraisal – comment to be made

DOCUMENT: [Southbourne Allocation DPD Reg 18 - Interim Sustainability Appraisal \(814.08 KB\)](#)

NO COMMENT

Southbourne Allocation DPD Reg 18 - Viability Assessment - Comment to be made for each document

DOCUMENT: [Southbourne Allocation DPD Reg 18 - Viability Assessment Stage 1 \(1.01 MB\)](#)

NO COMMENT

DOCUMENT: [Southbourne Allocation DPD Reg 18 Viability Assessment Appendix 1 \(834.88 KB\)](#)

NO COMMENT

DOCUMENT: [Southbourne Allocation DPD Reg 18 - Viability Assessment Appendix 2 \(856.34 KB\)](#)

NO COMMENT

DOCUMENT: [Southbourne Allocation DPD Reg 18 - Viability Assessment Appendix 2a \(918.38 KB\)](#)

NO COMMENT

143. TO NOTE THE DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

Thursday 12th December 2024, 6pm at St. John's Church Centre

The meeting closed at 14.04

Signed.....

Dated