



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 Planning Committee held Thursday 6th March 2025

Present: Cllrs: A. Tait (Chair), L. Meredith, J. Money, S. Rosenberg, S. Sivy, M. Wheeler.

In Attendance: M. Carvajal-Neal (Deputy Clerk), 1 Member of the public and two representatives from Bloor Homes

The meeting started at 18:00.

197 CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

198 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Cllr. N. Redman due to work commitments.

199 TO APPROVE AND SIGN THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 13th February 2025

Members **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes of the meeting held on 13th February 2025.

200 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

201 ADJOURNMENT FOR PUBLIC OPEN FORUM

The meeting was adjourned at 18:01

The Deputy Clerk read out the following statement from R. Seabrook:

"There is widespread misunderstanding concerning the legal framework controlling the water companies. The statutory capacity of a treatment works (eg Thornham) is based on the 80 percentile of Dry Weather Flow (DWF). This effectively means that it is based on the driest 73 days of the year; if it rains there is no legal limit on the amount of storm discharge. There is no legal framework defining the pipework infrastructure. For many years now this has meant that many houses have been built with only minimal development of infrastructure sufficient for Dry Weather Flow, relying ever increasingly on storm discharges to cope with wet weather.

For any planning application the District Planning Authority routinely asks about "Sewage Capacity". When the water company replies that it "has capacity" it is referring to its statutory Dry Weather Flow capacity to which it is contractually committed. It never comments on wet weather capacity for any development application and is never asked for comments on wet weather sewage capacity of any specific development application.

To clarify the true legal situation I suggest the following questions to Chichester District Council legal department (Nicola Golding):-

- 1. Does the District Council (CDC) have a legal obligation to satisfy itself that any planning application has adequate infrastructure?*
- 2. Would the CDC confirm that the only body that can formally consider the implications of inadequate sewage infrastructure and storm discharge is the CDC planning Committee. Bear in mind that the Environment agency clearly states that they only deal with treatment works and not the feeder networks, and that Southern Water are only contracted to Dry Weather Flow.*
- 3. Would the CDC please confirm whether or not storm discharge of sewage may constitute a danger to both public health and to the environment.*
- 4. Would CDC please confirm the District Planning Committee has never specifically asked for nor received any statements concerning sewage storm discharge for any planning application."*

Members asked for this item to be added to a future agenda. There were no further items.

The meeting was re-adjourned at 18:09.

202 CLERK'S UPDATE

202.1 Members **NOTED** the response from CDC regarding community facilities in Southbourne.

202.2 Members **NOTED** the transport survey circulated by WSALC and noted that due to timescales this could not be added to an agenda and as such councillors and Members of the public were encouraged to make their own comments via the online link.

202.3 Members **NOTED** that the Southern Water consultation would be added to the next agenda for consideration.

203 PRESENTATIONS

The meeting was adjourned at 18:10

Councillors received a presentation from Rebecca Fenn-Tripp and Lucy Ormrod of Bloor Homes regarding 40 units at Four Acre Nursery.

Bloor displayed a map of the site and discussed how they are looking to connect it to their adjacent site with the emphasis on a seamless connection and a consistent design across both sites.

Bloor displayed an illustrative plan of the proposed development to indicate their plans for the Greenring including adding an orchard, some appropriate natural street furniture and native, wildflower and ornamental species of plants and trees. Bloor understand from information previously sent to them from SPC that the Greenring should be a multi-use area with an emphasis on the environment.

Bloor advised that they are looking to submit their Reserved Matters application in April 2025.

Members raised several inquiries:

- 1. Energy Efficiency:** Why is Bloor not exceeding the minimum requirements for energy efficiency in new homes, such as by installing solar panels and heat pumps on every property? Local homeowners are retrofitting these features themselves. Wouldn't homes equipped with these products sell for a higher price? What is the EPC rating for these homes?

Bloor: The homes being constructed are energy efficient and meet all required energy efficiency standards. Bloor will ascertain the EPC rating and inform the SPC accordingly.

-
2. **Garages:** There have been local applications to convert garages in new build homes into habitable living spaces, resulting in a loss of garages and a reduction in available on-street parking. Could carports be installed instead? Is on-street parking designed to accommodate the conversion of all garages for alternative uses?

Bloor: Homeowners prefer garages over carports. The local planning authority is responsible for ensuring sufficient on-street parking when considering garage conversions.

3. **Connectivity:** During discussions, it was noted that a strip of land around the site is still owned by the original landowner, preventing physical connectivity between the two sites. Members request updates on Bloor's progress in securing this land. Will residents be able to travel between the two sites through this strip of land?

Bloor: Residents will be able to physically cross between the two sites through the land still owned by the original landowner. Efforts are underway to resolve this issue.

4. **Green Ring:** Members prefer the use of native species over ornamental ones and would prefer not to see species such as Red Robin or Laurels. They would like to see species like Hawthorn, Blackthorn, Willow, or Oak. Who is responsible for maintaining these areas before a management company is appointed?

Bloor: Will send the draft plans to councillors to look at in more detail and take on board the points raised regarding species. Bloor stated that they are responsible for any maintenance until a management company is appointed.

The Chair thanked Bloor for their attendance and their engagement with SPC.

Officers will write to Bloor Summarising the above points.

The meeting was re-adjourned at 18:46.

204 CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS WEEKS 6-8

204.1 25/00272/FUL & SB/25/00273/LBC WINSLEY HOUSE 134 MAIN ROAD SOUTHBOURNE EMSWORTH

Members considered this application and **AGREED** that, while they have **NO OBJECTION** to the proposal, they support the comments made by the Chichester Harbour Conservancy (CHC) regarding the conditions. Members do not object to the application, provided that the conditions stipulated by CHC are implemented. This is particularly important as the application would not comply with SPC NP SB17: Achieving Dark Skies without the necessary amendments.

204.2 25/00065/OBG G AND R HARRIS MAIN ROAD NUTBOURNE CHICHESTER

Members considered this application and **AGREED** that Officers write to CDC with the following queries:

- The application references the "Discharge of obligations schedule 1, part 1A, paragraph 1.1," which includes affordable housing. However, there is no mention of affordable housing in this application. Application 22/01283/FULEIA contains documentation stating that the discharge of Schedule 1, Part 1A, Paragraph 1.1 has already been undertaken. Can CDC clarify what Members are being asked to consider?
- The application references the "Discharge of obligations schedule 1, part 2, paragraph 3.1 of the S106 agreement," which includes the provision of a land management plan. There are no details of the land management plan included with this application. As such, Members cannot consider this application. Can CDC clarify what Members are being asked to consider?

- Regarding the play area, the details provided are an artist's impression and do not include specifics such as the proposed equipment to be installed, materials to be used, specifications, or dimensions. Can CDC clarify what Members are being asked to consider?
- Concerning the allotments, can CDC clarify what Members are being asked to consider? If Members are being asked to consider the design of the allotments, they would like to see secure parking provided, including a lockable gate to the car park. Additionally, Members would like allotment holders to be provided with a shed, not just the base.

After discussion it was proposed that SPC make enquiries into adopting the allotment plots as this was proposed to the committee by Metis in January 2023. The Deputy Clerk advised that as this is a matter of land ownership the committee cannot consider this proposal. It was further proposed that the committee consider recommending to Full Council to consider the adoption of the allotments. This was unanimously **AGREED**.

RECOMMENDATION: Members recommend that Full Council consider the adoption of the allotments at the Former Harris Scrapyard site.

204.3 25/00239/TPA 26 SADLERS WALK HERMITAGE SOUTHBOURNE EMSWORTH

Members considered this application and **AGREED** that they have **NO OBJECTION**.

205 CONSIDERATION OF AMENDED APPLICATIONS:

There were no applications for consideration.

206 CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPEALS:

206.1 SB/22/01941/FUL STABLES NORTH OF THORNHAM FARM HOUSE , PRINSTED LANE

Members **NOTED** that the appeal has been received and deemed Valid by PINS and will be undertaken by Written Representation. Members **AGREED** to uphold their original objection and to add to their objection the following policies of the now Made NP:

SB1,B- Outside of the settlement boundary

SB18- Within AONB

SB20- Flood risk

And the Material Consideration: Highway, safety and traffic.

It was proposed that the Deputy Clerk compile a written statement and together with the Chair formalise a response to be ratified at the next meeting. This was unanimously **AGREED**.

206.2 SB/21/01910/OUT- WILLOWBROOK RIDING CENTRE HAMBROOK HILL

Members **NOTED** that whilst it had been **AGREED** that Officers would invite Reside to meet with SPC, Officers have been unable to contact them. As a last resort Officers will contact CDC potentially via the portal. C&H have agreed to attend the proposed meeting, this was **NOTED**.

207 TO REVIEW ALL PERMITTED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS IN THE SOUTHBOURNE PARISH AREA AND TO CONSIDER ANY REQUIRED ACTIONS.

207.1 Members **NOTED** that 24/01161/OUTEIA (Inlands Rd) was due to go to CDC committee and the Chair would have attended to speak on the objections previously made by the committee, however the Chair had received notification that this item had been removed from the agenda. It was **AGREED** that the Deputy Clerk write to CDC to clarify.

208 TO RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON THE BLD FOLLOWING THE CDC DPIP MEETING HELD 26TH FEBRUARY 2025 AND TO CONSIDER A RESPONSE

The Chair gave a verbal update of the meeting. The Deputy Clerk will send the link to the recording to Members.

It was proposed that Members write to CDC to seek clarification on the following points:

1. Could SPC receive a copy of the report presented to the cabinet?
2. Since it has been determined that the housing numbers for the Willowbrook site will not be deducted from the total housing allocation for Southbourne, can CDC clarify how future speculative planning applications will be managed concerning Southbourne's housing supply?
3. It was suggested that Reg19 will be delayed until Autumn 2025. Can CDC explain the reason for this delay? SPC is concerned that this postponement may lead to an increase in speculative planning applications. It was mentioned that the delay might be due to additional required transport studies. Is this related to the click tapes observed on Stein Road and Main Road in Southbourne?

Members **AGREED** to send these inquiries to CDC.

209 TO NOTE THE DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

Thursday 6th March 2025, 6pm at St. John's Church Centre

The meeting closed at 19.01

Signed

Dated