

## Minutes of Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2013

**Attendees:** Alan Feltham, Alice Smith, Bruce Finch, Chris Bulbeck, Geoff Talbot, Graham Hicks, Jack Moss, Jacky Grant, John Southgate, Keith Parham, Marjorie Bulbeck, Mark Everson, Mike Downer, Oona Hickson, Robert Hayes, Roy Seabrook, Ruth Heelan, Sandra James, Sarah Richardson, Sue Talbot, Tom Hulton.

**Apologies:** Bill Ferguson, Jim Jennings, Rowena Tyler, Tom Bell.

1. Welcome & apologies submitted. We have two new members who have both joined the Communications team, Tom Hulton and Ernie Timms. Please note these are closed meetings - members of the focus groups are welcome to attend (but do not have a vote), for anyone else it is invitation only. **ACTION ALICE** to add new members to the map and the register of interests.
2. Minutes of last meeting: minutes of 5<sup>th</sup> August meeting approved.
3. State of the Parish Report:
  - (i) **Changes** have been sent to Rowena (AiRS) who has passed onto rCOH to make the required changes (a key one being separating Drainage from Housing). We do not know when we will get the final version back, this will be sent from Alice to the focal points who will then approve the changes made to their parts and send back confirmation or further changes to Alice (thence to Rowena and on to Neil as required).
  - (ii) The new **drainage figures** were discussed – there were figures for drainage for 2010, these were prepared by an independent party and have been audited. Southern Water have suddenly come up with some much higher capacity numbers, these have been adopted by CDC, but there is no explanation as to the increased capacity other than the figures have been calculated differently. There has been no infrastructure change, no change to the methods of dealing with waste water/sewage. No bridge has been provided from the old figures to the new figures. There is no 3<sup>rd</sup> party involvement and no audit; therefore at present we have no reason to put any faith in the new figures. They would appear to be incorrect as the drainage issues currently experienced are not going to go away just because SW have decided to use a new basis for calculation. The old basis for calculation missed two key areas, therefore could not be relied on either – if two key areas (Havant and ??) were missed, what other smaller areas were missed? It was agreed the SOP report should say something along the lines of “... *the 2010 figures are independently audited and 3<sup>rd</sup> party prepared, and here are the 2013 figures that have been provided by SW but have no transparency and no backup has been made available to us...*” **ACTION ROY** We still have time to comment on the CDC revised plan, Roy will send to Alice **ACTION ROY** a suggested comment on the drainage figures, Alice to send to all, **ACTION ALICE** we can then put this on the CDC website as our personal replies, **ACTION ALL**. Sandra James has taken this issue to Heather Caird, who has advised that her team have the figures that they need, but we are aware there is no visible basis for the new figures. Bruce Finch will take this up with the Exec Director of Housing **ACTION BRUCE FINCH**.
  - (iii) **PC Response to CDC revised plan (re drainage)** The PC will post a response to the CDC revised plan highlighting our concerns re drainage figures adopted by CDC and the lack of transparency of those figures. **ACTION ROBERT HAYES**. This is key as the housing figures are calculated based on the ability to provide facilities, i.e. drainage.
  - (iv) **Open ended questions** – the analysis has been done by members of the team, but we are expecting AiRS/rCOH to do the analysis and draw conclusions from the data analysis, this has been sent to AiRS and we expect that these figures will be included as appendices to the SOP report. Even though there is a lot of data, it will be good for us to have this available when the public come to events asking questions.
  - (v) **Clarity** – we need to ensure the SOP is not just a pile of data, the data is key to backup how we draw our conclusions and is great for appendices etc but we need to ensure that the SOP report is understandable by the layman, i.e. we need to expose where there are difficulties, i.e. explain why we have issues with the drainage figures. We need to firstly identify the issues and secondly show the analysis.
4. Stakeholder Planning Workshop: this is planned for Tuesday 1<sup>st</sup> October at Age Concern. An invitation only event taking stakeholders through the Southbourne State of the Parish Report and obtaining their input. Although this is a small space there is expected to be enough room for the attendees. Bill is sending out the hard copy letters and Alice is sending out the email invites **ACTION ALICE & BILL**. The invitees include 22 statutory contacts suggested by Rowena/Neil incl adjoining parishes, 3 Churches, 7 other Community Orgs, 10 Businesses/Employers, 3 schools and 10 SNDP Team Members nominated by their chairs, plus five other local interested parties. 60 invites sent, we

estimate 2/3 will attend, plus 10 helpers makes 50 attendees which the Age Concern building can accommodate. Parking at Age C is an issue but the Social Club have kindly offered the use of their car park next door.

5. Budget update. There is £825 remaining of the funds available, future expenditure is anticipated to be room hire and printing of posters and leaflets. If further funds are required the PC will be asked if they can provide them. Has Lawrence asked for all the funds that are available from CDC **ACTION ROBERT**.
6. Chidham Boundary Change: Although Tom Bell had advised this change was to take effect May 2015, it appears it is actually 1 April 2014. **ACTION BRUCE FINCH** to check the details and confirm. The best course of action is for Southbourne PC to discuss with Chidham PC and come to a joint decision as to which areas are included in which parish's neighbourhood plan, and to agree what percentage of the 50 houses are to move from Southbourne to Chidham. It is unlikely that the 50 was calculated using any particular methodology, so the two parish councils will need to determine a fair way to assess what part of the 50 should be allocated to each parish. **ACTION ROBERT & SANDRA** to arrange.
7. Developer Presentations/meetings. Planned for 15<sup>th</sup> October, we will invite developers with sites shown as potentially suitable for development on the 2013 SHLAA to an open meeting. There are 13 sites with 8 ownerships. The purpose of the event would be for each developer to present a 10 minute presentation to the SG, at well publicised open event. We would expect significant public attendance to this meeting. We plan to provide a copy of the site selection criteria, maps and details of all sites on the website so that the public can review this prior to the meeting, and so that everyone has the same information (public/developers/SG). The SG would be able to ask for clarity but should not comment on the suitability of any site, or give any opinions, at this event. This would not be the time for any decisions but would be that opportunity to listen to what the land interests have to say. Discussion of suitability and likely acceptability (bearing in mind the referendum requires over 50% approval of residents for the plan to go ahead, the SNP must be aware of what is and is not acceptable to residents) would be in the subsequent SG meetings. We would need to ensure that we can act and decide swiftly following that event. This meeting needs to be tightly controlled. Each focus group to nominate one person who can ask one planned question of each developer **ACTION FOCUS GROUPS** to nominate that person and to determine that question. There can be half hour questions from public at the end but those questions needs to be handed in, in writing at the start of the meeting, as we have only a short time available, as well as this being so early in the process that no one site is being considered over any others at this point. A chair is required for this; it was voted by the Steering Group that this should be **Bruce Finch**. We debated asking for an independent chair but having a chair that is knowledgeable of the issues the village faces was considered preferable. The timeframe is expected to be that we get information from developers by end 3<sup>rd</sup> week in Sept. The process is that following the presentations, we can select the best site(s) and that will determine what developer(s) is/are chosen. Those developers are then asked to do further work to justify the suitability of those sites, and demonstrate that they are willing to work with the N Plan, i.e. willingness to provide required infrastructure. Some may advise what else they plan to do for the Parish, i.e. provide pieces of infrastructure in their entirety as well as through the infrastructure levy. If something is committed to verbally by developers, we can build those commitments into the final neighbourhood plan. Alfrey Close was discussed, this application was refused and the appeal is 10am on November 12<sup>th</sup>, and as they are in the appeal process it would be inappropriate to invite this developer to present at the meeting. Once the appeal process is over they can be invited with the other developers to other events ([link](#) to the appeal details).
8. Timetable this has been split into two – one column for meetings/events and so on, and one column for deliverables. This has been colour coded to make it clear who is responsible for what. We can add the details of the events and meetings and this part can go on the website **ACTION COMMUNICATIONS TEAM** the details of deliverables and so on, need to be confirmed by Rowena/Neil, as the current dates etc are out of date. This part is fairly specific, and does not need to go on the website, but does need to be shared within the n/plan team, so we can ensure that we get all deliverables to the right place on the right time **ACTION ROBERT**.
9. Report from each Focus Group Each group covered the highlights of the group's work over the last month. The latest minutes for each group are available on the parish council website.
  - i) Communications Posters, banners and leaflets have been printed, these are to be placed around the villages by the n/plan team. Posters will be updated monthly. People are asked to take ownership of a particular location and update that poster each month. Please put the small posters in your cars, and any other visible locations. If you need more please contact Alice or Comms team. **ACTION ALL**. Ruth to send PDF of poster to Alice, to send to all, this way we can all send to all our contacts and hope for wide

- dissemination. **ACTION ALL.** Do not put posters on lampposts. Telegraph poles are ok. Bus stops ok. Perhaps we can put some up in buses? There will be an information file in the library.
- ii) Community. The survey questions were reviewed; top 5 community facilities requested are Surgery, Schools, Shops, Green Spaces, and Children's Parks. John Southgate has met with the schools and discussed expansion with each, they have land on each site, but the funding for this would need to be made available. John has had conversation with GP surgery; they estimate 800 houses would mean they need one more GP. They own land behind the surgery that could be used for expansion if required. Green areas discussed for new parks are west of Jubilee Mews, and opposite the GP surgery.
  - iii) Drainage: Terry Grant and Roy Seabrook met Southern Water in August. CC emailed new headroom figures, not 400 now 1700 capacity. We have doubts as to the accuracy of these figures. They advise capacity will be 6000 in future. There is no backup to these figures. The team expected SW to provide information to back up the figures but they advised it was purely a recalculation and there are no infrastructure changes. We suspect they look at rainfall only, and if this was based on the 2/3 years dry weather prior to 2012 this would give greater headroom. If recalculated using 2012 wet weather figures this is likely to show radically different capacity. This is not an appropriate methodology as the capacity needs to be there for dry years and wet years alike. We have a legal obligation to ensure the infrastructure is in place for the plan we create, and this does not appear to meet that obligation. We do not feel it is appropriate to just take these figures from SW without seeing independent data to prove that capacity is there, Sandra has arranged a meeting with district to discuss. This will join up with Havant, Emsworth, Westbourne and Chidham as well as Southbourne. All the parishes have the same issue. **ACTION SANDRA.** We do not just want data but want the calculations and methodology as well. We would like to see the figures as calculated on 2012 wet year data. We do not accept that this information should be classed as confidential. District has no monitoring of this system. EA only look at permitted levels, there is no limit re storm discharge. Storm discharge history must logically be an indicator of capacity. We may need to put in a FOI request and also may need to engage the help of Andrew Tyrie to pursue this matter, if SW continues to refuse to provide the information.
  - iv) Economy Surveys analysed and distributed.
  - v) Environment. The group has reviewed all the likely sites with regards to environmental issues.
  - vi) Heritage next meeting will be arranged shortly
  - vii) Housing Verified and discussed results from questionnaires.
  - viii) Transport SOP reviewed.
10. Documents supplied to the Parish Council there are documents that have been supplied to the PC that are not disseminated to the neighbourhood plan team. Some of the team have had to collate data from various sources, only to find that this was already available and the PC had the data. In order to avoid any more wasted effort, we would like the Parish Council to ensure that all relevant documents and data received are passed onto the neighbourhood plan team as soon as they are received. **ACTION PARISH COUNCIL**
11. Any Other Business
- i. Meeting 9<sup>th</sup> November –this meeting is being set in place, expected to be for public to attend to find out more about the neighbourhood plan, the available sites and any info that came out of the developer meeting 15<sup>th</sup> October. We will be able to present to the public the results of the questionnaire at this event. The SOP and all the backup data will be available at the event.
  - ii. Comments to local plan – all please to put comments online, referencing the drainage issues.
  - iii. Next meeting to include an agenda item re s106 payments for community centre, the issue of running costs.
  - iv. We have been invited to a networking and learning event on neighbourhood planning on Thursday 5 September at 10am. It will be held in the in Mid Sussex council chamber in Hayward's Heath. Roy Seabrook is going to attend.
  - v. We have been invited to attend a training session, 7th Oct 10am-12 which will cover affordable housing and the right to build, and bring us up to speed on the various approaches to housing delivery. Sue & Geoff Talbot and Roger Bannister.
12. Next SG meeting is Monday 7<sup>th</sup> Oct 2013 7.30 pm. Please note future dates are 4th Nov & 2nd Dec 2013 and 6 Jan, 3 Feb, 3 March, 6 April. All meetings are at the Church Centre at St John's Church, Stein Road, Southbourne PO20 8LB at 7.30pm.