

Minutes of Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group 7th January 2014

Attendees: Alice Smith, Bill Ferguson, Chris Bulbeck, Geoff Talbot, Jack Moss, Jacky Grant, Jim Jennings, Jonathan Brown, John Southgate, Mark Everson, Mike Downer, Oona Hickson, Robert Hayes, Roy Seabrook, Sarah Richardson and Sue Talbot.

Apologies: Bruce Finch, Graham Hicks, Marjorie Bulbeck, Rowena Tyler, Sandra James and Tom Hulton.

1. Welcome & apologies submitted.
2. Minutes of last meeting: minutes of December meeting approved, subject to a few amendments.
3. Community Facilities/Community Development Trust: Oona prepared a document detailing some of the issues we need to consider when asking developers to contribute community facilities. Attached as Appendix 1. One facility in a nearby location is a centre that hosts multiple of clubs and organisations, each member of these clubs pays a small levy, making them a paid up member of the centre, and this small levy accumulates to a large enough sum to cover the maintenance required for the centre. This parish may wish to consider using some local assets/areas in order to create revenue, i.e. set aside an area for a car park for the station? Also we can consider setting up a Community Development Trust; this can oversee the registering of community assets, and manage assets/services - with a trust structure we could apply for grants and/or lottery funding. A Trust could be set up before we know what we want; this would demonstrate that we have responsible management in advance of requesting funds. Regarding community assets we need to start with the list we already have and determine
 - i. are they fit for purpose
 - ii. what potential revenue streams can we identify
 - iii. a wish list of assets/services for the parish

A meeting is required to discuss all these issues - the Community Facilities group & the Business & Economy Group, plus others that wish to assist in this project. **ACTION ALICE** to email all to invite to meeting and arrange with **JOHN S** (at Age Concern). We need to consider a project plan, nominating a responsible person(s) to deal with this as time is key, is there any funding available to hire someone to do this? We need to explore all and any funding for project co-ordinator for Community Development Trust. **ACTION OONA & BILL** to investigate Community Development Trust Model. Guidance on registering community assets is in the Neighbourhood Planning Guide. Also it was discussed whether a project manager/co-ordinator could be employed/appointed to tie all the disparate elements of the neighbourhood plan together and to chase work in progress. **ACTION PARISH COUNCIL** to discuss all these points.

4. Housing Sites Selection: There are a number of tasks we need to do, some before we can complete the plan, some can be done after/during plan submission. Some of the actions will go into the neighbourhood plan as requirements of any developer/development; some are a work list for the Parish Council. E.g. mapping all footpaths is one of the items (Lawrence has a copy of the WSCC definitive map) **ACTION SUE** to type out the list and email to all, requesting assistance - each task might be owned by a single person, a focus group or the Parish Council, depending on the type of issue and the urgency required.
5. SEA Roles & Funding: There is great concern that we have not yet had any response or direction from either AiRS or CDC. We have made it clear that we do not have the skills to do this in-house and do not have the funds to appoint a consultant to do this, and have asked CDC & AiRS what resources and support they can provide respectively. We have had no response on this urgent matter. This is a District role, which they have to do at a district level. Specialist skills are required to complete this assessment. A consultant is usually hired to do it. **ACTION ROBERT** to write to Tom Bell & Rowena Tyler. Sue & Geoff Talbot and Robert Hayes have met with Tom Bell - CDC has already done an SEA showing that the Chichester Draft Local Plan is satisfactory. Whilst we could take the CDC assessment and try to complete at a parish level, without the appropriate skills and experience we could make fundamental errors, which is not acceptable. The SEA is part of the process, without it we fail the statutory process. It is noted that Sarah Richardson has asked at every meeting that we have had for 6 months, that we want AiRS to clarify who will and can complete this assessment and we have had nothing back. **ACTION PARISH COUNCIL** to discuss next week and arrange for a letter to be send to AiRS. This group feels it is perfectly reasonable to expect CDC to make the resources available for this task. It is not within the Parish's ability or responsibility. It was noted that Neil Homer had hoped we would be able to access some of the assessments undertaken by developers but there are two issues with that approach

- i. we need the SEA completed to complete the Neighbourhood Plan, and the Neighbourhood plan needs to be in place as soon as possible
- ii. We would not necessarily want to rely on developer commissioned information.

The funds for this are with CDC, and have not been passed to Southbourne Parish. **ACTION ROBERT** to raise this with Heather Caird, in his upcoming meeting with her. Robert will try to get Diane Shepherd to attend also. We need to know how much money is available for this and any other assessments. Would an FOI request help us determine what funds are available? (*Locality is an organisation that acts for the government on the Localism Act incl BLF Community Asset Fund (up to £500k Capital Grant) – there may be other funds too depending on what it is we are seeking funding for e.g. there is a separate Theatre Fund. There are also pre pre-feasibility £10k and pre-feasibility £100k Grants for this process. The 2013/14 Process is now closed but there will probably be a 2014/15 round which usually opens for 2 months to accept applications. There are also Community Loans and other Finance which may be appropriate if the Asset is a revenue generator such as workspace).*

6. Current Planning Appeals & Applications - a date has been set for the appeal for Alfrey Close/Garsons Road site (Hallam Land) where a nursing home, sheltered housing and independent age restricted housing is proposed - ROBERT please confirm dates thanks). Curlews has been decided (previous minutes include details of this under Economy report). Yacht harbour permitted to increase car park into neighbouring field along Thorney Road. Meeting coming up shortly to discuss the proposed 3 houses behind 61 Stein Road, the concern is the entrance right by the train gates, where Stein Road has a bend and a ramp, meaning very poor visibility (there have been RTAs here before). The WSCC consultee reply has been a desktop exercise stating this is a straight road with clear visibility which is clearly incorrect. Network Rail head office were asked to comment, they replied "No comment", it is a shame that the local railway official, has not be asked to input to this planning review as he has in depth knowledge of the line from Littlehampton to Havant.

7. Focus Group:

- i) Communication: keen to keep the pot boiling with residents, perhaps with some charts showing what we have done so far regarding meetings with various bodies. Due to lack of new news to share, the Bourne parents evening meeting 16th Jan will be skipped, but the team will endeavour to have some info for residents for 8th Feb, i.e. a graphic of what is going on. There is a worry residents will be confused by the details of the statutory process, so we need to ensure that what we have is easy to understand and meaningful to residents. Most people want to see how the villages are to be affected by change. There is some work needed to refine Bill's model to show people what we are doing, as we do not have a strategy ready for sharing at this point, but we would like to show people what is going on now. E.g. quote contacts we have had with various bodies/officials/residents, and that we are putting the results all together now. List of significant contacts, e.g. CDC, SW and so on?
- ii) Community. Minutes of the group's meetings are on the website.
- iii) Drainage: A meeting is now set up for EA, SW, CDC, Heather Cairn, Bruce Finch, Robert Hayes, Sandra James, and Roy Seabrook for end January 2014. It is hoped the Harbourmaster and Natural England will attend. This is not an open meeting but will be on the public record, we expect CDC to arrange to have it appropriately minuted, and the minutes will then be part of our neighbourhood plan audit trail. The meeting has 3 objectives -
 - a) Evaluation of physical capabilities of Thornham Site,
 - b) Investigate the discrepancies between the independent consultants' figures and the SW figures. CDC should update strategic study with the independent consultant and get their opinion on the situation, and
 - c) Persuade SW to be more forthcoming on discharges e.g. communicate all discharges to email list updated by someone such as the harbour.

Regarding the review of headroom figures, this was an exercise that SW did with CDC, which CDC considers to be a ground breaking new approach. We would very much like to see what headroom there would be if this same approach was used, using the latest wet weather figures, as the review done used only dry year data. The sudden jump in calculated headroom is due to using dry year figures. It is worth noting the dry year figures were available to the independent consultant, but they chose to ignore the dry year figures - perhaps this is a professional's prudent approach to calculating drainage headroom? The new "ground breaking" approach is one that has been put together by CDC and SW. The team have made contact with Natural England who will endeavour to attend the meeting in January. Sandra James has confirmed previously that it is CDC that have to support the data that we are being provided with - SW provide the data but CDC are responsible for ensuring it is the right data

to use, and are responsible should there be some problem in the future. We will need to ensure that our neighbourhood plan includes the requirements for drainage etc., so that if the requirements are not met, the legal obligations are all with CDC i.e. they ought not to approve any applications that do not meet the criteria or caveats that are included in our final neighbourhood plan. There has been a lot of flooding over the Christmas break, notably north of the station, Farm Lane, School Lane (2 foot deep). The Hambrook overflowed. Gordon Road, ditches were clear but the road drainage could not cope with amount of water. We need an overall picture of how the drainage infrastructure coped, or didn't cope, with the latest wet weather. Everyone please photograph what you can and send to Roy. **ACTION ALL.** Roy got the Highways contact to survey. PC drop-ins may help with collecting data re drainage/flooding. If residents have issues with ditches that need clearing, they should contact Chichester District Council, who will be able to determine who needs to clear it (i.e. CDC or land owner).

- iv) Business & Economy. A briefing note has been supplied, for information, to the Chairperson Recreation Sub Committee outlining possible future options, some of which may be revenue earning. There is a need to establish what recreation facilities are required within the Parish in future years. A meeting between members of the Recreation Sub Committee and the FG might be beneficial.
 - v) Environment minutes of the group's meetings are on the website.
 - vi) Heritage minutes of the group's meetings are on the website.
 - vii) Housing minutes of the group's meetings are on the website.
 - viii) Transport minutes of the group's meetings are on the website. A response from WSCC now received.
8. Budget update. Latest budget provided with the minutes, no change from last month.
9. Timetable an event is to be planned where we can present the neighbourhood plan strategy to the residents, this needs to be timetabled into the latest timetable **ACTION COMMUNICATIONS TEAM.**
10. Any Other Business
- i. **Questionnaires:** this needs to be actioned quickly. Sue has consolidated the responses from the residents down to 10pages; this has now been sent to the SG members for review by cob Friday 10th Jan, and then will be sent to developers by the Parish Council. Lawrence has the email addresses for the developers; this task is expected to take very little time. **ACTION PARISH COUNCIL.** We can then advise residents that their questions and comments are with the developers and we are awaiting their responses. It was anticipated that the Parish Clerk would collate the residents' responses, but when at 18th December this had not been done, Sue did the consolidation over the Christmas break in order to avoid any extra delays.
 - ii. **Neighbourhood Plan Email Account:** all history has been lost from this online account, all emails sent and received, all contacts, all contact lists. **ACTION ROBERT HAYES** to work with computer support to see if the history can be recovered. Some hard copies of correspondence are with Sue Talbot and the Parish Clerk. All hard copies to be given to the Parish Clerk to be retained for audit trail purposes. **ACTION ALL & PARISH CLERK.**
11. Future SG meetings it was agreed that the meetings will be moved to the first Tuesday in each month, therefore the future dates are Tuesday 7th Jan, 4th Feb, 4th March, 8th April, 7th May, 3rd June, 8th July and 5th August 2104. All meetings are at the Church Centre at St John's Church, Stein Road, Southbourne PO20 8LB at 7.30pm.

Community facilities discussion paper on Strategy for the future.

Community Focus Group has done sterling work mapping the range of community facilities, including buildings, groups, statutory services etc in the Village.

At some stage in the development of new homes CIL payments will create a pot that can be used for Capital infrastructure.

There is a danger that without a strategy, we are caught on the hop not properly identifying our requirements for the future. We need to consider.

Are existing community buildings and facilities e.g recreation area:-

In the right places

In the ownership of the Parish....Create a Community Trust?

Fit for purpose? Now and into the future looking at least 25years hence?

Capable of amalgamation if necessary.... Fishbourne Centre model

Secured into the future.

What are the gaps in provision, youth etc?

What if some buildings were sacrificed to other uses and new provision developed, thus raising revenue?

How can revenue be maintained and raised so that we do not have a series of facilities with no one to run the services, maintain them etc?

There are many more issues to consider but those above could provide the bones of a developed strategy with a shopping/wish list that could be built upon and consulted with the community