

## Minutes of Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group 8<sup>th</sup> April 2013

Attendees: Rowena Tyler, Robert Hayes, Alice Smith, Geoff Talbot, Sue Talbot, Graham Hicks, Jack Moss, John Southgate, Oona Hickson, Roy Seabrook, Sarah Richardson, Chris Bulbeck, Marjorie Bulbeck, Mark Everson, Lawrence Tirebuck, Mike Downer, Alan Feltham, Keith Parham.

Apologies: Mark Dunn.

- 1) Welcome & apologies submitted
- 2) Minutes of last meeting: some amendments made, then minutes approved
- 3) Terms of Reference: some amendments made, then Terms of Reference approved. Declaration of interests to be a register, so easier for the residents to locate the data if required. No limit put on the number of Steering Group members. New Drainage focus group added.
- 4) Timeline for Focus Group Activities: it was agreed that the original project plan timeframes could not be met. All groups agreed an extra 6 weeks to the timetable would allow them to draft the questionnaires and gather state of the parish data. PC meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> April, at that meeting they will discuss & ratify moving the whole plan out by one month. **ACTION ROWENA** to send to Alice a vertical version of Neil Homer's project plan so that this can be more easily read by the group. **ACTION ALICE** to then send to all. Comments on the CDC draft plan are accepted until 2.5.13. Information required in State of the Parish report is to be collected by the focus groups (what Southbourne residents want, what we already have, what is needed) by way of questionnaires, open days etc. then the State of the Parish report to be published 3.6.13. Prior to its publication Neil Homer will present us with the results of the questionnaires. At present the PC agreed deadline for the NP is 2.12.13. CDC Final deadline is April 2014. Concern was raised over the tight timeframes, other Parishes take a year to create a State of the Parish report and 2 years to develop a Neighbourhood Plan - we are doing this in just months, in order to keep in line with the CDC planning timeframes. **ACTION???** Can we get a copy of the CDC project plan? This will assist all in keeping in time with that. **ACTION FOCAL POINTS** Focus groups must now identify their stakeholders, so that the SG can send consolidated requests for data. Much data is available at a District level not at a parish level. **ACTION ROWENA** to send the oxydata set that can then be sent to all, in the meantime. **ACTION ALICE** to send to all the link to the Southbourne specific data sets that are already available online. **ACTION ROWENA** to send us details of what another neighbourhood planning team are doing so we can learn from their process. **ACTION ROWENA** to send the example State of the Parish report shown at the meeting, to all so that it can be sent out to all group members.
- 5) Report from each focus group
  - (i) Community. Members are Jackie Grant, Robert Hayes, Ruth Heelan, Marjorie Bulbeck, John Southgate (chair), Clare Stent, Alice Smith, and Roger Bannister. The group has met 3 times; minutes are available and will be filed on the PC website. The FG has produced a list of the existing facilities, with brief descriptions for each, and have devised 3 questions re facilities to be incorporated in this questionnaire. The CDC plan says we are short of some facilities but does not say which – can we get this info from CDC? **ACTION??** The CDC plan notes that there is a lack of green recreational facilities
  - (ii) Economy & Business. Members are Chris Bulbeck, Geoff Talbot (co-ordinator), Gail Ward, Bill Ferson and Graham Hicks. This group has put in requests for data from CDC via Bruce Finch but have had no responses back yet. Perhaps one meeting with one council officer to answer all the questions? **ACTION GRAHAM HICKS** to see if he can identify someone. Data in the draft Local Plan is available generally at Chichester level not at Parish level. The group considers some data may need to be collected physically, this needs to be determined (what, when who). Perhaps students at the Bourne could be involved in data collection & collation (Geography & Humanities students). Southbourne village has been the main area considered, but Prinsted, Nutbourne &

Hermitage need to be considered, as do the large number of nursing homes in the parish which probably provide part time employment opportunities. Geoff has a list of data required from CDC **ACTION** Chair would consider channelling all requests through a single District Councillor. Studies supporting CDC draft plan suggest around 2.5 hectares to be set aside for employment land, and note that Clovelly Road is “severely constrained and some units may benefit from refurbishment”. There was a suggestion in the meeting that it could be turned into housing land and a larger new employment site earmarked elsewhere. It was considered that Clovelly Road provides some smaller units with a lower floor rent than other areas, and that any new large scale replacement site might result in higher rents with the result that it may not be taken up by either the existing or new business tenants, who are here in Southbourne purely because it is cheap. Rental prices per sq. meter are cheaper in Southbourne than elsewhere and also as these are small units, the cost to the businesses is a lot less than other locations. Perhaps Emsworth Business Association might be contacted by this group. There are also business units at Westbourne, Nutbourne, Emsworth & Hambrook, so some information about these units will help understand what is appropriate for Southbourne (i.e. if they are cheaper/more expensive/empty). This team envisage two parts to the questionnaire, one for households and one for businesses. The group also need to locate the numerous residents who work from home. This is one of the smaller teams and as Gail Ward will be busy over next few months some help would be appreciated. John Southgate volunteered some assistance. **ACTION ALL:** if anyone can assist this group please contact Geoff Talbot either directly or through your focal point or through Alice Smith.

- (iii) Environment. Members are Alan Feltham, Jack Moss, Jim Jennings, Mark Everson, Sarah Richardson (chair), Bill Fergusson, Diane Goodman and Elizabeth Medler. There are 3 new members to this group. There are serious considerations re drainage, and it was agreed by the Steering Group that this is such a large issue that it is appropriate to create a new group.
- (iv) Drainage: yet to be formed. **ACTION ALICE** to email to all requesting volunteers, then this list of volunteers can form the new group to consider the issues. If no Environment Group members are on the new group, it would be useful if some of them can attend the first few meetings in order to pass on information already gathered. Southern Water (SW) has not yet responded with answers and some of the information/data SW has provided to date conflicts with local knowledge/opinion. The drainage group has yet to meet with SW. We would like some scientific data as opposed to SW assurances. **ACTION NEIL HOMER** Neil is investigating a plan that would allow potential developers to fund investigations. We would need to ensure that these were unbiased as clearly the developers would have a vested interest in proposed development. According to the CDC preferred approach, Southbourne has no drainage issues, and for that reason this parish is asked to provide its 15 year development requirement in just 5/6 years, allowing the major developments in Tangmere & Chichester to take place later (Tangmere cannot expand until their drainage issues are resolved). If this is not the case, and Southbourne does have drainage issues, either currently or following development, the SG will have to go back to CDC to ask them to amend their preferred approach document. Southbourne sewage goes to Thornham Sewage Works which is shown as having spare capacity per the CDC plans (pg. 104). SW advise there is spare capacity at Thornham for another 500 houses, but fail to mention that this facility also serves part of Emsworth, Westbourne and part of Havant which all plans for new development, Westbourne already having a great deal of new housing already built/being built off Redlands Lane. The Drainage Group will be meeting with CDC to ascertain the area served by Thornham. Also the residents are aware that SW often releases excess sewage into the creek

alongside Farm Lane, which then flows into Chichester Harbour. This does not indicate spare capacity. SW refuse to notify in advance of such discharges, and although asked, have not provided information about how many such discharges occur. As part of the CDC planning process SW or another body must have provided CDC with data that show that Southbourne has spare drainage capacity. We do not know who did this study but would like to see it. **ACTION BRUCE FINCH** (last SG meeting) to find out who did the study, and get the study for the Environment FG and the SG to review. It maybe that we will need to rely on OFWAT to pressure Southern Water. It was discussed that Southbourne NDP group could discuss the drainage issue with Westbourne, Emsworth, Chidham etc. and maybe get investigations that cover a wider area. **ACTION NEW FOCUS GROUP.**

- (v) Heritage. Members are Chris Bulbeck, Marjorie Bulbeck, Chris Parham, Mark Everson, Michael Downer, Oona Hickson (chair). Minutes of the last meeting will be circulated shortly. **ACTION OONA** The key documents for this group have been analysed, and the group have been data gathering, e.g. creating lists of the listed buildings in the parish, looking for redundant/omitted/fit for development buildings, also ones that the group considers ought to be Listed and are not (checking on the British Listed Building website). In the Parish there are 41 x G2, 2 x G2\* and no G1 listed buildings. The group is aware it needs to consider potential within the parish and is currently investigating the remains/history of the Tidal Mill at Nutbourne. All data sources are being used, i.e. Southbourne pictorial history and similar, can help identify buildings that are not listed that perhaps ought to be put forward for designation. Old photographs or documents can also help **ACTION ALL** if you have any old photos or documents could you let the Heritage group have a copy as this may prove valuable in their work. Trees under a protection order can fall under Heritage or Environment but as Mark Everson is the tree officer and sits on this group, it was agreed trees should be considered by the Heritage Group. As this team is not overworked they are happy to lend assistance to other groups that need help. **ACTION FOCAL POINTS** to make a request of this group if you feel some assistance would be valuable.
- (vi) Housing. Members are Henrik Magnusson, Jim Jennings, Keith Parham, Oona Hickson, Robin Rolfe, Roy Seabrook, Bruce Finch, Kev Reeves, Laura Boyns and Sue Talbot (co-ordinator). This group is yet to meet in full and elect a Chairman. The group need data for Southbourne Parish, much of what is available is for Chichester only. **ACTION ROBERT HAYES** Robert to send Breakdown of ward profile to all. **ACTION??** Ask someone from CC housing to go to the meeting on April 16<sup>th</sup>. **ACTION HOUSING GROUP** CDC has an empty homes officer that the FG can contact to obtain data about Southbourne's empty homes and perhaps engage the officer in this process. **ACTION??** Locate the waiting lists data, which is at parish level. This team will need the extra time given by the moving of the deadlines and may require some assistance with tasks once the group have met and identified the tasks.
- (vii) Transport & Accessibility. Members are Alice Smith, Geoff Talbot, Robert Hayes, Sylvia Jezeph and Jack Moss (chair). This group have met twice and have been collecting data, existing and new transport infrastructure. Transport aspects will be heavily influenced by the decisions of other groups. The level crossing in Southbourne is noted as an issue, the railway line here has as many trains as Chichester. The village is well served well by rail, but it was noted that because many trains stop at Southbourne and not at the other villages, thereby increasing road traffic as people drive to Southbourne to catch the train. The train companies must have provided data to CDC for their plan, can we get that data? It is key to understanding how development will impact rail and road. This crossing will be affected whether development is north or south of the railway line, as it will either be people coming south to drive to work/junior and middles schools/shop/etc. or people going north to work/take students to the Bourne/etc. The SG discussed the management of the level crossing, we do not know how this is organised - it could

be that this level crossing is controlled at both Chichester and Emsworth, which could explain the long waits – the management process needs to be understood. Could Mark Dunn assist in obtaining this data? **ACTION TRANSPORT GROUP.**

- 6) Draft questions for residents questionnaire. Rowena will send to Alice a draft questionnaire, each focus group will take ownership of the questions pertaining to their area, delivering questions by end of May so that the final questions will be consolidated into one final questionnaire, at a focal points meeting on Wed June 5<sup>th</sup> (**ACTION FOCAL POINTS** arrange this meeting and ensure all can attend) before the parish council meeting set for 11 June 2013, at which the final questionnaire can be validated. **ACTION ALL** any reason this timeframe cannot be met must be notified immediately.
- 7) Chidham Boundary Change, response from Steering Group **ACTION ROBERT HAYES** will draft a response from the Steering Group, stating Steering Group support the Parish Council's response. The Parish Council intend to respond saying that the current planning processes includes that area within the Parish of Southbourne, therefore it should be left there until after this planning process has been completed. Changing the boundary at this point would mean reassessing housing allocations, SHLAA details and so on.
- 8) CDC drop in meeting at Bourne on 28th March 2013 many members of the SG and a number of local residents attended, some SG members also attended the Chichester session. We were advised that the CDC plan final submission/publication date is April 2014.
- 9) CDC planning document, response from Steering Group (due 2 May 2013 latest) **ACTION ROBERT HAYES** will draft a response, using Sue Talbots draft response (attached as appendix 2) but adding on more about the drainage issues. The Parish Council will determined their response at their meeting on April 9<sup>th</sup>. It was noted that the community infrastructure levy document is not yet ready, which makes it difficult for the parishes to ensure that developers are required to provide sufficient funds for required infrastructure. Comments on the CDC draft plan are accepted until midnight 2.5.13, and can be submitted by any resident using this link [http://chichester.limehouse.co.uk/portal/local\\_plan/lp\\_pref\\_approach](http://chichester.limehouse.co.uk/portal/local_plan/lp_pref_approach)
- 10) Inviting more residents to join the neighbourhood planning process, plus sharing of information (posters, media, online). When the questionnaire goes out, Southbourne NP group will deliver it, it will be returned to Action in West Sussex who will collate and analyse the data. We must capture those who won't fill out and post a questionnaire – e.g. drop in meetings, online questionnaire, hard copies that can be filled out and left onsite at strategic locations and so on. We need to also consider posters, newsletter, clippings, Village Magazine, leaflets sent out from all 3 schools. An attempt should be made to reach all age ranges, locations, socio/economic groups and so on. The PC will discuss this at the PC meeting 9 April 2013.
- 11) The Parish Council website will be the repository for all the minutes and other information re Southbourne's Neighbourhood Plan; this is with a web designer who will have a redesign done in the next 2/3 weeks, allowing for us to put all the information on there, and to receive residents' feedback and questions. In the meantime Robert is going to run a blog so that people can see online what is happening with the neighbourhood plan, and can leave comments. We will need a few moderators so that any questions are dealt with swiftly, and any abusive or offensive material quickly removed. The blog and the website must be responsive and live in order to engage with residents. The PC will discuss the website and blog in detail at the PC meeting 9 April 2013. **ACTION ALL** please volunteer as a moderator if you feel you are able to do so. Please send your offer of help to Robert Hayes.
- 12) Other Parishes. The group discussed spreading the word of the Neighbourhood plan to the friends of Maybush Copse. It was discussed whether Chidham & Hambrook might wish to join Southbourne in creating a Neighbourhood Plan. Westbourne has approached SNP group with a view to including the part of Westbourne not included within the National Park in the Southbourne NDP. The part of Westbourne within the National Park will be dealt with by a different process under the guidance of the National Park Authority and will have different requirements and considerations, therefore Southbourne Parish Council did not feel it was appropriate to create a shared Neighbourhood Plan. We will of course share ideas and information with the neighbouring parishes.

- 13) Next SG meeting is Monday 13<sup>th</sup> May 2013 7.30 pm. Please send minutes, agenda items etc. to Alice Smith as soon as you have them, and by Wed 8<sup>th</sup> May latest, so that they can be sent out to all on Thurs 9<sup>th</sup> May in preparation of that meeting.

**SOUTHBOURNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING TEAM – STEERING GROUP**  
**Appendix 1 to Minutes of Meeting 8 April 2013**

**Terms of Reference**

1. The purpose of the Steering Group is to create a Neighbourhood Plan for the entire parish of Southbourne, manage it through the approval process and set up a robust on-going management process to ensure the plan is acted upon and amended as necessary.
2. The Steering Group (SG) will consist of members of the following composition:
  - a. Chairman
  - b. Secretary
  - c. Other SG Members
3. The SG will make efforts to maintain a range of skills/knowledge in the SG and Focus Groups, and be representative of the parish as far as is possible within the constraints imposed by being drawn from volunteers.
4. The Parish Council clerk will provide such financial and administrative assistance as is appropriate within that approved by the PC.
5. There will be 7 Focus Groups :
  - i. Community
  - ii. Drainage
  - iii. Economic/Business
  - iv. Environmental,
  - v. Heritage/Local Knowledge
  - vi. Housing
  - vii. Transport/Accessibility
6. Each Focus Group will contain one or more SG members and each SG member will be on at least one Focus Group (FG). FGs will seek specialist assistance as required.
7. Each FG will elect a focal point or chair, who will be responsible for reporting back from the FG to the SG. If the chair is not able to attend the SG meeting, they must appoint a delegate for that meeting, from their FG.
8. The chairs of the FGs represent the Chairs Group (CG) who are responsible for sharing information with the other FGs as required, in order that duplication of efforts are avoided and so that communications are not delayed by waiting for SG meetings to share information.
9. The full SG will meet once a month, on the 2nd Monday in each month if possible.
10. The SG may consider itself sufficient to make decisions if 75% of the group is present.
11. FGs will meet as required but at least once a month. FGs will aim to send their minutes to the SG on the Thursday prior to the SG Monday meeting.
12. Meetings are not intended to be 'Open' meetings but should be held where possible in public buildings and notified on the PC web-site and notice-boards. FG members will be notified of SG meetings by email and may attend to observe but not vote. Specialists or interested parties may be invited to attend and speak at SG meetings.
13. Agendas and Minutes of SG and FG meetings will be produced by the Secretary, distributed to SG members and published on the Parish Council web-site.
14. The views of residents, businesses and other people and groups with interests in Southbourne Parish will be sought by the SG and FG members using a range of communication methods, including Open Meetings and surveys.
15. The use of electronic methods for communication will be maximised, while remaining sensitive to the needs of groups unwilling or unable to access these methods.
16. The project will be managed through a project plan, which will be developed and updated by the SG.
17. The committee will report regularly to the Parish Council and other interested groups as agreed.
18. SG and FG members will be expected to complete an entry in a register of interests which will be made available to residents.
19. SG and FG members must maintain confidentiality when requested and comply with the requirements of the Data Protection Act.

**Southbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan  
Housing – draft : response to CDC Local Plan**

- 1 Southbourne Parish Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Draft District Local Plan and considers that it is a well written and comprehensive document. The Parish Council generally supports the Vision and Objectives of the Plan but has some concerns relating to wastewater treatment and to the provision of housing.

**Support with modifications**

**Reason:** Concern about the practicality of providing new housing in the Parish in view of the constraints on wastewater treatment, and concern about being able to limit housing in Southbourne if delays materialise elsewhere in the east-west corridor.

- 2 Southbourne Parish Council generally supports the identification of Southbourne village as a Settlement Hub (Policy 4) and the identification of Hermitage and Nutbourne as Service Villages (Policy 5).

**Support**

**Reason:** The Parish Council welcomes appropriate provision to serve the needs of the Parish.

- 3 Southbourne Parish Council notes the proposed housing provision of approximately 300 homes in Southbourne village and the indicative figure of 50 houses elsewhere in the Parish, and this will be the subject of testing during the forthcoming preparation of the Southbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan.

**Comment**

**Reason:** Testing at the local level is required to establish whether these numbers are appropriate.

- 4 Southbourne Parish Council is not convinced that Thornham Wastewater Treatment Works (paragraph 4.12) has sufficient capacity to serve its catchment area satisfactorily at present, and is therefore very concerned that new development will not be adequately serviced. (Settlement Capacity Profile Section 22 Southbourne – Potential Site Availability and Conclusions for Local Plan Policy – “There is understood to be potential wastewater capacity at Thornham WwTW to accommodate 500+ dwellings”). The Parish Council considers that assuming that this “spare capacity” is available, it will be insufficient to serve existing commitments plus windfall sites, plus proposed new development in Southbourne Parish (350 units), plus Westbourne Parish (25 units), plus further development in Emsworth (Havant Borough).

Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan  
Steering Group Meeting 8 April 2013  
Appendix 2

**Oppose**

**Reason:** Assurance is required before the Parish Council will support the provision of new housing.

- 5 Southbourne Parish Council is concerned that should the delivery of increased capacity at the Tangmere Wastewater Treatment Works fails or is delayed, development in Chichester, Tangmere and Westhampnett will also be delayed thereby placing unreasonable pressure on Southbourne to supply more new housing than would otherwise be the case.

**Comment**

**Reason:** Concern that Southbourne may be pressured into providing more housing than is needed locally.

- 6 Southbourne Parish Council is concerned that constraints at Shopwyke (including remedial works) and at Westhampnett (including noise, aviation safeguarding and flooding) may lead to delay in delivering sufficient housing in the Chichester area. This would place unreasonable pressure on Southbourne to supply more new housing than would otherwise be the case.

**Comment**

**Reason:** Concern that Southbourne may be pressured into providing more housing than is needed locally.

- 7 Southbourne Parish Council is concerned about the delays to traffic in Stein Road and the severance incurred by the closure of the railway crossing gates for relatively long periods. (para. 8.3 and Policy 8 – timely delivery of transport infrastructure)

**Comment**

**Reason:** Concern that any possible infrastructure or management improvements at the level crossing are in place in time to facilitate delivery of housing either north or south of the railway line so that it does not place undue pressure on traffic movement.

- 8 Southbourne Parish Council is concerned that a document setting out the requirements for the District Council's Community Infrastructure Levy is not yet in place (para. 9.4) This will be required to secure the appropriate contributions from new development sooner rather than later.

**Comment**

**Reason:** Concern that insufficient support will be available to secure infrastructure payments at the right time.