

DRAFT SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF MAIN COUNCIL 5TH APRIL 2022.

**FELPHAM PARISH COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE PLANNING, LICENSING &
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN COMMITTEE
on SATURDAY 19th March 2022 at 3 p.m.**

PRESENT: Councillors: Glen Hewlett, Graham Matthews, Bob Budd, Paul English, George Grundy, Mary Harvey, Michael Harvey, Dave Smart (Ex Officio) , Jaine Wild
Councillor Matthew Copeland was also in attendance in the public gallery.

PL 115. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Councillor Anne Barker, Councillor Gloria Moss, Councillor Ros Kissell

PL 116. ABSENCES WITHOUT APOLOGIES:

There were no absences without apology.

PL 117. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:

The Clerk advises councillors, that under the Localism Act 2011 (C20 Part 1 Chapter 7 Section 33) dispensation can be made and the Dispensation Scheme can be adopted by the Parish Councillors for a period of up to four years regarding the Bognor Regis Golf Course potential development. A copy of the Dispensation Scheme has been distributed to all Parish Councillors and the Scheme adopted at Main Council on December 7th 2021.

Councillor Bob Budd declared an interest as a member of Bognor Regis Golf Club.

PL 118. QUESTION TIME:

Councillor Glen Hewlett welcomed the public to the meeting and outlined the procedure of the meeting, stressing that it was vital that the committee view each application without bias and not prejudge any outcome before the debate. The Planning Committee would also discuss the associated application for the new golf course, as both applications are linked and one cannot progress without the other.

Councillor Hewlett advised that the application for the new golf course is a full application. The application for the residential development on the current golf course site is an Outline application with all matters reserved **EXCEPT** for the entrance to the development off Downview Road. An outline application sets the principle for development if passed by Arun District Council. The fact that the entrance to the proposed development is not, a reserved matter means that if the application is approved, the entrance to the development **will be** through Downview Road.

These applications are set against a background whereby Central Government views Arun District Council as a failing Planning Authority (as it only delivered 65% of its housing target between 2018 and 2021). This means that the Government has a "presumption for development" unless there is a strong case and substantial reasons as to why a development should not take place.

Councillor Hewlett reminded those that attended, that any comments made by Felpham Parish Council are one voice and residents were urged to add their comments separately to these applications.

The first question was raised by Mr Alan Hobbs:

Could the council elaborate on how this application takes account of phase II of Enterprise Bognor Regis (EBR) and the BEW development. Particularly in relation to surface water run-off into the Lidsey Rife but also the maintaining the 'green gap' between Bognor Regis and Felpham. There appears to be a large part of the SUDS plan missing from the Golf Club application but the strategy does specify that the system will flow into the rife. Again the plans for EBR phase II also indicate runoff into the rife. As local residents will attest, the golf course currently waterlogs in the winter months and especially so if/when the rife bursts it's banks. The combined scenario of heavy rainfall and the rife bursting it's banks doesn't appear to have been appropriately considered within the application. And this position will only get considerably worse with the implementation of EBR phase II, which may well rely on the golf course being able to assist with water retention and not add to the load. In addition it's not correct to say that a green corridor will remain following the development of both sites as EBR phase II will develop out to the western bank of the rife and the golf course to within a few meters of the eastern bank.

Councillor Glen Hewlett advised that surface water run off comes under the jurisdiction of the Environment Agency and Southern Water who are statutory consultees. Councillor Graham Matthews advised that West Sussex County Council have stated that they 'do not have any records of the area flooding but this does not mean that it does not flood'.

Mr Simon Wild asked the following:

The government inspector's report during the public consultation for Site 6 (Blake'smead) stated that one of the biggest problems for urban extensions was accessibility for schools. That was never addressed at Site 6, leading to expansion of local schools with overcrowding and traffic chaos, particularly in Wroxham Way, Downview Road and Goodwood Avenue which has affected residents immensely.

Question:

Hallam on behalf of the golf course believe local schools can absorb any extra pupils. Do you agree with that?

When young people have nothing to do they indulge in mischief and anti-social behaviour, and there have been many examples of this at Blakesmead. Youths, some from Blakesmead already visit the land south of the golf course which has permissive access to paths and the landowner receives a DEFRA conservation grant. While there have been attempts to deter anti-social behaviour, nevertheless, they have lit fires, camped out and left huge amounts of litter and the detritus of drug taking, including burnt foil, empty Nitrous Oxide bulbs and deodorant cans, which are used for inhalation.

Question:

Can the Parish Council see that If the plans were accepted, with hundreds of yards of high density social housing to the immediate north and with many youths crammed in with nothing to do, that this conservation area, which is prized by dog walkers and has the best bird habitat in Felpham will be completely ruined?

The golf club states they were motivated to want to move site because the proposed north south road that has ADC's approval would reduce the size of the golf course. And four years ago, when ADC rejected the golf club's plans for inclusion into the local plan, the government inspector while agreeing not to include it did say that it "should be considered If it were resubmitted in the future, as it would help pay for the north south road."

Question:

Would the Parish Council agree that the price of the north south road could lead to the environmental ruin of Felpham and that not only should they oppose the golf club's plans, but they should oppose the north south road as well?

Councillor Glen Hewlett responded to state that Felpham Parish Council had met with Hallam Land Development who stated that there were 65 spaces at Bishop Tufnell School although Downview School is oversubscribed. Schooling is the responsibility of West Sussex County Council and they need to ensure that there is adequate funding from the developer for the schooling needs created by the development. Residents of Downview Road are well aware of issues caused by the traffic and associated bottleneck created by the school pick up and drop offs.

Regarding anti social behaviour, one reason cited by Bognor Regis Golf Club for moving is encroachment and trespass. Sussex Police have been consulted and have put an initial response in. The football pitch now has planning consent. Another reason cited is the North South Road which currently has no plans, funding or project. Further reasons given for the move are winter playing, out of date irrigation system, major works required to the Club House and insufficient facilities.

Councillor George Grundy observed that West Sussex County Council must ensure that children can attend school even if that means funding buses.

Mr David Meagher advised that both Site 4 and the proposed site for housing are very prone to flooding. This application has only considered that site alone. You cannot have both sites developed without looking at both.

He thanked the committee for addressing many of the questions he had sent to the committee prior to the meeting, having answered prior questions from other members of the public.

Questions from The Aldingbourne Footpaths and Rife Country Park Group.

The Group requests that the following questions should be addressed by Arun District Council (the Council) when considering the planning application FP/274/21/OUT (Bognor Regis Golf Course proposed housing development on some 40 hectares).

1. When considering FP/274/21/OUT, the Council must undertake a comprehensive planning exercise which also takes into account the adjoining Council promoted commercial development site known as Site 4 (former LEC Airfield together with associated land and necessary access link road, comprising some 30.5 ha) which is Phase 2 of the Enterprise Bognor Regis Strategic Employment Land Allocations package.

Both developments could occur in a similar timeframe, and:

2. Both proposed developments would have major impacts on the character of the Local Gap in this part of the Bognor Regis Green Wedge area. The Local Gap policy seeks to prevent coalescence and retain the identity of the settlements concerned. Thus, key questions to answer are: Would these two developments cumulatively compromise the integrity of this gap? Would there still be separation between Bognor Regis and Felpham?

3. Both development sites are in Flood Zone 3 (the most likely to flood) of the Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning and so must be carefully considered together so that they both will be safe for their lifetime taking into account the vulnerability of their users and that they both won't, when considered together, increase the flood risk elsewhere, particularly downstream.

4. Both developments would have a major impact on two important nature conservation designations; namely the Lidsey Rife Biodiversity Opportunity Area and the Rife's Local Green Space.

5. The Flood Risk Assessment report which accompanies the proposed housing development does not demonstrate that it takes into account the adjoining proposed employment site, either in the Baseline or Post Development Hydraulic Modelling. Why is this vital piece of information missing?
6. Sole vehicular access to the proposed housing is via the existing Downview Road, an already well used Class D, Local Distributer Road. Even with proposed junction improvements at the B2259/Downview Road traffic light junction, will this extra traffic load not cause terrible delays, especially at peak times? Should the proposed housing on the golf course only be directly accessible from the A259 Relief Road, as was the recent new housing development which contributed substantially to the cost of building the Relief Road? Importantly, those new developments were deliberately designed not to have direct vehicular access through to the existing housing areas. So why should the golf course housing development have its main access via the existing housing area?
7. A key part of the drainage strategy is to provide a flood berm (or bank) to separate the north from the south part of the site, and to place new development on platforms to raise it above the surrounding existing grounds levels. Thus, it is assumed that a substantial amount of suitable fill material will need to be imported on to the site from elsewhere to achieve these works? With this in mind, we question:
- Where will this material come from?
 - How much material will need to be imported?
 - How many lorry loads will this equate to?
 - What will be the designated 'haul route' for such lorry traffic?
 - Has the cost of such material and the associated transport costs been incorporated into the overall cost per dwelling calculations?
8. As we know, the existing Golf Club is situated in a Flood Zone 3 (the most likely to flood) of the Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning, BUT this is also the case for the proposed New Golf Course. So how does this register as an improvement, are there really true benefits? Also, why should the relocation of the existing Golf Course take so much 'centre stage' attention?

Councillor Glen Hewlett agreed that a wider strategic view should be taken. With regard the strategic gap, a recent planning decision at Goring has now set a precedent meaning that all strategic gaps may be lost.

Sandra Dwyer asked the following question:

Road access to the development will be via Golf Links Road. This will necessitate a change in priority to form a new road junction into the site. In addition, a number of local improvements to offsite junctions and existing Public Rights of Way will be provided. Land crossing the northern part of the golf course will be safeguarded (kept open and available) for the delivery of a new link road between the A259 and the current airfield.

There is already partial access provided off the roundabout into Stanhorn Road first right going into the fenced off development land at the front of Blake Mead estate (please see below)— Would it not be more sensible for additional traffic, to use this more direct route into the new estate, rather than increasing the traffic through Felpham village using the B2259 or having to build another junction further up the A259 Charles Purley Way?

An additional question mentioned the need for dog waste bins.

Councillor Glen Hewlett advised that environmental studies have been carried out by the developer including TPOs and two hectares of additional planting.

Regarding flooding, there is existing strain on the system as Southern Water are already discharging sewage.

Regarding additional infrastructure, under the Community Infrastructure Levy, this should be large enough to accommodate any new development but does not include primary care. There are currently no NHS dentists in local area. The Commissioning Care Group would need to apply for sufficient funds. The Ford Development included extended the existing GP provision.

Regarding footpaths, permissive ways can be withdrawn. Public Rights of Way need consultation, but some have been diverted.

The Clerk advised that although Felpham Parish Council can purchase additional dog bins but currently these cannot be emptied.

Mr Brown commented that the flooding strategy consultants are suggesting raised platforms. This will require a large importation of suitable material which will need to come in along Downview Road. A large number of HGVs will be bringing this in and this needs to be considered. Has this been added to cost benefit analysis?

Site 4 hydraulic survey does not allow for Development 4 and the loss of Flood Zone 3. This is not in the calculations. Both developments will remove valuable land that holds water.

Plans Show potential access onto the relief road and is this something that could be a possibility. Site 6 had to exit onto relief road. Would this development be allowed?

Councillor Glen Hewlett advised that there is no exit onto A259 and the Golf Club do not own the land. A concession is that a corridor across the current golf course is to be made available and the road will require to be 'provided by others'. There is no project, money and timescale for this. The only access currently is Downview Road.

Councillor Glen Hewlett agreed that planning should be more strategic.

Importation and exportation is usually controlled as part of planning consent.

A resident of Limmer Lane asked whether this development contravenes Arun Local Plan and the Felpham Neighbourhood Plan. It was confirmed that this was indeed the case.

Mr Knight commented that some of trees on the development have TPOs and asked whether they can be lifted? Councillor Glen Hewlett confirmed that they can be lifted but this has to go through a process. Councillor Paul English advised that TPOs cannot be used to stop a house being built. On Site 6 (Blakes Mead) a lot of trees had TPOs and contractors visited early on a Sunday morning and removed them before residents could react. They received a small fine and had to put in whips. Councillor Glen Hewlett advised that the application is to remove and replace trees.

Mr Ian Petty asked what the Parish Council's considered opinion was on the number of objections required on access, to make a difference to Planning Officers. Councillor Glen Hewlett advised that Felpham Parish Council will debate both applications and make any comments to Arun District Council Planning who will make a decision on both applications and Felpham Parish Council are a statutory consultee. Any opposition must be on planning grounds and must be on a legal ground. Numbers are immaterial but legal objections are very important. Each person has a voice and must make this known through a comment to Arun District Council through the planning portal. Every objection will be viewed.

District Councillor Dave Edwards advised that a single objection based on planning grounds would be sufficient, but objections must be based on planning and without a groundswell of opinion, this will be recommended for approval. Parish Council comments immediately go to Arun District Council Committee who will then make a decision based on officers' advice and the committee will make their own opinion. An appeal can only be based on the committee's grounds for decision. Felpham Parish Council have a list of reasons for objection. The more people that object will make the committee think, but a decision must come down to genuine reasons that cannot be mitigated by the developer.

Regarding Local plans and Neighbourhood plans, Councillor Dave Edwards advised that in 2014 the Golf Club was not deemed developable but if there is a need for planning in a district this can be challenged. Arun District Council are duty bound to consider an application, even if it goes against the Local Plan. Councillor Glen Hewlett confirmed that there are villages locally who have a Neighbourhood Plan but due to presumption, have developments that have been recommended.

Councillor Paul English advised that officers did challenge the plans for the Blake's Mead development, in order to obtain the best possible outcome for residents. The Inspector did not allow access through Felpham Village as this would ruin the ambience and the well being of local residents.

Councillor David Edwards asked the room whether they would still object if housing developers were able to gain access to relief road, and Downview provide emergency access only. The room overwhelmingly indicated that they would still be opposed to the development.

PL 119. CORRESPONDENCE:

None

PL 120. PLANNING APPLICATIONS:

FP/274/21 /OUT	Bognor Regis Golf Club Downview Road Felpham PO22 8JD	Outline planning application with all matters reserved, except means of access, for the erection of up to 480 new homes (C3), the formation of a new means of access onto Golf Links Road, together with the creation of new surface water drainage, new landscaping and habitat creation, ground works and other infrastructure and the retention and re-purposing of the retained club house (F2). This site also lies within the parish of Yapton, affects a Public Right of Way and is a Departure from the Development Plan. This application is subject to an Environmental Statement.
M/16/22/P L	Land South of Grevatts Lane/A259 Climping	Laying out of an 18 hole 72 par golf course, a 9 hole golf course, practice greens and a driving range including a buggy compound; the formation of a new access onto the A259; construction of a club house with associated golf club facilities; the construction of a maintenance building and external area of hardstanding; the laying of parking, new roads and paths; new landscape planting; surface water drainage basins and water storage resevoirs; and other earth works and infrastructure. This application also lies within the parishes of Climping and Yapton, is a Departure from the Development Plan and affects a Public Right of Way. This application is subject to an Environmental Statement.

Councillor Glen Hewlett invited the comments of the planning committee.

Councillor Graham Matthews commented that Downview Road is totally inadequate to be used for the building and future use of 480 additional homes. It used to be one of four routes

onto the nearby estates which has now been reduced to three following the legal closure of the Roundle Estate as a through route.

Since the building of the Blake's Mead Estate, the two schools off of Downview Road have more than doubled in size making Downview Road extremely busy at the opening and closing times for the schools. Downview Road was considered not to be suitable as an access route for the builders of Blake's Mead and residents of Blake's Mead. It is also part of the 20mph scheme in Felpham Village.

The connecting road B2259 on the opening of the Felpham Link A259 road became very quiet, however, over the last three years it has reverted to being the prime route of travel through Felpham due to the increasing load on the A259, following the development in the Shripney area causing delays on the A259.

The increase in size of the two schools has also led to on street parking in roads such as Rife Way by parents dropping off/picking up students.

Regarding foul water, Southern Water have shown over the last few years, that it does not have the capacity to handle the current foul water load during periods of light rain leading to regular discharge of untreated sewage into nearby streams and the sea. No further building should be undertaken until Southern Water increases its capacity.

Regarding medical cover, the nearest medical centre 'Flansham Park' has confirmed that they will not be able to take on the number of patients arising from this development without it causing problems and Dr Rogers, a practice partner, has objected publicly.

Taking the average family, this development would mean 544 additional children. Felpham Community College now has only 19 vacancies.

Councillor Matthews also raised concerns regarding safety at the junction on the A259 where the proposed access to the new golf course will be created.

Councillor Jaine Wild expressed her anger at the situation that will be created on Downview Road. As a resident who lives next door to Downview School she has witnessed the increase in capacity to the point where thousands of people are driving daily to and from the school making it impossible for residents to leave and arrive at their homes. Older people live in bungalows and ambulances would not be able to travel to an emergency at certain times of the day. Regarding GP provision, Councillor Wild also pointed out that at Flansham Medical Practice, Doctor Rogers has opposed the development. Now it is very difficult for residents to see a doctor or talk to them on the phone, the development would make this much worse. The beautiful golf course which amongst much wildlife has deer and cuckoos etc is in grave danger.

Regarding the new golf course, Councillor Wild advised that the A259 is a fast-flowing road with already dangerous junctions such as Comet Corner. The new access will be dangerous and there have already been fatalities on this stretch of road.

Councillor Mary Harvey commented that she is not opposed to golf club moving but pointed out that this land historically floods. However, she is completely opposed to houses being built which will only increase flooding which is already a hazard on the coastal plain. In addition, Downview Road is totally unsuitable for the additional traffic that would be created. Extra demand on doctors, schools, air pollution and the loss of natural habitat for wildlife and people are also of great concern.

If the Golf Club wish to move, this land should remain as green open space for enjoyment.

Councillor Michael Harvey questioned how Arun District Council can continue to find land to build on. Traffic will be horrendous, and the development will destroy wildlife, be unsightly

and cause a loss of the local green gap. The development goes against 11 points in Neighbourhood Plan. He stressed that we must protect the gap between settlements. In addition, the Club house needs much expenditure. Councillor Harvey questioned what the use of a Neighbourhood Plan is, if it can be ignored in this way. Noise, disturbance and smells are also material considerations that should be taken into account. The land should be used for allotments and not houses.

Councillor George Grundy agreed that he was also concerned about flooding, but his primary concerns are as to whether Felpham can assist with the education of children when numbers increase to almost double from the development.

Councillor Paul English agreed that wildlife and trees need to be protected. He expressed concerns that Southern Water would manage the new development appropriately and pointed out that they had been fined for polluting, but this still continues. Regarding the roads, £1m of mitigation money was spent in Felpham to improve road safety including the Downview Road traffic lights which had safety improvements to help all age groups. The developers now wish to negate this to accommodate the additional vehicles created by up to 600 homes. These cars will use Downview Road, Outerwyke Road and Firs Avenue and the additional traffic will obliterate this side of the village. Currently, it can take up to 45 minutes to drive from Felpham to Littlehampton and the additional commuters will only increase this. This site application will destroy the health and safety and wellbeing of residents. When the Blake's Mead development took place, additional funds were allocated to the Flansham Park Medical Centre but they will be unable to cope with the additional 1000 residents. He stressed the importance of every resident making their voices heard and objecting on planning reasons.

Councillor Bob Budd stated that as a relatively new resident of Felpham he enjoyed living in the village and the community. Although he is a member of the Golf Club this will not influence his decision and he will represent the community of Felpham and follow the will of the majority who are opposed to the development.

Councillor Dave Smart reinforced the concerns voiced regarding traffic levels on Downview Road and pointed out that Felpham Parish Council had recently received the results of a speed and traffic survey. He estimated a 50 to 60 per cent increase in the traffic that would be using this road. The construction traffic would also be more dangerous as this is a major pedestrian route for children throughout the day. The plan does not recognize this and also incorrectly states that there is an hourly bus service along Wroxham Way. On Site 6 which has 850 to 900 houses, the A259 was required. The road has two roundabouts acknowledging the traffic volume. The new Golf Course is over 50 percent of the size of that development, but no allowances have been made and plans are to bring traffic out through a 20mph zone and into a residential development. This is not fair or safe.

In the plan it also states that many days of golfing have been lost due to the course being waterlogged which is clearly an admission of a flood problem. According to Beach Buoy there had been well over fifty releases of water to Lidsey Rife in late 2021 indicating that the natural drainage is already struggling and under pressure. There is very little mentioned about riparian responsibilities in the plan.

The Golf Club House in need of investment but being this is being gifted to the community. Councillor Smart questioned who will be financially responsible for this.

The transport plan incorrectly mentions the Neighborhood Plan but looks at an older version and is incorrect.

Councillor Glen Hewlett stated that he has lived in Felpham for over 30 years. This development will fundamentally change Felpham. It is an excessive overload on local services, residents already cannot get appointments with a doctor/dentist. Having walked along Downview Road at school time, the traffic is unbelievable. Wildlife on the beautiful golf course will be decimated and deer have already been killed on the bypass.

The application has been poorly thought out, with no communication with the Parish Council. Only 1500 homes were consulted but this will affect the whole village. It has also been, in his view, arrogantly presented and the Parish Council had to almost beg for a meeting with the Golf Club and this would have been held after they called in for comments on their original application. They (the land agents) considered it a 'done deal' in his view.

There are two elements to the application. Firstly, we will lose the golfing facility that we have currently got. Regarding the new course at Ancton, this is a wildlife area and has public rights of way. We are at this point due to the mismanagement of Bognor Regis Golf Club for last 30 years in his opinion. Councillor Hewlett would also be opposing the application.

Regarding planning application, FP/274/21/OUT, Councillor Glen Hewlett proposed that Felpham Parish Council strongly object to this planning application on a number of significant planning grounds and in consideration of the feeling of the committee members. This was seconded by Councillor Dave Smart and unanimously voted for by committee members.

Regarding planning application M/16/22/PL, Councillor Glen Hewlett proposed that Felpham Parish Council strongly object to this planning application on a number of significant planning grounds and in consideration of the feeling of the committee members. This was seconded by Councillor Graham Matthews and unanimously voted for by committee members.

Councillor Glen Hewlett advised that the objections of Felpham Parish Council will now be drafted and following submission to Arun District Council via the Planning Portal, this will be available on the website along with many objections that are relevant and can assist residents to make an argument. He urged residents to use these and put them in their own words ensuring that the word 'object' is mentioned. Councillor Jaine Wild pointed out that objections can be altered by their author after submission.

April 9th is the crucial date when officers will look at the objections raised. A decision will be expected in May/June and as soon as Felpham Parish Council are aware of the outcome this will be placed on the website.

PL 112. MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE (with the prior consent of the Chairman):

None.

PL 113. BUSINESS AT CHAIRMAN'S DISCRETION:

None.

PL 114. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: Tuesday 12th April 2022 at 18:15

In closing, the Felpham residents thanked Felpham Parish Council for their work.

The meeting closed at 15.39pm

Signed.....

Date.....