**DRAFT**

**Minutes of the Annual Parish Meeting of Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council held remotely on 29 April 2021 at 7:30pm**

Present: Cllr P MacDougall (Chair) Cllr C Archer

Cllr P Bolton Cllr B Garrett Cllr S Bramwell Smith Cllr R Gowlett Cllr G Hyde Cllr R Perri Cllr J Sheppard Cllr J Towers

In attendance: District Cllrs A Moss, P Plant and D Rodgers

 County Cllr M Magill

 Clerk & RFO, Bambi Jones

43 members of Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council attended this meeting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. | **Introduction and Welcome**The Chair, Cllr P MacDougall, welcomed everyone to the meeting. He advised that the precept in 2021-2022 had been kept at same level as the previous year. The May Parish Council meeting would be held remotely by Zoom but the June meeting would be back to face-to-face format. The Council was still assessing where to hold this meeting; a risk assessment would need to be carried out for the selected venue. The Council has introduced a method of recognising those in the community who had gone out of their way in helping others. We had had one nomination this year. Resident John Letheren, featured on the front page of Village News, had tidied up the length of Broad Road - cutting back hedges to make the footpath accessible. The Council wanted to acknowledge his contribution and a letter would be sent to him following the meeting. |
| 2. | **To approve the minutes of the last Annual Parish Meeting held on 30 May 2019****Resolved:** That the minutes of this meeting be approved. |
| 3 | **Acceptance of written reports from our District Councillors (Adrian Moss, Penny Plant and David Rodgers) and our County Councillor (Mike Magill) with a brief question and answer session.**The following questions were raised:- Queried the housing numbers from the district councillors’ perspective on our village. Mr District Cllr Moss advised that based on current information in the documentation released to the parishes, the number of houses proposed for this parish was 400. Conversations had taken place between the Parish Councillors and CDC Planning Officers when presenting the evidence of the work they were doing on the Neighbourhood Plan (NP). This number was subject to change as new evidences came in. District Cllrs were working hard for all the villages in their ward to get the right outcome. The Parish Council was working very hard to get the evidence that 400 was too high for this parish.- Queried traffic control in the north of the parish with bikes, horses, large lorries, speeding cars and the current limit of 30mph in Priors Leaze Lane and Hambrook Hill South having no effect at reducing speeding cars. County Cllr Magill advised that he was looking at traffic management in the area. There had been a pushback on his request for signage in the rural lanes in the north of the parish. The Chemroute cycle route was progressing and the reduction of speed on the A259 was being considered having brought in safety teams to see how speed could be reduced. - Queried whether, without a Local Plan (LP), larger planning applications could be put on hold. District Cllr Plant confirmed that the LP had expired and CDC had developed an Interim Housing Statement. CDC follows high standards in assessing planning applications to ensure that parishes are not over-developed. A number of developers had taking their refused applications to appeal. District Cllr Moss advised that the Parish Council was putting some of the best reasoned arguments and should be congratulated in its response to applications. The Planning Committee, chaired by Cllr Roger Gowlett, considered all planning applications and the Parish Council would hold a public meeting of residents in the case of larger applications.- Concern re the difficulty of getting a meeting with the local MP. District Cllr Plant advised that Mrs Keegan had been working very hard and had met with several local councils and liaised with fellow MPs regarding planning issues. She was also meeting with the Leader of CDC and with District Councillors on a regular basis.  |
| 4. | **Acceptance of written reports from chair of the Parish Council (Cllr P MacDougall) and other members of the council – Cllr J Towers (roads and transport, travel, school liaison, footways), Cllr C Archer (Drainage, sea defence and trees), Cllr R Perri (Play area, Broad Road) and Cllr P Bolton (the Meadows) with a brief question and answer session.** (Reports available at above link)The Parish Councillors were introduced and their written reports were acknowledged.The following queries were raised:- One resident declared an interest in tree planting and asked about rewilding the parish and contributing to endeavours to minimise climate change. Cllr Bolton, Chair of the Public Open Spaces Advisory Committee, advised that the Council was in the process of acquiring the meadow alongside west side of Broad Rd to the north and that once this had occurred the Council had a development plan for both of its meadows. Cllr Archer said that at present the scope for wilding was not possible in Hawthorne Meadow but possibly in Pynham Meadow. As the Council’s lead on trees, he had spoken to all the land owners in the parish and had identified a handful of areas for trees. Some individual landowners were willing to have a tree outside their property on the verge. In order to get funding the landowner would need to agree to maintain the tree. - Queried the availability of allotments on Pynham Meadow, not just to the development’s residents, but to the wider parish. Those interested in having an allotment should contact the Clerk to put their name down. There would also be an orchard on Pynham Meadow which would be on the west side. Work needed to be done to the existing culvert to connect ditches. - A query was raised about the wildlife corridors and what remit the Council has in safeguarding those areas. We have rare species in this are from the AONB to the South Downs. Sarah Hughes is the District Council’s Wildlife Officer who put the wildlife corridors together. They are waiting for the LP to be finalised and then the corridors will become final. The District Council has found some Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) monies to fund her for a further 3 years work.  The Parish Council’s Environment Group was working with Sarah Hughes and wildlife corridors are being factored in when responding to planning applications. However, at present they are not policy in the old LP and they do not have the same weight as policy which has been implemented. When arguing against a planning application we need to use those policies which stand up the strongest. The Government’s National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) should be used as a guide. There was a titled balance in that the District Council has no LP and no 5 year housing supply. The Parish Council’s arguments against applications have been found very useful.  |
| 5. | **The *Revised Neighbourhood Plan*** **(NP)**Cllr MacDougall (Chair of the Parish Council’s Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG)) advised that the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) was working on a revised NP. The group consisted of local residents and Parish Councillors. The original NP was approved in June 2016. CDC’s project plan would see the LP agreed by March 2023. Southbourne Parish Council had completed their NP and had agreed 1200 dwellings. This Parish Council had not agreed to accept the allocated housing number of 500. The Council’s NP needed to dovetail with the District Council’s LP. If we produced a NP out of kilter with the LP we would not get it past the Government Inspector. And if the Council had agreed a housing number allocation of 250 based on the residents’ survey, the District Council’s LP may still allocate us a housing number allocation of 400.   |
| 6. | **Open discussion on the *Revised Neighbourhood Plan*, the results of the residents’ survey and the problems we as parish need to confront.**Residents were encouraged to express their views on future of the village. The Council had been advised by Planning Officers that we had not done enough local consultation. This meeting was being used as part of the consultation process. Residents’ view and comments were very important to the Council and we would be passing them on to CDC.- Queried whether the Parish Council had any choices in the provision of amenities as part of the planning process. Cllr MacDougall advised that it was difficult as the Council was still going through its assessment of the sites submitted as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process. Mr Johnson advised that the Planning Committee considered planning applications on their merits and made comments. So far every major application before the Council had been objected to. The developer was only concerned with their application and not the effects on the village. Without a revised published housing number it was very difficult to assess applications. If one of the large applications was agreed by CDC or agreed on appeal Pallant Homes has said it would work with us to implement the design. If all applications along the A259 were agreed there would be roughly 450 homes.- Concern re infrastructure e.g. road, sewage, community facilities required with large scale developments. District Cllr Moss explained the process of Community Infrastructure Levy payments made by the developer for infrastructure purposes. The pot was divided up between the District Council, WSCC and the Parish for education, libraries, roads, etc.- Queried the housing number accepted in Southbourne. Cllr MacDougall advised that these were all on one site. Over the next few months there would be a statement of ground agreed agreed between Southern Water, the Environment Agency and the District Council regarding the waste water treatment works where there is limited capacity for new homes. Southern Water is able to discharge in to the harbour if the alternative was to discharge brown water into people’s homes. The quality of water in the harbour was very good and accurate.. Queried the Local Plan to be determined by March 2023 and whether the NPSG had lost an opportunity as planning applications would be submitted on most of the sites before the Local Plan was agreed. District Cllr Moss advised that the Local Plan would be finalised and published in Spring 2022 and submitted in the Summer of 2022. Then it went to examination in Autumn 2022 and would be adopted in Spring 2023. The document would hold a lot more weight when it was published in Spring 2022. It was possible that the numbers would be revised before that time. The Parish Council wanted to get the numbers to an acceptable level suitable for the parish and to enable us to produce a NP that would be acceptable to residents. The Parish was in a difficult position.- Queried that CDC was demanding a housing allocation in areas put forward in the HELAA report and concern that the planning system in the country was broken. Cllr MacDougall advised that the Council received a grant annually for preparing the Neighbourhood Plan. The Council held regular meetings with CDC to discuss these issues. Should a developer get outline planning permission they would still need to take a full planning application to CDC for approval. At this point we would need to get involved and endeavour to shape the application.   |
| 7. | **Residents are invited to raise any matters of interest**Cllr MacDougall advised that the Parish Council was looking at the constraints on each site in the NP and had met with all developers to discuss these and other matters. The sites had been placed in order of priority. Sound reasons for accepting or rejected a site were needed. The Council had grant funding to allow us to appoint consultants to assist us with preparing that information.A query was raised about the reduction of CO2 emissions and how much influence we had. The Parish Council would have policies in the NP related to the building of homes and to mitigate against climate change. In terms of sustainable travel electric charging points were requirements on developments as well. The District Council also had policy requirements in those areas and would work with the Parish Council to ensure that the policies were dovetailed. When the policies were finalised, these would be advertised on the Council’s website and leaflets would be put out to residents in the parish for them to comment.  |
|  |  |

The meeting closed at 9.30pm