# West Itchenor Parish Council

Minutes of a Meeting of West Itchenor Parish Council held on Monday 11 July 2016 in Itchenor Memorial Hall.

Present: Mr G Colbourne, Mr J Dunn, Mr C Mead-Briggs, Mr A Spencer (Chairman) Mrs S Taylor, Mr C Watson

In attendance: Mrs C Smith (Clerk), Mr P Montyn (WSCC), Mr G Barrett (CDC), Mrs E Hamilton (CDC), 4 members of public

The meeting commenced at 7pm.

**55/16C Chairman's Welcome**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**56/16C Questions/comments from members of the public.**

A resident questioned what action had been taken on the previous request for the Parish Council to undertake a risk assessment on potential incursions by Gypsy's and Travellers. The Chairman advised that any incursions would be the responsibility of any landowners to deal with and the Parish Council would offer support if required.

Mr Barrett advised that the Police had the powers to move on travellers now that the transit site was in full operation.

A resident suggested that the Parish Council had a statutory power to protect the Common. It was suggested that the Parish Council should have a plan in case of any incursion on the Common. It was agreed that the Parish Council would look at this.

A resident restated concern that the Parish Council was not supporting other local parishes by writing to the Secretary for State about the original seven options for the A27.

The Chairman confirmed that the letter was discussed and that it was felt that it would not serve any useful purpose.

**57/16C District and County Councillor reports.**

Mr Montyn updated the Council on Conservancy matters.

The Planning Committee is considering new planning guidelines in conjunction with CDC. A number of changes are to be implemented which would tighten the rules within the AONB. The documents are current with CDC for approval then they will go to the Conservancy Consultative Committee for adoption. The first policy will be a supplementary planning document when approved.

Regarding the helicopter landing in the field – AONB regulations are different in individual areas. Richard Austin (AONB Manager, Conservancy) had been asked to raise the issue of helicopters in AONB but the governing body was not interested.

Last week saw the Annual Meeting of the Conservancy and Advisory Committee. The meeting had looked at how to raise funds, what could be done to give the Conservancy more stature, better communication and a visitor centre. Members also looked at what could be done to give the Conservancy more power in planning matters.

The County Council Waste and Recycling survey closed on 12 June with nearly 5000 responses. These have been evaluated and a number of recommendations put together and reviewed which will be going to the Cabinet this week. Mobile sites may stay but might operate fortnightly rather than weekly on the Peninsula.

In response to a query about precedence Mr Montyn advised that the Conservancy is a body in law. Members consist of elected councillors from West Sussex CC, Hampshire CC and CDC and Havant BC and some others from harbour users. The Advisory Committee is constituted slightly differently. Planning is an Advisory

Committee matter only. The District Council has the final say in planning matters. The Conservancy is treated as a statutory consultee but it is not actually.
Mr Barrett had previously issued a report which is appended to these Minutes.
Traveller site in Birdham, the public enquiry starts 20 December for 3 days. Currently not all issues appear to be covered by enquiry and this is being looked into. In addition, a retrospective application for topsoil has now gone in.
Another enquiry for Earnley starts on Wednesday and officials are waiting to see what happens with this one.
The Sandpiper site visit was abandoned as traffic problems. There are issues with the development with regard to refuse collections as the road is not up to the required standard.

**58/16C Apologies for absence.**

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Cllr Trevelyan.

**59/16C Declarations of Interest.**

Cllr Colbourne declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10 as a member of Itchenor Sailing Club.
Cllr Spencer declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10 as a member of Itchenor Sailing Club.
Cllr Mead-Briggs declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10 as a member of Itchenor Sailing Club.
Cllr Dunn declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10 as a member of Itchenor Sailing Club.
Cllr Dunn declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 16 as a resident living adjacent to the Common.

**60/16C The Minutes of the Annual Parish Council meeting held on 16 May 2016.**

The Chairman called for the approval of the Minutes of the Annual Parish Council meeting held on 16 May 2016. These were **APPROVED** and the Chairman duly signed the minutes as being a true record of the meeting.

**61/16C Matters arising from the minutes of 16 May 2016.**

Min 39/16C, page 2
Cllr Watson has taken over as chair of the Neighbourhood Management Panel which will continue despite the lack of any Police involvement.
Min 52/16C, page 6
A question was raised as to whether the newsletter was going to be issued soon. This was confirmed.
Min 52/16C, page 5
In relation to Mr Barrett's comments about raising the issues of the mobile skips at the all Parishes Meeting it was noted that this had been discussed. The District Council is looking to extend recycling facilities but it has different targets to the County Council and there appears to be a lack of joined up thinking between the two organisations.
Min 52/16C, page 6
In relation to PCSO's preventative and proactive policing has now gone. PCSO's will operate centrally and will react to issues. Residents with issues are advised to call 101 for non-emergency situations or 999 if it is an emergency or a crime is taking place.
Min 52/16C, page 5
In response to a question about the state of the bridge by the pond it was noted that this was in hand with Highways.

Min 52/16C, page 5

In regard to the verge by the black bungalow, letters have been sent to local parties and responses are awaited.

Min 45/16C, page 3

Mr Barrett had reported that the owner could appeal a section 215 notice and there was concern that an appeal could be costly. The Parish Council was advised that owner could appeal against notice but this would be heard by the Magistrates Court. With the cost of appeal being one reason for the District Council's reluctance to issue a Section 215 notice Mr Barrett was asked whether then in light of this information could this be reviewed as Magistrates cannot award costs.

The Parish Council expressed some frustration to the District Councillors as it felt that with clear laid down policies it was infuriating that the District Council were refusing to take any action. There was also further concern that planning decisions were being made without any clear reference to policies.

Mr Barrett agreed to take the issue of Old Haven up again with the Enforcement Manager.

**62/16C The Minutes of Planning Committee meetings - 16 May and 6 June 2016.**

The Minutes of the Planning Meetings held on 16 May and 6 June 2016 were **NOTED**.

The issue of the red card procedure was raised with the District Councillors with a request for the procedure to be explained. Mr Barrett responded that if the Parish Council suggests refusal of application he would always ask the Parish Council to meet with Officers to go through which are planning issues which are not. If there is a case where the Parish Council comments are valid and Officers are not prepared to take the application to Committee, then they will use the red card. Mr Barrett was advised that this then puts the Parish Council in an impossible position because effectively the District Councillors could veto the Parish Council decision.

Both District Councillors were asked if they were aware of the West Itchenor VDS an excellent document adopted by the District Council. The Parish Council suggested it struggling with planning applications and felt it was not getting the support it needed.

The importance of the VDS was highlighted including references to it in planning decisions. Several planning decisions that clearly breached the VDS were highlighted and Councillors felt very strongly that the Planning Committee spent considerable time on planning applications but that the District Council and the District Councillors were ignoring this.

The marine boat store application was highlighted where the applicant went to appeal and the Planning Inspector had said he was more interested in the views of the people on the ground than the District Council. The Planning Inspector had also highlighted an obligation on the District Council to carry out enforcement.

It was suggested that the Red Card system was fundamentally flawed. Parish Councils were advised when the consultation system changed that with DOM applications if the Parish Council felt strongly about it they could get their District Councillor to Red Card it. There was no reference to having to persuade a District Councillor to use a Red Card.

Mr Barrett explained that now Parish Councils have the opportunity to meet with Officers, highlighting previous issues where Parish Councils had recommended refusal then hadn't bothered to come to the Planning Committee to put their case forward.

It was agreed that the District Councillors would receive copies and guidance on the West Itchenor VDS.

**63/16C The Minutes of the Annual Parish Meeting held on 15 April 2016.**

The Chairman called for the approval of the Minutes of the Annual Parish Meeting held on 15 April 2016. The number of people attending was amended to read 100. These were **APPROVED** and the Chairman duly signed the Minutes as being a true record of the meeting.

It was noted that the guest speakers had been very well received and thanks were given to Cllr Mead-Briggs for arranging for Andrew Tyrie MP to speak at the meeting.

**64/16C Advertising boards within the Conservation Area**

Complaints had been received by members of public against the recent erection of a new advertising sign at the entrance to the Itchenor Sailing Club. Although the sign had been sited on Sailing Club land there was concern that even if the sign had not required planning consent it should have had adverting consent.

It was noted that the management of the Sailing Club had wanted to put a notice board at the entrance to the lane and it was advised that in a Conservation Area they were advised that planning consent would be required. The Sailing Club had written to the District Council to check what permissions would be required and had been advised that no permission was necessary and only had to move a WSCC footpath sign.

Several Councillors expressed concern about the sign and the lack of any consultation with residents or the Parish Council even if it had been advised that permission was not required. Reference was made to the reassessment of the Conservation Area which was carried out in 2009 and that it had highlighted in particular the importance of The Street within the Conservation Area. Page 21 of the Conservation Area Character Appraisal states: “In the exercise of any powers under the Planning Acts with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention must be made to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area” and “The display of advertisements may be more restricted than elsewhere”.

It was agreed that the District Councillors would take this up with the Planning Officers.

There was a suggestion from a resident that the Parish Council should write to the Sailing Club and ask for the sign to be removed.

It was agreed that the Clerk would write to the Sailing Club expressing concern about the sign and requesting copies of emails from the District Council that confirmed that permission was not required.

**65/16C Environment Working party update**

An update on the continuing work of the Environment working party had previously been circulated, a copy of which is appended to these Minutes.

There was a question on the IDB abolition as Spinney Lane residents wanted to dredge the rife from the pond to make it flow more efficiently. Dominic Henley (CDC) had advised that as this was maintenance no permission was required. The Environment Agency is aware and this is being monitored very closely. The silt is about 3 feet deep which is of concern as there is too much to spread on the banks so it will have to be taken away. There was concern that pond has also been contaminated.

At a meeting with Southern Water last week a number of issues were raised in great detail. It was suggested that Southern Water effectively responsible for contaminating pond and residents were looking for a contribution for taking contamination away.
This was useful for Southern Water as it highlighted interesting things they didn't know such as where the water flows. They have a schedule of work but were not prepared to share with the Parish Council but it was important to know it may conflict with work being done by the Parish Council.
It was noted that the Southern Water schedule of works was awaiting approval and this should be chased again in a few months.

The Chairman stated that there had been more progress on these issues in the last 12 months than the past 5 years and thanks were expressed to Cllr Dunn and Cllr Watson.

**66/16C A27 Highway Improvements consultation**

Highways England has now announced that the consultation on the improvements to the A27 at Chichester starts on 14 July and will run for 10 weeks. A number of exhibitions are planned and details of these have been put on the Parish Council website. Further to this District Councillor Graeme Barrett had also advised via email of the options that would appear on the consultation.

Mr Barrett reported that a large number of parishes wrote to the Minister with responses being received from Highways England. This had been taken further and had since received an apology from the Department for Transport. This was again followed up by letter with information on planning applications that will have an impact on A27 such as Shopwhyke Lakes, Whitehouse Farm and the Free School. Highways England has advised on its website on five options for the consultations. He is trying now through the Peninsula Forum to send a leaflet to residents to encourage them to engage in the consultation which starts on 14 July.
Are the options clear or satisfactory? A large number of stakeholders were advised that there were a number of other options.

It was agreed that an information leaflet might be helpful but there was some discussion on whether this should just highlight the exhibitions or whether residents should be advised on the best option with a view to getting support for this. It was suggested that if it was clear to the Parish Council there was an optimal decision then it should promote this.

It was suggested that the purpose of the consultation was looking at getting a better flow from East to West with no reference to feeder routes. A good deal of modelling has been going on but there was concern that the modelling didn't take into account seasonal flows for visitors to West Wittering beach. All the information is available on the Highways England website.

2 members of public left the meeting.
Cllr Taylor made her apologies and left the meeting.

There was further discussion on the purpose of the proposed leaflet and how it would be delivered. Councillors agreed that it was important that people are told what isn't going to happen. This was Highways England route planning but it was not going to deal with issues about accessing Chichester and issues with the level crossings. During the last consultation done in 2004/5 there were 9000 responses which was not a good level of response.

It was suggested that once the plans were available the Parish Council should have an extraordinary meeting to discuss the A27 Improvement consultation.
**RESOLVED** that the Parish Council would hold an extraordinary meeting on Thursday 21 July at 3.30pm to review the A 27 Improvement consultation papers. It was agreed that the Parish Council would not make a decision on its response at this meeting.

Mr Barrett, Mrs Hamilton, Mr Montyn and 1 member of the public left the meeting.

**67/16C Local Council Award Scheme.**

Details of the Local Council Award Scheme had been circulated to Councillors.
It was suggested that the Parish Council should apply for quality status because it reflected its' aspirations.
The cost to apply for the award would be £80.
There was some concern that this could take up a considerable amount of the Clerk's time and may provide no benefit. In addition, there was a lot of work at the moment with issues relating the the Common and the A27 Improvement consultation. In response it was suggested that the Parish Council should in any event be operating at the highest standard and that the award would formally recognise this.
**RESOLVED** that the Parish Council makes an application for quality status in the Local Council Award Scheme but that this would be delayed for six months.

**68/16C Clerks Report.**

Repair of the passing place opposite the Church.
It was noted that the holes were getting deeper but that it was not a very big job to undertake. It was noted that Barry Field had offered to help but would need a team of about four people to do the work. The work should be carried out sometime around September/October and would likely cost up to £200.00
**RESOLVED** that the Parish Council supports a request to repair the passing place opposite the Church. Mr Field would be asked to manage the project and assistance would be sought from residents.

West Sussex County Council – Have your say
Residents and businesses have the next two months to influence how West Sussex County Council shapes what it does and how it spends its budget in future.
The County Council today launched its What Matters to You online survey to find out what people think are its most important services and why.
The questionnaire gives people a say on how more than £500 million pounds worth of council services should be provided for over 821,000 residents.
Answers will influence how the County Council shapes what it does and how it's budget is set for West Sussex in future years.

Newsletter
The newsletter was almost complete with an update on a couple of articles to be provided.

Letter from Andrew Tyrie regarding court closures
The Clerk had received correspondence from Andrew Tyrie MP on the possible court closures in Chichester. It was agreed that this should be circulated.

**69/16C Finance.**

69.1 Notice of changes to the National Salary Scales effective 1 April 2016
It was **NOTED** that the pay scale award had been published for 2016/17 and was to be backdated to 1 April 2016. The notification had also been received for 2017/18.

69.2 Schedule of Payments and Receipts

**RESOLVED** that the payments listed in the Schedule of Payments and Receipts totalling £2,400.00 be made. See appendix 1 (July 2016).

69.3 Statement of Accounts

The statement of accounts up to the 11 July 2016 was **APPROVED** and Cllr Dunn duly signed of the bank statement and bank reconciliation.

**RESOLVED** that in view of the confidential nature of the business about to be transacted, it is advisable in the public interest that the press and public be temporarily excluded and they are instructed to withdraw.
1 member of the public left the meeting.

**70/16C The Common.**

70.1 BT cabinet

The Clerk provided Councillors with an update from a meeting held with Sarah Bazen (WSCC) and Paul Boichat (BT) highlighting the issues surrounding the placing of the cabinet and what happens next.

The Clerk was asked to find out from Ms Bazen where the information on the public maintainable highway had come from.
It was considered that the cabinet should have been placed on the periphery of the Common near the houses.

70.2 Common Registration

The Clerk and Cllr Mead-Briggs had visited the Records Office and had found a map that had given a clearer picture of the ownership of the Common. Some further research was required before the Parish Council could consider how best to take this matter forward.

**71/16C Items for referral to the Parish Council Meeting on Monday 19 September 2016.**

It was **NOTED** that the date of the next meeting had been put back by one week because of the Clerk's availability.

Signed_____Date_____
Chairman