



Imogen Whitaker - Clerk & RFO to the Council  
T: 01243 575094/E: [clerk@birdhamparishcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@birdhamparishcouncil.gov.uk)  
[www.birdham.org.uk](http://www.birdham.org.uk)

---

Minutes of the of the HYBRID Parish Council Meeting  
held on Monday 21st June 2021  
at 7pm in the Village Hall and on Zoom

**Present:** Cllr Timothy Firmston (Chairman,) Cllr Graham Campbell, Cllr Pocock  
Cllr Bush Cllr Hamilton (Zoom)  
WSCC Pieter Montyn CDC Susan Taylor CDC Graeme Barrett CDC Elizabeth Hamilton (zoom)  
12 members of the public.

---

#### **Preamble**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting – the first meeting in person since March last year. He said that some would be attending through zoom. He thanked Cllrs Campbell and Pocock for having put in a lot of work to set up a suitable system to run the hybrid meeting. He asked everyone to stay 2m apart. The doors and windows would remain open and when leaving the hall everyone was asked to wear their masks and use the sanitiser provided.

#### **1. Apologies**

Cllr Glover and Cllr Barrett (CDC). Cllr Churchill was unable to join the meeting through technical issues.

#### **2. Declarations of interest**

- i. Cllr Firmston declared an interest in planning application BI21/01668/DOM
- ii. There were no dispensation requests

#### **3. Minutes – to agree and sign the minutes of 17<sup>th</sup> May 2021 meeting, and the Extraordinary meeting of June 8<sup>th</sup> 2021.**

The minutes of 17<sup>th</sup> May 2021 were proposed by Cllr Bush, seconded by Cllr Pocock and unanimously **AGREED** to be a true and accurate record and were duly signed by the Chairman. The minutes of 8<sup>th</sup> June 2021 were proposed by Cllr Campbell and seconded by Cllr Pocock and unanimously **AGREED** to be a true and accurate record and were duly signed by the Chairman.

The Chairman had received a request from the Village Hall to change the date of the July meeting due to a double booking. It was agreed to hold the meeting on WEDNESDAY 28<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2021. There will not be a meeting in August, but from September 2021, the monthly Parish Council meetings will be held on the third Wednesday of each month at 7pm in the village hall and on zoom.

Action

Clerk

#### **4. Youth Dream Charity presentation**

Mike Nicholls and Kim Yong of the Youth Dream Charity gave a presentation of the work provided by the charity to help young people on the Peninsula.

Mr Nicholls covered the following:

- Mike Nicholls is the Chairman of Youth Dream
- Set up in 2015 in response to WSCC closing the Youth Wing at The Academy Selsey (TAS) and appeal to community to help with youth services
- It is a Registered charity with 8 Trustees
- Building – The Bridge Youth Support Centre
- The Charity provides counselling, mentoring, resilience training, educational support

- The Charity is funded by grants
- In 2019 the Charity was invited by National Lottery to apply for a development grant to produce a strategy for youth provision across Manhood Peninsula
- Network of 18 partners providing youth services (scouts, guides, TAS, Early Help WSCC, STC, Bridge)
- Surveyed just under 1000 children living on Peninsula, in person and by questionnaires
- Attended youth clubs, scouts, guides and every year group at TAS, Year 5s and 6s at Sidlesham and Medmerry Primaries, plus surveys with Birdham and Seal Primaries and Chi High
- Aim to understand WANTS, NEEDS and ASPIRATIONS
- The Strategy was written in 2020 and sent to all youth providers and Parishes
- National Lottery grant to fund the recommendations from the Strategy - £320,000
- Employing two youth workers – East, West for 3 years
- More hours for counselling
- More hours for mentoring
- More hours for inclusion and educational support work

Ms Long explained in more detail the work undertaken:

- Two youth workers go into Primary schools (split East and West) one lunch time a week and to TAS – to help with transition, it is ok to not be ok, and to liaise with staff and children who have problems and getting to know the children
- Clubs wanted – many existed = Manhood Peninsula Youth Leisure Directory
- Girls group starts September
- Youth Development Officer – to help the Youth Clubs that provide the services to the young people. They have just helped the Witterings' Youth club write it Policies and Procedures, Found storage space for Dance Live and for the guides, and helping the Birdham scouts venue
- One of most interesting things to come out of the 3-month consultation was how Primary school children are influenced by current news – annual debating event
- Use of animals – West Wittering, Sidlesham, North Mundham and TAS all have animals to help with anger and other issues
- Transition – walking buses, bus trips
- Lunch club in TAS
- Work to prevent young people becoming NEETS (Not in Education Employment or Training)
- Set up a youth club in Selsey – community warden
- Helping children not in school (17 peninsula wide)
- WSCC and NHS smoking cessation support
- Emergency accommodation register for young people who are suddenly made homeless
- Holiday activity schemes – this summer, partnership, FSM, etc
- Lots of work to be done!

Mr Nicholls said that the Charity was seeking the support of Parish Councils. There was a benefit event planned at Sidlesham Primary School. The Charity wanted all PCs to know what they were doing and to be involved if they wished.

The Chairman thanked them for their presentation and for the great start they had made.

## **5. Public Question time from residents of Birdham in accordance with Standing Orders 1d – 11**

1. A resident had previously emailed the council several times and she explained that the pavement along the A286 was completely overgrown, and low kerbs made it unsafe to walk with a 2- and 5-year-old as lorries driving by could easily drive onto the pavement without realising it. She wanted to ask whether it were possible to have Vehicle Activated Signs or flashing school signs to remind people that not everybody who goes to Birdham School lives on the school side of the A286 and that the road must be crossed. Several parents drive to school because they are too scared to walk along this road with their children. There are also young people using their bikes to get to school.

The Chairman said that the Council has twice asked WSCC to clear this pavement and Birdham is “on the list”. The resident said that a substantial part of the pavement was covered with debris

and overgrowth forcing the children to stand in bushes full of stinging nettles when a lorry drives past too fast.

She asked whether there would be any cycle lanes on this side of the road as there was one on the other side. The Chairman said that the speed limit had been discussed. Cllr Montyn would consult further with the resident (corrected: "with WSCC")

Action

Cllr Montyn

The Chairman said that aspirations of residents were important and that these aspirations were forming part of the Neighbourhood Plan review. Reducing the speed limit on the A286 through Birdham was in the existing 'made' plan and would be carried forward within the current review.

2. A resident said that the "aspirations" of the council were out of date and were never backed up with comments made by the council on planning applications, and their agreement to those plans. He said that in the aspirations the council talked of too much traffic but was prepared to allow the over-development of agricultural sites and brownfield sites to become residential. Cllr Campbell said that the Parish Council cannot give permission. The resident said that council did not point out the anomalies to CDC, nor list its objections. He said that on most large developments there was no come back from the Parish Council and that the mention of increased traffic in the local area affecting the residents was not mentioned. Cllr Bush said that there would be a public consultation on all the sites that were proposed for development in Birdham and that residents would be able to make their views known. He said that the Parish Council was working hard, in tandem with other local parishes, to object to planning applications citing the lack of infrastructure, and the levels of traffic.

The resident went on to raise two further points with the council that he had raised that morning with the clerk. He said that the Minutes and Agendas were not kept up to date and that the last minutes were from 2020. He said that this would be why the Parish does not get the turn-out to meetings or the feedback from residents.

The Clerk said that the Minutes and Agendas were up-to-date and could be found by simply clicking on the tab "council" at the top of the page and the first drop-down box was the Agendas and Minutes. It was not necessary to scroll all the way down to the bottom of the page. She will ask the website company to remove this tab.

Action

Clerk

The resident's second point was about the planning application BI/21/00980/FUL, which had been reviewed by the Council at the May meeting. He said that Council had not done a proper investigation. He said that there had been two applications; for the first there was no objection but developing the property for financial gain on a small parcel of land he felt was not suitable for the area, and that the Parish council, given its local knowledge should have investigated more fully.

The resident went on to explain in detail the issues that had not been addressed:

- Due to locality and the surrounding area the development is not suitable for the space and density of existing properties in Bell Lane on Main Road Birdham
- The spacing and density of the new development and of properties in Chaffinch Close which were referred to in the application have no bearing on the application when considering the density within the garden of the existing property
- It has to give due consideration to the existing adjoining properties and the street scene
- The developer has indicated shrubs and trees at the front of the proposed property but has omitted them from in front of the neighbouring property Aurora. The elevation on the main road is therefore inaccurate and was not picked up by the Parish Council.
- Section 15 has also been inaccurately completed by the applicant regarding trees shrubs and mature vegetation stating that there is nothing there that will affect the adjoining property. This was not highlighted by the Parish Council.
- To do with loss of light and overlooking: the residents have a right to natural light. The proposed property would be less than 1m from Aurora's external wall, overshadowing and overbearing and reducing natural light. A two-storey property with a height of 7.5m less than 1m away from the dwelling of a single storey.
- Aurora and Sleepy Hollow and numerous other properties flooded in June 2012. The water entered Aurora via the grounds of Strathmore which were under water to a depth in excess of 300mm. The water was above the air vents of Strathmore until the residents of Aurora

started pumping the waters away from Strathmore's ground to prevent any further ingress. Pictures of this are on the planning portal of CDC.

- The reduction of mature trees and vegetation to facilitate this application would only exacerbate the problems of this site and affect the surrounding properties
- The application is suggesting that there could be new soak aways for Strathmore but with no viability tests

Cllr Pocock interrupted the resident and suggested that the resident reduce all his concerns into a three-minute time frame, which would be all the time allowed him, and present it to CDC. The resident asked why the Parish Council's site visit had been so defective and not highlighted the issues surrounding the application.

Cllr Pocock said that the Parish Council often raised the points that the resident had raised, with the District and County Councillors.

The Chairman drew the discussion to a close. Cllr Bush offered to discuss the resident's concerns outside the meeting and asked the resident to provide the information to him.

Action

Cllr Bush

3. The clerk had previously circulated a letter to councillors from another resident concerning traffic in Church Lane. The resident outlined her concerns regarding the build-up of unnecessary traffic in the one-way part of Church Lane that turns left at the Church. She said that residents were seeing continual increases in the number of cars, lorries, delivery vans and tractors taking the short-cut down Church Lane rather than travelling 200 yds further and turning left at the junction into Crooked Lane. She said that not only was the traffic increasing but the speed too down a lane full of potholes. She said that vehicles and cyclists seemed to think it was acceptable to go the wrong way down the one-way road, leading to hazard if meeting another vehicle.

She said that the road was now dangerous for walkers, especially parents walking their children to school and back. She said that repairing the potholes in the lane would only increase the ability for cars to drive even faster. The road should only be used by 6 houses – Church Farm, Church Lodge and the four bungalows in Claytons Corner. Kewell's Corner approaches the close by turning into Crooked Lane.

She said that the situation was exacerbated when the Cricket Ground was in use and on Sundays during worship, when cars drive en-masse and often at speed when the events have finished. Cars park along the verge outside the residents' hedges, causing a hazard for any emergency services trying to access the houses in this road.

The resident felt that the solution was to place bollards across the road just beyond the cricket ground stopping the flow of traffic but allowing pedestrians to walk through. This would mean making both halves of the road two-way for traffic. This would give access to Church and Cricket Ground but entering and exiting the same way, and the residents of the road would access from Crooked Lane.

Failing that the resident felt that 5 mph signs should be erected with sleeping policemen placed on the road.

This will be passed on to WSCC Highways for them to take up and Cllr Montyn will follow up some points made.

Action

Cllr Montyn

## **6. To receive a report from WSCC member for Birdham Cllr Montyn**

Cllr Montyn said that now the election was over he had been appointed Chairman to the finance and scrutiny committee, and the planning committee (waste and minerals). He said that the Rampion 2 windfarm was coming forward soon, and he will keep involved in that. There is a website called Rampion 2 which is very informative.

He was aware of the letter from the resident re Church Lane and agreed that it should be sent to Highways.

Cllr Firmston asked about the constituency boundary changes on the Peninsula.

Cllr Montyn said that the National Boundary commission has a duty every so often to see how many voters there are in each constituency. Chichester District has too many voters and the commission is suggesting putting the eastern side of the Peninsula into Bognor. Cllr Montyn said that if residents had issues with this, they should say something to WSCC as splitting the Manhood into two is not a good idea. It means that there will be two Members of Parliament to deal with the same issues. He said residents were free to support the planned changes or not. The consultation closes on 4<sup>th</sup> August 2021.

Cllr Firmston asked for a contact at WSCC Highways who could be contacted concerning the laying of the base of the proposed new bus-stop in Bell Lane. Cllr Montyn will forward this tomorrow.

Action	Cllr Montyn
--------	-------------

### 7. To receive reports from CDC members for Birdham

Cllr Taylor CDC said that Cllr Barrett had been forwarding the Members' bulletin so everyone would be kept up to date. She said that the Air Quality consultation had been taking place, and that in fact air quality in the district had improved – particularly at the Stockbridge roundabout.

Next year was going to be Chichester's Year of Culture. Apart from participation from the Festival Theatre and the Cathedral, CDC was looking for participation beyond the obvious – not just city centric and asking other communities to contribute.

The Chairman said that as the Arts Festival in Birdham had been cancelled last year, the local groups would be able to offer something to the Year of Culture.

Cllr Hamilton CDC said that there would be a Full Council meeting tomorrow but with only 50% of councillors present, the others joining on Zoom. The business of the day was the making of two neighbourhood plans – Boxgrove and Selsey. The next meeting will be on 20<sup>th</sup> July.

Cllr Hamilton went on to say that with regard to the boundary changes it was unsuitable to split the Manhood.

### 8. Planning matters including appeals, applications and CDC delegated decisions.

- i. **Notifications of new Planning Enforcement Notices – there were none received**
- ii. **Notifications of Planning Appeals – there were none received**
- iii. **Updates on Planning Enforcements** – the clerk had written to Emma Kierans re 22 Greenacres and Shona Archer re the travellers but neither have responded.
- iv. **Planning applications to be decided:** two further applications were added after the issue of the agenda

Planning Application number	Address	Details	COMMENT
BI/21/01563/DOM	Loretto Crooked Lane Birdham PO20 7HB	alterations and extensions to existing building	NO OBJECTION
BI/21/01301/DOM	10 Burlow Close	Proposed detached garden room in rear garden for ancillary home office/domestic accommodation use	NO OBJECTION ON CONDITION THAT THE GARDEN ROOM IS NOT USED AS PERMANENT RESIDENTIAL DWELLING
BI/20/00223/FUL	22 Greenacres	Breaches of planning permission?	Greenacres: A local resident distributed copies of photos and explanations of those items that the neighbours of the property consider to be breaches of planning permission and asked for assistance on

			how they should take this forward. They have sent these to CDC and a site visit made by the enforcement officer. Cllr Campbell said that it was the job of the enforcement officer to deal with this but that the Parish Council would forward the documents to CDC with a covering note stating their agreement with the issues raised. The same information will also be sent to the Harbour Conservancy and the three Witterings' District Councillors. <b>Action: Clerk</b>
	Rampion Wind Farm and its effect on Manhood		Interested parties to look at <a href="#">Home - Rampion2</a> Neither the environmental impact nor its effect on migrating birds is known. The consultation opens on 14 <sup>th</sup> July until September. The farm will stretch from Brighton right along the coast to Selsey.
BI/20/02066/OUT	Koolbergen/Kelly's nurseries	Outline application for 73 homes	<b>OBJECTION ON GROUNDS LISTED BELOW</b>
BI/21/01633/DOM	1 Rowan Close	Retrospective erection of flue for a wood burning stove to heat an existing wood cabin	To be discussed at July 28 <sup>th</sup> meeting
BI/21/01668/DOM	The Kedge , 1 Oakmeadow, Birdham, PO20 7BH	Erection of single storey side/rear extension and associated internal alterations, conversion of garage into habitable accommodation and erection of detached garage and boat store	To be discussed at July 29 <sup>th</sup> Meeting

PARISH COUNCIL OBJECTION TO BI/20/02066/OUT: 73 homes at Koolbergen/Kelly's Nurseries

A previous planning application for a similar number of houses on this site was refused in 2016 (16/00933). The reasons for our objection are as follows:

1. Birdham Parish Council is currently carrying out a review of its Neighbourhood Plan, which became out of date when the Local Plan became out of date. As part of this review, a call for sites was made, and 19 sites in the Parish are currently being evaluated. This site is included in the evaluation, and it would be premature to approve this site before the call for sites evaluation has been completed, and consulted upon, so that the most suitable sites in the village can be utilised, rather than those first proposed.



2. A source of major concern highlighted by the review of the Birdham Neighbourhood Plan is the very poor level of sewerage- service new developments in the village receive. There have been many complaints along these lines:

“Our sewage system backs up and things such as toilets, sinks and showers do not drain . In many cases boilers stop working as the condensate system is plumbed into the mains drainage and because of the backup, the boilers experience back pressure and shut down, leaving residents with no heating”.

Southern Water’s response to this application does not inspire any confidence that they have the capacity to serve existing clients, let alone a significant new development.

All planning applications that feed to the Sidlesham WWTP will feature similar objections, and it is high time the District Council took its responsibilities seriously and refused all planning applications until proper infrastructure is provided.

3. As far back as 2002, a report by the Halcrow Group identified that “the increase in population and economic activity have created a demand for transportation that now exceeds the capacity of the transport infrastructure on the Peninsula”.

The intervening years have seen little significant improvement in transport infrastructure on the Western part of the Peninsula.

Further developments have continued to be approved on the grounds that only a small increase in traffic movements will occur. However, as the table below shows, the cumulative effect of these approvals has seen a 9% increase in total traffic on the A286 up to 2016, the latest date for which figures are available. Anecdotally, the traffic has increased considerably since 2016.

There has been a marked deterioration in road safety. Between 2015 and 2020 there were 5 fatalities and 5 serious injuries on the A286, with a further 15 serious injuries and 2 fatalities on the B2179 and B2178

Clearly the A286 has become an increasingly congested and dangerous road. Traffic movements in the summer are undoubtedly higher than shown above, as vehicles head along the Birdham Straight for the beaches. This results in disrupted bus timetables; traffic hold ups when vehicles need to turn off against the oncoming flow and causes long tailbacks when cyclists cannot be overtaken. There is sufficient evidence to oppose any further house building served by the A286, both in Birdham and Bracklesham/East Wittering, unless radical changes are made to increase the capacity and safety of the A286, or an alternative traffic corridor is developed such as a properly segregated cycle route connecting the Witterings, Birdham and Chichester.

4. The Parish Council does not consider that this project is deliverable in a 5-year time frame. One of the sites is still operating as a successful nursery, and there is no reason for this to change in the foreseeable future.

5. This is an outline planning application. It is our understanding that during the period where there is no current local plan the local authority will be giving preference to detailed planning consents. In the absence of a detailed consent, the local authority should be looking to condition the application with reference to a design code in order to protect this sensitive area (with proximity to the AONB). The Parish is in the process of developing a design code to be attached to the new Neighbourhood Plan and would welcome the opportunity to participate in this process. The development is overly dense in this location. The site is 2.34 hectares, and the 77 houses gives a supposed density of 32.9 per hectare, but which in fact will be higher as some of the space is taken by a retail unit and some light industrial units. Unacceptably high for this location.

6. The outline scheme does not clearly identify car parking allocated to each use.

7. It is possible that this site will score well in terms of suitability in our call for sites report. Currently the application is not a full application, and the layout looks particularly unsuitable for a rural location. Should the application be refused, and the site be approved as suitable for inclusion in our revised Neighbourhood Plan, the Parish Council undertakes to work with the developer to deliver a plan which will suit all parties, subject to proper sewerage and road improvement plans being implemented.

8. The Parish Council receives many complaints about the danger and unpleasantness of walking along the A286 in the village. Should the District Council be minded to approve this application, this should be on condition that the speed limit through the village be decreased to 30mph. The road layout should also be reviewed to assess whether the available space is being used to the best advantage of all road users.

v. Delegated decisions to be noted

Planning Application number	Address	Details	Decision
BI/21/00383/D OM -	Loxworth Main Road Birdham	single storey side extension	PERMIT
BI/20/02899/FU L	Houseboat Water Gypsy Birdham Marina	Replacement houseboat at berth number 16	REFUSE

Cllr Firmston reported back to the meeting that the Council had received a response to its letter to the Harbour Conservancy about the inconsistency of their responses to planning applications. Please see attached. Cllr Firmston added that no response had been received concerning the comments submitted by the Parish Council to the Policy 19 Consultation (House boats – Harbour Conservancy).

**9. Birdham Neighbourhood Plan Review Report**

- i. As previously mentioned, there were 19 submissions for the Call for Sites. These are being appraised by commissioned planners and then the NP group will go to consultation with the village. The group has applied for further funding which has not yet been received.
- ii. The group wrote to Highways England asking them why they never objected to any development proposals when they know that the roads are already at capacity. So far there has been no response.
- iii. So far, the Council has not been able to find a suitable use for the bequeathed land. Once all the options have been put together this also will go out to the village for consultation on its use.
- iv. The group has applied for financial assistance to develop design codes for the village, and this has been approved.
- v. The group is still working on the possibility of a cycle way along the canal.
- vi. The group has written a letter to Southern Water asking them what they were doing and why they have not objected to any developments when they know that the treatment plant is at capacity. They always respond that they are legally obliged to connect new houses, but this is not sufficient.  
In connection with this the Parish Council will submit two questions to the Gillian Keegan conference next Friday.

Action	Clerk
--------	-------

**10. GLAM – the case for quiet lanes on the Manhood**

**Deferred**

**11. Discretionary Grants – to discuss and award grants**

Two organisations had applied for a grant from the Parish Council. 4Sight Vision which helps those who are visually impaired and Ducklings, the new toddler group being formed at the Church.



It was unanimously **AGREED** to donate £150 to 4Sight Vision who support 4 Birdham residents. The Council is awaiting further information from the toddler group about real costs etc and then could award the remaining £100. Clerk to follow up.

Action

Clerk

### 12. New Homes Bonus application – to agree designation of the grant:

There had been proposals for a toddler swing in play area; a wheelchair ramp for the village hall and/or a new front door; allotments on the recreation ground.

The council discussed the various options, and it was unanimously **AGREED** to apply for the grant for a toddler swing set for the children’s play area. The Parish Council may be required to make up any shortfall.

Action

Clerk

### 13. Climate Change Actions:

Cllr Hamilton

Cllr Hamilton had had to leave the meeting but had previously circulated the following as ideas for implementing some actions.

- i. **Solar panels** - The CDC scheme Solar Together has finished but another scheme is planned for later in the year. Wagner, in Sidlesham and CC Solar in Littlehampton both seem reasonably priced and have a good reputation. It was thought that the Village Hall committee were interested in panels for the Village Hall roof.
- ii. **Tree planting and less grass-cutting** – CDC will be giving away 6000 trees for planting this autumn. They will be in bundles of 20. The downside would be that the small trees would need constant watering next summer. Cllr Hamilton had also asked about the possibility of fruit trees to start a community orchard.
- iii. **“Green” homes grants for those in fuel poverty**
- iv. **Waste minimality – to get to 70% reduction by 2030** - Waste Minimisation/Free Cycle/Next Door/Trash Nothing are all web sites where serviceable unwanted goods can be sold or given away. CDC is planning to collect food waste, textiles and WEE ( small unwanted electricals) .
- v. **Car sharing** – there are websites such as BlaBlaCar for safely car sharing (this needs further research for viability)
- vi. **EV charging points in the village (village hall)** - The village hall could qualify for a grant under the Workplace Charging Scheme. This could be a point earning money for the use of locals and visitors. The nearest public ones are in car parks at Chichester and West Wittering.
- vii. **Local repair café in Birdham** – there is one in Chichester, but Birdham would need somebody to run it and a venue.

The Birdham Emergency plan also needs to be kept up to date regarding Climate change and the probability of increased flooding. It might be sensible to add a list of residents with small boats who could help in an emergency.

### 14. Clerk’s report

#### i) Correspondence

- ✚ West and East Sussex County Associations hold a bi-annual meeting with the Chief Constable of Sussex Police and the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner. The meeting is attended by the Chairmen of the County and District Associations. The next meeting will take place on Monday 5th July 2021 and member councils have an opportunity to raise any questions of a strategic or unresolved matter by submitting them beforehand.
- ✚ All Parishes Meeting Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> September 2021 at 5.30pm on Zoom. Cllr Firmston to attend and one other space available.
- ✚ WSCC will be changing its street lighting to “green” lamps and working with SSE for a green energy supply. The savings in costs will be passed on to the Parish Council.

#### ii) Village Hall Fencing boundaries

The former clerk had been applied to for his view on the fencing responsibilities and boundaries. He said that the fence to the left of the hall was on Village Hall land and was the responsibility of the Village Hall. But as the fence also protects the playing field which is owned by Birdham Council, a

one-off £1000 for repairs and renewals had been spent by the Council a few years ago. The fence to the right of the hall was the property of Birdham Parish Council until it joined the gate. The short piece of fencing around the old nursery play area is/was erected by the nursery and should have been removed. The fencing outside the actual hall was granted by the BPC to the village hall for use by the nursery but was considered to be of use for the hall and allowed to be retained at the hall's responsibility.

It was **AGREED** to meet with the hall trustees and designate responsibility for each section. This will be noted and kept for future reference.

Action

Cllr Firmston

- iii) **To approve the Payments for consideration** – the payments, with the addition of three invoices for the sound equipment for the hall for a total of £109.71, were proposed by Cllr Pocock, seconded by Cllr Bush and unanimously **RESOLVED**.
- iv) **Expenditure to date and Bank reconciliation - circulated**

#### 15. Councillor Reports:

##### i. **Play area and playing field – to include Football Goal Posts**

There had been a very successful children's fair on the recreation ground over bank holiday weekend and thanks to D Ridley for a professional installation and removal of the site.

A local resident was helping with sourcing football goal posts for installation on the field.

- ii. **Village green and pond** – the footpaths through Triangle Copse and Pond require weeding. A volunteer group will be organised by Cllr Firmston.
- iii. **Communication working group – no report**
- iv. **Community resilience** – the plan is to be updated this summer by Cllr Firmston
- v. **Manhood Peninsula Action Group – no report**

#### 16. Reports of meetings attended by Councillors – there were no reports

#### 17. Items for inclusion on the next agenda

Climate change actions  
Boundary Review

#### 18. Date of next meeting – exceptionally the date of the next meeting will be **Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> July at 7pm at the village hall and on zoom.**

There being no further business to discuss the meeting closed at 9.35pm

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Tim Firmston - Chairman

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Birdham Parish Council Payments for Consideration  
Meeting June 21st 2021**

**Balances on accounts:**

Current account	115938.42
Deposit account	100005.29
NS account	7092.54
	<b>223036.25</b>

**Received since last meeting**

Bank interest	2.49
vat refund	9693.45
recreation ground	450.00
	<b>10145.94</b>

**Paid since last meeting**

betty geary	litter picking	70.00
I whitaker	Clerk's salary	719.84
a dover	bus stop/grass cutting	80.00
nest	pension	52.50
cdc	contribution to mpp project officer	438.00
m h kennedy	grass mowing	510.60
t firmston	binbags for village green bin	8.00
		<b>1878.94</b>

**Payments for consideration**

sse	street lighting	110.60
betty geary	litter picking	70.00
i whitaker	Clerk's salary	719.84
nest	pension	52.50
chi tree services	tree felling rec ground	3000.00
m h kennedy	grass mowing	255.30
a dover	bus stop/grass cutting	60.00
jnr computers	domain renewal/MS365 subs/IT support	1298.40
sse	street lighting	95.10
wsc	street lighting	1036.48
		<b>6698.22</b>

Birdham Parish Council Meeting 21st June 2021

**Bank accounts as of 15th June 2021**

Current Account	115938.42
Deposit Account	100005.29
National Savings	7092.54

**Total** 223036.25

Opening balance 1st April 2021	148950.69
add receipts in the year	84209.94
less expenditure to date	10124.38

**Balance** 223036.25

**Less**

Reserve @ 50% of Precept	27400.00
--------------------------	----------

**Total** 27400.00

**Ringfenced Funds**

Op Watershed	2400.00
Culvert Ditch Maintenance	7000.00
Adams bequest (Fencing)	6500.00
CIL Payments	83990.66
NHB	10595.30
Neighbourhood Plan Grant	1269.03
Neighbourhood Plan Grant	46664.00

**Total** 158418.99

**Available Funds**

**Total** 37217.26

Signed:

*IXWhitaker -  
Clerk*

Appendix: Response from Harbour Conservancy to Parish Council re inconsistency of comments on Planning Applications:

Your ref: letter 25 April 2021

Our ref: B1.21.00189.FUL – BI.20.02378.FUL

8 June 2021



CHICHESTER  
HARBOUR  
CONSERVANCY

Imogen X Whitaker  
Clerk to the Council  
Birdham Parish Council  
2 McAdam Road  
Hambrook  
Chichester  
West Sussex  
PO18 8FG

Dear Ms Whittaker,

**Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty – planning assessment process  
Case examples BI/21/00189/FUL and BI/20/02378/FUL**

Thank you for your letter sent by email on 25 April 2021. I apologise for the delay in this response which has been caused by the recent increase in workload and a backlog of case work to respond to. I do hope that the delay in this reply has not been inconvenient to your council.

Your letter seeks some feedback on two cases referenced:-

- planning reference: BI/21/00189/FUL: Houseboat Mooring Berth 30, Houseboat Karibuni, Chichester Canal Southern Bank, Chichester Marina, Birdham, Chichester, West Sussex; proposal for the installation of a replacement houseboat including installation of H-column cored and grouted anchoring system,
- and,
- planning reference: BI/20/02378/FUL: 1 Birdham Business Park, Birdham Road, Birdham, Chichester, West Sussex; proposal for erection of light industrial building (Use Class B1) comprising 2x units following demolition of 3x extended outbuildings.

The former, at Chichester Canal, was for considered by the Chichester Harbour Conservancy Planning Committee on 12 April 2021 with a recommendation to raise 'no objection' to be forwarded to the LPA which the Planning Committee endorsed. The application was withdrawn by the applicant. The site lies inside the AONB designation boundary.

The latter, at Birdham Business Park, was considered under delegated authority on 22 February 2021 with a recommendation to 'object' to be sent to the LPA. The proposal is still awaiting an LPA determination. The site lies outside the AONB designation boundary, on the opposite side of the Birdham Road and therefore adjacent to the AONB.

Your letter sates "*The Parish Council would like to better understand the decisions made by the Conservancy for these two applications in its role as a statutory Consultee to the Planning Process.*"

**Chichester Harbour Conservancy**  
The Harbour Office, Itchenor, Chichester,  
West Sussex PO20 7AW

**01243 512301**  
info@conservancy.co.uk  
www.conservancy.co.uk



### Some background

The Parish Council will know that The Chichester Harbour Conservancy, administer and safeguard the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The aim of conserving and enhancing the areas natural beauty requires the Conservancy to consider the proposal on its landscape character aspects. Landscape covers both urban environments as well as countryside and coastal areas.

The Parish Council will also be aware that the statutory purpose of the AONB is to conserve and enhance the area's natural beauty.

Relevant to this is the duty on public bodies (the LPA, Parish Councils' etc.) to 'have regard' for that statutory purpose in carrying out their functions (Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, 2000). The Planning Practice Guidance confirms that this duty also applies to proposals outside the designated area but impacting on its natural beauty. Legislation requires that the LPA should assess the application carefully as to whether the proposed development would have a significant impact on or harm that statutory purpose.

The Conservancy considers planning applications and other submissions against its own set of planning criteria, the AONB Planning Principles, which are contained within the Chichester Harbour Management Plan 2019-2024. These are supported by the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Beauty Joint Supplementary Planning Document (2017). The SPD is adopted by both Chichester District Council and by Havant Borough Council as part of their planning policy and development control approach.

### The examples

I note that the Parish Council view on the LPA public access web site indicates that :

- The Chichester Canal replacement houseboat proposal had the Parish Council strongly object *"on the grounds of the mass and the scale of the building being inappropriate and not in keeping with the surrounding area and the AONB. It is not a boat, but a featureless container and does not in any way conserve or enhance the AONB". "There have been a number of similar structures approved over the last few years. BPC has objected to all of them, on the same grounds as this application, but all have been approved."*
- The Birdham Business Park proposal for the erection of light industrial building had the Parish Council object *"to this extremely large building with very high roof on such a small site. The site is already densely populated and the scale and massing of the building is inappropriate given the proximity of the AONB."* This view was reiterated after the developers letter refuting comments made. The follow up Parish Council view added *"The length of the proposed building and its height gives a mass and bulk that will give an inappropriate view and harmful visual impact from the AONB which is a protected landscape."* *"The building is proposed to be located close to an existing hedge line that is the only visual screen on the southern boundary. A buffer zone of several metres wide needs to be incorporated adjacent to the hedge."*

I assume that the Parish Council has read and understood the two planning assessment reports submitted by The Conservancy to the LPA for these cases. The reports are available on the LPA public access web page under the planning application references quotes. The reports are comprehensive as to the AONB criteria relevant to the assessments, and the site history, site character, and proposal details that these criteria are considered against.

### Chichester Harbour Conservancy

The Harbour Office, Itchenor, Chichester,  
West Sussex PO20 7AW

01243 512301  
info@conservancy.co.uk  
www.conservancy.co.uk



A cautious, 'on balance' assessment not to object to the proposal was made by the Chichester Harbour Conservancy Planning Committee for the Chichester Canal houseboat replacement based upon all relevant considerations of the proposal against the AONB Planning Principles and other AONB guidance.

The houseboat design was clearly indicated in the assessment as being of poor visual appearance. *"The houseboat would have a design that would be 'shed-like' in appearance. There are a variety of houseboat designs on the canal."*(para. 4.1). *"High standards of design are not generally associated with houseboats. The existing houseboat has a simple 'box shape' design. The proposed replacement has a similar overall appearance but incorporates a ridged roof with end gables giving a 'shed like' appearance. Neither the existing or proposed design is architecturally or aesthetically inspiring, but both are functional if utilitarian in concept and appearance."* (para 6.10 -6.11).

The scale of the proposal was also raised in the assessment report. *"The change of a 'box-like' vessel of 8.53m visual accommodation structure length and 2.63m height to a 'shed-like' vessel of 13m visual accommodation structure length and 2.98m height is a modest change, particularly when considered against other houseboat replacement along the canal (see para. 2.6 above). Therefore, it is not considered to be so excessive to generate a serious objection."* (para. 6.21).

The assessment report included in conclusion (point 4) *"The houseboat design is simple and basic, similar to that being replaced. High standards of design are not generally associated with houseboats and this would seem to apply in this case. The design is not as expansive as some at other moorings, and therefore is not considered to be a significant visual imposition within the AONB protected national landscape environment setting."*

The houseboat replacement was considered against CHAONB Planning Principles PP01, PP09, and the emerging new CHAONB guidance PP19: Houseboats.

A more straightforward assessment to oppose the business park proposal, citing two issues of concern which happen to mirror the concerns of the Parish Council (*high ridgeline and excessive building mass, positioning eroding the landscape buffer screen*). Again, this approach was based upon all relevant considerations of the proposal against the AONB Planning Principles and other AONB guidance.

The industrial building was considered in the assessment report. *"The proposed changes would clearly add a significantly large building. The visual impact of the scale, the mass and bulk of the proposal to the AONB protected landscape environment is of concern. The building is larger and closer to the boundary than the replaced structures. The impact therefore would be more pronounced."*

And in conclusion *"The positioning of the proposal would have a localised impact on the character and appearance of the site and the immediate surrounds. The proximity to the southern boundary would enable the building to be seen especially in the autumn and winter months when foliage is less. The scale of the building would emphasise the presence of the building in the landscape."*

The business park proposal was considered against CHAONB Planning Principles PP01, PP09, and guided by the CHAONB approach for similar potential development as offered by PP07.

**Chichester Harbour Conservancy**  
The Harbour Office, Itchenor, Chichester,  
West Sussex PO20 7AW

**01243 512301**  
info@conservancy.co.uk  
[www.conservancy.co.uk](http://www.conservancy.co.uk)

I trust that the above breakdown of the AONB approach and consideration of the two raised examples identified by the Parish Council go some way in explaining our planning assessment considerations and the process we follow to reach a view, be that a delegated authority response by a qualified and experienced planning professional, or that of the Chichester Harbour Conservancy Planning Committee appointed members.

Should you have any further questions regarding the above, please contact us for additional clarification you may consider necessary.

Yours sincerely



**David Rothery**  
**Conservancy Principal Planner**  
**Chichester Harbour Conservancy AONB Unit**

**Chichester Harbour Conservancy**  
The Harbour Office, Itchenor, Chichester,  
West Sussex PO20 7AW

**01243 512301**  
[info@conservancy.co.uk](mailto:info@conservancy.co.uk)  
[www.conservancy.co.uk](http://www.conservancy.co.uk)