



## Southbourne Parish Council

The Village Hall  
First Avenue  
Southbourne  
West Sussex  
PO10 8HN

01243 373 667

[admin@southbourne-pc.gov.uk](mailto:admin@southbourne-pc.gov.uk)  
[www.southbourne-pc.gov.uk](http://www.southbourne-pc.gov.uk)

**Additional comments/updates from original LP Reg 19 responses. All items relate to respondent Mrs. Maria Carvajal-Neal Deputy Clerk 7805**

### Policy A13 Southbourne Broad Location for Development

Reference 4043, 4043, 4048, 4057, 5245, 5421 (Mrs. Maria Carvajal-Neal Deputy Clerk 7805)

#### **Q.241 What is the justification for the proposed 1,050 dwellings, local employment opportunities and supporting community facilities and uses at the proposed broad location for development?**

It is important to acknowledge that SPC recognises the necessity for housing. However, it should be noted that the available land is predominantly grade A and B farmland, which, once developed, will no longer be able to contribute to local or national food production. SPCs NP Public Consultations indicated that a majority of SPC residents also agree that housing is needed, however, there is significant concern that the required infrastructure will either not be delivered or will not be in place before the housing is constructed. SPC understand that Southbourne is identified as a Settlement Hub due to the facilities that exist, but these are few, oversubscribed and failing under the weight of an ever-expanding population (currently approx. 6400 at last census). Additionally, many of these facilities are also utilised by residents from neighbouring parishes who lack access to similar amenities within their own communities. As a result, increasing development in Southbourne without simultaneously enhancing, expanding and increasing public amenities would place these facilities under significant strain, potentially compromising their availability and quality for all users.

The table below indicates the current applications and housing numbers for Southbourne Parish which evidences the substantial amount of development even before the commencement of this Local Plan and A13 initiatives:

	Built on Neighbourhood Plan 1	Approved Local Plan	350	
22/00157/REM	Cooks Lane	permitted	199	Taken off original 1250 allocation being built out now.
22/01284/FULEIA	Harris Scrap yard/Oak Farm	Permitted on appeal	103	
22/01903/OUT	4 Acres	permitted	40	
23/00024/OUT	Penny Lane	permitted	84	
<b>sum</b>			<b>227</b>	
<b>Windfall sites</b>				
22/01751/FUL	Wayside	permitted	8	
21/03365/FUL	Priors Orchard/traveller site made to houses	Permitted on appeal		9

22/00593/FUL	South Lane	permitted	8	
22/01005/FUL	Sussex Brewery	permitted	1	
<b>Sum</b>			<b>26</b>	
21/01910/OUT	Willow Brook	IN APPEAL	63	
21/00596/EIA	Hallam/Behind Tuppenny Barn	EIA pending	110	
24/01161/OUTEIA	Metis-East Inlands Road	pending	49	
TBC	Elivia - Southside Cooks Lane	Pre app	84	
<b>Sum</b>			<b>222</b>	
		Total	<b>475</b>	<b>Permitted or pending before BLD</b>
				<b>gets sorted.</b>
				<b>575 remaining</b>
			<b>1024</b>	<b>Built or pending with NO infrastructure</b>

The ever-changing housing numbers expected are confusing, this uncertainty is troubling not only for SPC but also for the residents of Southbourne who remain unclear as to the expected numbers. The three scenarios proposed to SPC in a meeting with CDC and their consultants, Tibbalds, were also concerning to SPC. One of the scenarios involves a mixed-area siting of houses, which cannot be master-planned effectively or provide the much-needed road bridge. This infrastructure is crucial to ensure the viability of the proposed allocation and to support the continued growth of the parish. The lack of clarity and planning exacerbates concerns about the potential impact on the community and its future development.

**Q.243 Would the establishment of the site extent and boundary through a future Development Plan Document or a revised Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan be effective?**

Only if infrastructure is integrated into the plan and at the earliest opportunity. This integration is crucial for ensuring sustainable development and meeting the needs of the community. Without adequate infrastructure, any development risks being incomplete and potentially detrimental to the area's long-term viability. Therefore, the effectiveness of any plan will largely depend on CDCs ability to enforce infrastructure commitments, ensuring that the necessary facilities and services are provided to support the new development. This approach not only addresses the immediate needs but also contributes to the overall growth and prosperity of the community.

**Q.244 Would the requirements to be addressed in the allocation of the site as set out in the Policy be effective in achieving sustainable development on the site?**

The requirements outlined in the Policy for the allocation of the site will not be effective in achieving sustainable development without the inclusion of essential infrastructure. Key elements such as a road bridge, additional open and green spaces, a community centre, and the expansion of the doctor's surgery are imperative. While SPC acknowledges the pressing housing needs, it is crucial to recognize that sustainable development encompasses more than just housing. Without the necessary infrastructure, the development risks becoming unsustainable, failing to meet the broader needs of the community and compromising the area's long-term viability. Therefore, for the Policy to be truly effective, it must ensure that these infrastructure components are integrated into the development plans from the outset.

**Q.245 What is the justification for the serviced self/custom build plots, Gypsy and Traveller pitches and Travelling Showpersons' plots in criterion 1, 2 and 3?**

The justification for serviced self/custom build plots came from the surveys carried out in the SPC Neighbourhood plan which indicated a favourable response by residents. SPC acknowledges that the LP has added to these numbers in the submission document. SPC was not consulted on any of the policies regarding the G T and S communities. Southbourne already has a large showmen site within the parish, which has been

---

increased through various planning applications in recent years. SPC query how many more are to be expected. At least 2 additional pitches have already been delivered by planning applications. SPC support H14a which stipulates that all G T and S pitches provided must comply with the site design policy and must benefit from suitable provision of essential services including water, power, sewerage, drainage and waste disposal. SPC would like to see that current sites are mandatorily retrofitted with the same.

**Q.246 Would the policy be effective in regard to any effects on the transport network with particular regard to railway crossings?**

No, the policy would not be effective in regard to the effect on the transport network. SPC believe that the data used in defining the policy is inaccurate. The Stantec report, based on data from 2021 and extended to 2023, focuses exclusively on highway safety. It identifies 8:00 AM as the peak time; however, SPC data suggests that the peak period begins at 7:00 AM, as commuters aim to avoid the school run starting at 8:00 AM. The Stantec report does not highlight that during this time road users often park indiscriminately on Stein Road, causing queues from both directions that rarely clear the railway line before the gates close again. The Southbourne gates, controlled from Chichester, do not receive notification of trains departing Emsworth until they cross a pressure pad midway between the two stations, indicating an approaching train. As such the train gates are then left down for longer than they need to be, causing increased traffic congestion.

It does not appear that Network Rail, nor GoVia Thameslink or Southern Rail were consulted as part of the Stantec report. As referenced by GoVia Thameslink Reg 19 response 5938, 5939 Respondent 8179. At time of Reg 19, 6 trains per hour stopped at Southbourne, SPC don't have the numbers for Southern Rail but they have increased their timetable in June, adding 6 more trains an hour at peak times. This doesn't include the express through trains. The barriers can be down approximately 25 minutes per hour in peak times. Road users bypass Stein Road and take Inlands Road level crossing, this is a half-gated barrier level crossing and Network Rail have advised SPC that they are very concerned about its safety. SPC would like to see that the plan does not just consider highway safety.

SPC contests the findings of the Stantec Report concerning the number of dwellings that can be developed north of the railway before necessitating a road bridge. There is a lack of clarity from CDC and WSCC highways on this matter, as each report reviewed by SPC has indicated different trigger points. SPC find that there is already a need for a road bridge and that future development will exacerbate the situation even further.

SPC's concerns extend beyond highway safety to include the division of the village into two parts by the existing railway crossing, the inconvenience experienced by drivers at the gates, and the overall impact on traffic flow throughout the village. While SPC supports active travel initiatives, it is important to highlight that over 30% of the population in Southbourne Parish is aged 65 and above. Additionally, there are currently no public transportation options available along Stein Road, making car travel the only viable means of transportation.