

**Meeting at the Office of Sovereign Harbour Limited, with Carillion plc.  
Friday June 14<sup>th</sup> 10.00 am.**

Representing Carillion / SHL:

Mark Orriss (**MO**), Development Director Carillion

Clifford Carvell (**CC**), Project Director SHL

Dan Hughes (**DH**), Marina Operations Manager (Harbour Master)

Sovereign Harbour Residents Association (SHRA) Committee members:

Reg Ludford

Dave Hitchcock

Clare Donovan

The meeting had been called to discuss a number of questions which had arisen at previous Public Meetings of the SHRA and to ascertain plans for future development within the Marina as a whole.

These notes are NOT minutes of the meeting but represent an agreed representation of what was discussed, issues that materialised and any resolutions, or otherwise, that emerged.

The meeting began with RL thanking Carillion for the time given to the meeting and explained that points would be raised which were discussed at the last Public Meeting on June 11<sup>th</sup>.

**MO** made a clear statement of Carillion's disquiet over the emotive language used during the planning meeting for the B&Q site. He was unhappy that facts about size of the property were misrepresented and that the word "blackmail" had been used against Carillion in terms of future economic development in the area.

Further discussions about the B&Q proposal will be outlined later in this document.

**MO** stated that any letter received at the SHL office would receive a reply.

**Atlantic Drive:**

Carillion retain ownership of the Waterfront end of Atlantic Drive (excluding the lighting) as far as the school. There is an agreement for EBC to adopt this portion of the road already in place.

**Housekeeping:**

The question was raised about upkeep of the harbour area (litter, gardens etc) specifically, who was responsible for what and where.

Certain areas under the management of SHL were criticised and points taken about gardens needing attention. **DH** stated that work is in progress to re-seed some areas and reduce weed growth. Litter patrols are undertaken regularly.

Other areas where there are problems and where responsibility was unclear were resolved:

- Sunley Homes are responsible for the upkeep of the gardens beyond the Harvester Bridge.
- ASDA own half the car park and the roundabout by the fuel station. They are thus responsible for maintenance of gardens, litter clearance etc within this boundary and behind the store.
- PRUDENTIAL own, and are thus responsible for the remaining land around the cinema complex.

Direct approaches had been made by SHL to the local ASDA management with some effect, but blame for the rubbish has been placed at the feet of the customers!

**DH** suggested the re-siting the recycling bins could help with some of the problem to prevent prevailing winds carrying litter to other local areas.

### **Pathways and open spaces:**

There is nothing currently defined for the completion of the site by Bermuda Place, at the end of Santa Cruz Road and adjacent to the lock. It would appear that Prowtings have promised more than had been agreed and that whilst proposals were "close to agreement", there remained issues to be resolved particularly concerning provision of services and access. Further difficulties arise due to changes of level.

- The completion of the waterside walk (Little Venice) is the responsibility of Prowtings. It was suggested that although talks were continuing with Prowtings, the take-over by Westbury may be another source for delay. No planning permission has been sought or given.

North Harbour residents, particularly on the Wimpy development are keen to know about plans for the open space at the end of the North Harbour between Persimmon and White Oaks.

Although outline plans are available from the Planning Office at EBC, showing amenities for boat owners, there are no current plans for the site. Provision of such amenities may still be made depending on the development of the moorings and the number of non-residents with moorings who will need such amenities.

There is no programmed timetable for moorings development; it will be dictated by demand. Currently, 14% of boat owners are resident at the harbour but it is anticipated that this will grow with North Harbour development.

No reply was given as to whether the residents would be involved in any consultation about plans for this site should a decision be made NOT to provide these amenities.

There is currently no programme for completion of the walkways at this open space site to give safe access from Pacific Drive to the harbour side walk way. There is apparently some dispute concerning responsibility for necessary changes to existing lay-outs at the edge of the Persimmon and White Oaks developments, which need to be resolved with the Highway Authority and the developers.

There will be an access road to the NE of the Martello Tower, direct to the beach between the Jones development and the adjacent site (?Macleans). Approval is subject to a 106 agreement and **MO** stated that Carillion would like to see this completed as soon as possible. There has been considerable interest in the Martello Tower itself but nothing will be progressed until seafront developments are nearer completion.

### **Bridge Access:**

Provision of swipe cards to all residents would present too many administrative problems to be viable.

There will shortly be a push button system to release the pedestrian gate from the harbour side. To return, use the free phone facility to obtain the code. Residents will still be required to register for the code as before by writing to the harbour master.

There is no discrimination as to who gets the code, however, it was stated that telephone calls to Harbour staff were often less than courteous and this may result in a somewhat surly approach to other residents. Respect was called for on both sides.

**MO** pointed out that gate access would become academic when the land beyond the bridge was being developed as any right of access through the building site would be controlled by the developer concerned.

Pontoon work from this had necessitated the opening of gates on to Pacific Drive to enable the access of heavy vehicles which could damage the bridge. Future road access would depend entirely on the developer's plans. (The site is now definitely under contract.)

### **Surgery:**

**CC** stated that he had not received any approach from the PCT or FHSA with regard to provision of land for a surgery although there had been discussions with Doctors and that it was up to someone to make an approach to Carillion. Land can be available at the market rate.

It was considered that the land currently occupied by Carillion/SHL's offices would present an ideal and probably more economical site due to the proximity of the car parking and existing services. However, there was no programmed date for Carillion to move from the site which could thus result in longer term delays for plans for a surgery.

### **Harbour Charges:**

The question of need for dredging was raised in association with changes to harbour design. **DH** stated that the original harbour was designed to take Passenger Ferries, hence the length of the "arms". Shortening these arms to restrict the size of vessel using the harbour has NOT resulted in silting. This is a problem faced by all harbours and rivers on this part of the coast and all harbours therefore need to dredge. Licences and other restrictions give strict times for dredging and removal of waste and the current need was for twice a year. Changes to the arm on the town side of the harbour were in place to catch shingle drift for later use by the Environment Agency.

**CC** agreed that there had been a couple of errors in the letter sent out with the accounts which had resulted in confusion for some residents. SHL were asked to come up with some sort of written outline of charges which could be handed to residents if required.

The charges were clarified as follows:

The Estate charge falls into 2 parts

1. the SW charge paid annually on January 1<sup>st</sup> IN ADVANCE.
2. the Marina charge paid annually on January 1<sup>st</sup> IN ARREARS for the preceding period October 1<sup>st</sup> to September 30th.

Delays in invoicing have been due to need to clarify the situation with regard to VAT.

Whilst the existing charges are based on 1500 properties sharing the total charge, the more homes being occupied will result in a lesser charge to each home.

On completion of purchase, all residents will have signed a Deed of Grant and Covenant concerning these charges and it is the responsibility of the developers' solicitors to pass these documents to SHL solicitors. Delays in this notification will result in delays to invoices. It does not mean that invoices will be waived.

There was some discussion about the involvement of someone representing the residents on the Board of the Trustees. **MO** indicated that further appointment of Trustees was likely to be delayed until the Environment Agency had decided who they wanted as their representative on the Board.

### **B&Q and associated development:**

Whilst agreeing that Carillion are in breach of a planning requirement to landscape "the mound", **MO** considered it a potential waste of money to landscape any further until the fate of the entire site is decided. **CC** pointed out that a large part of any landscaping design would be shingle with associated planting and that paths were impractical and not part of the legal requirement.

The "gravel pit" which has been created by the removal of material for sea defences, will be filled in with excess material and rubble from the on-going developments. It was not seen as a greater risk than the harbour. Some residents had expressed an interest in seeing it landscaped!

There was much discussion about the B&Q planning decision. No written result has, as yet, been provided by EBC although it was agreed that the planning committee seemed to base their decision on traffic. Carillion have invested heavily in the roads around the area, developing the dual carriage way etc to assist with the additional traffic envisaged. This combined with investment in the infrastructure of the Harbour as a whole gives cause for concern over adequate revenue from the remaining land. No firm word was given regarding appeal.

**MO** reiterated their reasons for pursuing the B&Q plan.

- The site has many obstacles to building which make any development an expensive option, particularly given the allocation of the site to B1 (light industrial use) by EBC.
- Office accommodation will not be an economic proposition on this site.
- B1 usage could result in the entire area becoming a light industrial estate rather than a more prestigious development as befits the Harbour area.
- To overcome the high cost of development, a high revenue enterprise such as B&Q is needed.
- There are no other interested parties in this land because of the cost.

**MO** pointed out that there was nothing to stop Carillion selling off small portions of the site to any company wanting to start a small production company, vehicle servicing facility etc. as this complies with the EBC plan.

Special agreement has been reached with ASDA concerning public access to the site from the roundabout by the ASDA filling station (landowners). This may not be available to smaller individual developers.

Entrance to B&Q from Pacific Drive will be for B&Q deliveries ONLY and a right hand turning lane has been provided by the Highways Authority. This will negate the need for lorries to negotiate the small roundabout and thus reduce noise and traffic impact for residents.

- The adjacent site to the east will also be costly to develop. The B&Q development will release funds to ensure that the site is economically viable and a Call Centre developer is ready with plans, as is a local company ready to take on the site to the North of the Wimpy estate.
- Agreement for B&Q to develop will enable the Pevensey Road sites to be completed in the near future. Refusals and further delays would result in long term delays in any completion of the harbour.
- This completion could also then include further development of the Waterfront to provide more public leisure & retail amenities.

There was some discussion about the needs for provision of certain types of facility at the Waterfront but it is clear that there are no plans currently in the programme.

No further approaches have been received by companies such as Six Continents (Harvester).

After a somewhat confrontational start, the meeting concluded with the general opinion that we would all like to achieve a prestigious development with adequate facilities which creates a residential and leisure opportunity seldom available.

It was agreed that a further meeting would be held on Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> September.

The meeting closed at 12.45pm.