



Minutes of the meeting of the Manhood Peninsula Partnership

Mon 23 March 2026

10.00am – 11.30am

Online via Teams

Present:

Joan Foster, MPP Chair (JF)
Amy Pryor, Coastal Partnerships Network (AP)
Andrea Smith, CDC (AS)
Wendy Gray, Hunston PC Chair (WG)
Deborah Picken, East Wittering & Bracklesham PC (DP)
Nicolette Pike, West Wittering PC Chair, CHC chair (NP)
Tracy Edwards, Sidlesham PC (TE)
Robert Carey, Earnley PC Chair (RC)
Annie Maclean, North Mundham PC Chair (AMac)
Andy Townsend, Environment Agency (AT)
Iain Ballantyne, CDC Cllr The Witterings and CHC (IB)
Lee Walther, Nat Trust (LW)
Martyn Chuter, Walk, Wheel, Cycle Trust (MC)
Paul Bedford, West Sussex Flood Group Forum, SWISh chairman (PBe)
Carolyn Cobbold, MPP Project Leader (CC)
Gail Richens, RSPB (GR)
Bill Martin, MWHG (BM)
Jane Cunningham, MPP Project Officer (JC)

Apologies/absent:

Francis Hobbs, The Great Sussex Way (FH)
Chris Watson, West Wittering PC (CW)
Chloe Rose, RSPB (CR)
Pieter Montyn, Chair WSCC (PM)
Dorothy Cox, Chichester Canal Trust (DC)
Charlotte Owen, Sussex Wildlife Trust (CO)
Lydia Harvey, Shoreham Port (LH)
Eva Turley, Marine Management Organisation (ET)
Sam Tate, Chichester City Council (ST)
Adrian Moss, CDC Council Leader, Ward member Harbour Villages (AM)
Richard Austin, Chichester Harbour Conservancy (RA)
Jonathan Brown, CDC Environmental Portfolio Holder (JB)
Mark Chilton, CDC (MC)

Jill Sutcliffe, MWHG (JS)
 Richard Bland, Walk, Wheel, Cycle Trust Chichester (RB)
 Max Ambrose, CEO West Wittering Estate (MA)
 Zeno Wijtten, RSPB (ZW)
 David Sale, WSCC (DS)

Donna Johnson, CDC councillor representative, WSCC and Selsey Town Council (DJ)
 Richard Bates, CDC, Ward member Harbour Villages (RB)
 Paul Morris, Donnington PC (PM)
 Emily Bye, Environment Agency (EB)
 Dom Henly, WSCC (DH)
 Duncan Keir, WSCC (DK)
 John Parsonage, Environment Agency (JP)
 Ellie Read, WSCC (ER)
 Jess Meagher, WSCC (JM)
 Steve Hill, WSCC Partnerships Lead, Highways (SH)
 Tim Firmston, Birdham PC (TF)
 Danielle Dunfield, The Great Sussex Way (DD)
 Ian Martin, Selsey Town Council (IM)

1	Chairman's Welcome and Announcements	JF
	The Chairman welcomed all to the meeting. JF asked IB about message from Claire Potts re sites for the Local Plan Area. Manhood Peninsula is not mentioned. Local Plan states no development on the peninsula. IB – another 25% of houses to be identified district wide on the Plan. May have to look at the Manhood. Peninsula. NP – attended a training meeting with CDC planning officers. Expressed concern about sites on the peninsula. Local Plan should take precedence, but 5 year land supply is insufficient. IB – the Local Plan was adopted on the assumption that during the course of the plan period a 5 year supply would be identified. This is known as Tilted Balance. CC – 20% of sites have to be immediately deliverable. Some sites are not yet deliverable. Can we compose letter to Southern Water with respect to sewage explaining the issue. JF – this is a peninsula wide issue. PBe – correspondence has been tried. SW respond with comments on system reinforcement. Coastal flooding inundation provides a 25 year lifespan for houses here. The issue is fundamental but not resolved. DP – discussed the target figure. IB – July deadline for changes. Discussion took place re Grampion Conditions and sequential testing. JF – write to CDC ad Southern Water. JC – CDC is part of the MPP and the route in should be via Iain Ballantyne or Andrea Smith. CC – an alternative is to write a position statement rather than a request for policy change.	

	NP – East Wittering and West Wittering met Southern Water on 28 Nov. Positive meeting. SW explained their situation. The issue was that attenuation tanks could not be used. Discussion re Grampion Conditions. It was agreed a position statement would be possible if parishes were consulted, though it was also stated again that CDC is a member of the MPP.	
2	To approve the minutes from the last meeting and action points The minutes from the previous meeting were agreed and approved as an accurate record of the meeting. Action Summary: - JC/JF to remind Chris Stark that the A286 is not improving and to ask whether he is still he planning on doing a road safety audit? 15/01/2026 Email correspondence with Chris Stark , WSCC, re Road Safety Audit: <i>JC: I am writing to ask whether the road safety audit in two locations on the Manhood Peninsula has been scheduled yet? Last year you kindly informed the Manhood Peninsula Partnership GLaM group that something was planned and I'm following it up.</i> <i>CS: It may have been that we were in the process of undertaking our monitoring of collision data countywide and that a couple of sites within the Peninsular had been identified as a concern. I am aware a couple of sites that were under consideration, these are:</i> <i>B2202 Selsey Road ie Wophams Lane – this is progressing through design and scheduled for a safety scheme in 2026.</i> <i>B2145 Selsey Road ie Rotten Row, Sidlesham – currently low priority in the programme, delivery subject to availability of resources based on priority programme.</i> <i>The only scheme for A286 was at junction with Wophams Lane, which was delivered under the 23/24 programme of works, nothing was identified in 2024 or 2025. Another scheme for B2145 near Lockgate Road was withdrawn as scheme costs exceeded available budget and expected road safety benefits, though the site remains on the monitoring list.</i> <i>We undertake an annual monitoring exercise for collision data and through this, priorities within the programme can change. This monitoring includes reviewing sites where there are clusters of injury road traffic collisions and identifying if there is a pattern to the behaviours of road users or environmental factors to consider. Each individual site where we identify there is a potential intervention is then assessed as a group to identify the priority programme – so just because there have been collisions does not mean there is a viable intervention or that we will have the resources to prioritise that site. We are investing in new technology to give us greater insight to site selection, which now means we may also begin to consider locations where there has not yet been a collision but there is potential for significant harm if a collision occurred, thereby taking a preventative rather than reactive approach to casualty reduction. The 2026 monitoring will begin in March with site assessments following in</i>	JF

	<i>spring / early summer, so it will be late summer before we know what the 2027 programme may look like, and whether any sites on the Peninsular will be included.</i> <i>Just a point about language: a “road safety audit” is only undertaken as part of a scheme that changes the infrastructure and the way road users behave as a result of that change. Not all schemes have an RSA, it depends on the complexity of the scheme. In advance of a scheme, such as when determining priorities or at feasibility stage, we generally refer to site or risk assessments.</i>	
3	Matters arising from the Minutes not dealt with elsewhere on the Agenda	All
	None	
4	Coastal Partnerships Network (CPN)	AP
	Amy Pryor, CEO Coastal Partnerships Network AP - Coastal Partnerships Network supporting coastal collaboration. This presentation was given at the CPN conference last autumn. AP has been involved with CPN since 2014 when part of Thames Estuary Partnership (TEP). Was elected as chair of TEP in 2016. Who is the CPN? Coastal partnerships have been around since the 1990's. The partnerships were born out of an English Nature initiative. An 'honest broker' was thought essential, which led to the formation of the CPN. Each partnership is different, but that reflects what stakeholders want and need. Defra hasn't invested because all coastal partnerships are different and not nationally consistent. CPN – set up as a working group in 2006. CPN is now a charity. Dedicated funding has been acquired. Much national collaborative work has been undertaken in supporting catchment partnerships to work with coastal partnerships. • White paper to Defra laid out reasons why government should support coastal partnerships to the same degree, if not more than, catchment partnerships. • Championing Coastal Co-ordination funding acquired. The co-ordination role is considered essential. The value – accelerates action on the ground, though difficult to evaluate. • Needs an equivalent of the Catchment based approach and to recognise the coastal remit is not just the thin strip between high and low water. CPN is approached by many bodies to support R&D to consultants. Legal status for CPN was established by creating their own trading arm consultancy. The money for consultancy work is ploughed back into CPN. CPN is now a CIO. There are 55 coastal marine and estuarine partnerships round the country. A baseline vision for CPN was created in 2020. Has to be meaningful on a local, regional and national level.	

Much consultation undertaken to understand what partnerships wanted: • Networking, advocacy and communications. • The annual forum is recognised as valuable by all partners. • Coastal community issues are paramount, together with enhancing the natural environment. • Digital networking is essential. The website is key. • Advocacy – shaping future policy that recognises local challenges as well as national. Learning and development. Recognises that partnership officers hold the local knowledge. Hidden value. CPN recognises the wide remit of skills needed and different themes. The flip side is that coastal and marine expertise outside the partnerships is not good. How do we build that back in? Knowledge development and practise has been progressed depending on funding. Collaboration at national and regional network level. To be driven forwards once assets are developed. Recognition of consistent monitoring and evaluation is essential and a Fourth stream, the monitoring and evaluation programme, is under development. In future the CPN will run a survey and use this as a metric for national activity. Coastal Co-ordination funding was essential. CPN consider their work to be nationally relevant. A one stop shops for funding advice, advocacy, policy and more. The tech spec for a Coastal Co-ordination hub was created. This financial year's round of 3Cs funding will be used to support the hub. • It is about bringing Social and environmental knowledge together in one space to enable holistic decisions to be made. • 3C's funding has been acquired to help build the Leadership Group. • CPN won't own it but will facilitate it. Bringing social impact investors together with nature finance is being progressed but hasn't been done before. Coastal partnerships can be the bridge. What's next? • Wrapping up the evidence and background work accrued over the last 5 years is to be presented at a national level, and will articulate the impact. • Working towards having a core team within CPN. • Funding and comms plan under review by the board now. Will need feedback from partnerships. JF thanked AP for her presentation. CC – fantastic. Having been involved in the MPP since 2001 can appreciated the difficulties. The MPP is currently hosted by the district council. About to undergo local government reorganisation. The future is unclear. Do you have any advice? AP – many partnerships are hosted by local government. There are a few considerations:	
--	--

	• How would you like to be hosted and what will that mean for the scale of the partnership: ○ Do you want to grow. ○ Do you want to go it alone without a formal host? ○ What sort a scale of money do you need. AP would like to bring together partnerships grappling with the same issue. JF thanked AP for a tremendous presentation.	
5	MPP contributions from parishes	AS
	Andrea Smith, Environmental Strategy Manager, CDC AS – reiterated the changes to JC’s salary as outlined in the email sent round recently. Salary is covered, but not expenses, events and conferences or other events organised by the MPP. After expenses there is approx £4,000 for MPP activities, assuming parish contributions stay roughly the same each year. Projects can be suggested for funding by MPP members. The intention is to use parish contributions to further the aim of the partnership. RC – if salary is now covered, shouldn’t parishes pay less? If there are special projects, there could be an appeal to parishes for funding for specifics. AS – parishes must decide for themselves. A parish could pay less and contribute to larger specific projects. It is all down to parish preference. CC – I understood CDC paid for the salary. AS – was partially base budget funded, is now fully base budget funded. Discussion took place re funding of MPP Project Officer post. It was confirmed it is an administrative change. CC – we can persuade parishes that there is a huge benefit to making the MPP as strong as possible in the face of local government reorganisation. Continuing to contribute reinforces the fact we are a strong partnership. DP – if the money isn’t spent do we lose it? AS – money unspent at the end of the financial year would offset the cost of the officer’s salary, but the intention is to spend the money on activities. There is greater clarity on funding for the post. The parish contribution is for more discretionary expenditure including projects. RC – CC’s point is very valid. Important to continue supporting the MPP. If there are major projects, we must keep the communication with parishes ongoing. JF – projects – not all parishes attend the MPP. What projects would 11 parishes want to support? Do we have to go back to all parishes to gain authority for a spend? RC - not necessarily. We are happy for MPP to agree on expenditure.	

	JF – are all parishes present happy for MPP to decide on expenditure? Those parishes present agreed they would be happy for the MPP to agree expenditure, though it was accepted that there might be push back depending on the project. JC – have we already made the first step in asking for permission by creating the sub-groups that are already supported by parishes. AS – JC does have to follow CDC procurement rules.	
6	MPP Terms of Reference (ToR)	JF
	Joan Foster ToR has been circulated. Any concerns? MC – Sustrans has changed name. Action point: Sustrans has changed name in ToR All agreed	
7	Local Government Reorganisation (Standing Item)	JC
	Jane Cunningham The following information is from an update issued recently by CDC: We are moving closer to a decision from the Secretary of State on the future structure of local government in West Sussex, which we expect in mid-March. At this stage, the decision is referred to as 'minded to', meaning it's the provisional position. It will then be confirmed in law once the Structural Changes Order (SCO) is laid in the autumn. A Structural Changes Order (SCO) is a legal document used by the Government to implement changes to local government structures—most commonly when moving from a two-tier system (county and district councils) to a single unitary authority. The options currently under consideration are: • A single unitary council for the whole of West Sussex (population 901k) • Two unitary councils, comprising: ○ <i>Chichester, Arun, Adur and Worthing</i> (population 473k) ○ <i>Mid Sussex, Crawley and Horsham</i> (population 428k) • A five-unitary proposal for the whole of Sussex, submitted by Brighton & Hove. CDC has mapped out the phases of the programme through to Vesting Day in 2028 and beyond, which will require careful planning and coordinated effort across all councils.	

	<table><tr><th>Phase</th><th>Timeframe</th><th>Consideration</th><th>Governance</th></tr><tr><td>1. Preparatory</td><td>October 2025 – March 2026</td><td>Before decision on option made</td><td>Locally agreed</td></tr><tr><td>2. Transition</td><td>April 2026 – July 2026</td><td>After minded to decision</td><td>Locally agreed</td></tr><tr><td>3. Planning</td><td>August 2026 – April 2027</td><td>Policy decisions unlikely to be made</td><td>SCO defines governance</td></tr><tr><td>4. Shadow</td><td>May 2027 – March 2028</td><td>Mandate to make decisions for new council(s)</td><td>Shadow Executive (Elected)</td></tr><tr><td>5. Vesting</td><td>April 2028</td><td>Stabilisation focus</td><td>Executive</td></tr><tr><td>6. Optimisation</td><td>May 2028 - onwards</td><td>Development of new council(s)</td><td>Executive</td></tr></table>	Phase	Timeframe	Consideration	Governance	1. Preparatory	October 2025 – March 2026	Before decision on option made	Locally agreed	2. Transition	April 2026 – July 2026	After minded to decision	Locally agreed	3. Planning	August 2026 – April 2027	Policy decisions unlikely to be made	SCO defines governance	4. Shadow	May 2027 – March 2028	Mandate to make decisions for new council(s)	Shadow Executive (Elected)	5. Vesting	April 2028	Stabilisation focus	Executive	6. Optimisation	May 2028 - onwards	Development of new council(s)	Executive	
Phase	Timeframe	Consideration	Governance																											
1. Preparatory	October 2025 – March 2026	Before decision on option made	Locally agreed																											
2. Transition	April 2026 – July 2026	After minded to decision	Locally agreed																											
3. Planning	August 2026 – April 2027	Policy decisions unlikely to be made	SCO defines governance																											
4. Shadow	May 2027 – March 2028	Mandate to make decisions for new council(s)	Shadow Executive (Elected)																											
5. Vesting	April 2028	Stabilisation focus	Executive																											
6. Optimisation	May 2028 - onwards	Development of new council(s)	Executive																											
8	Manhood Greenway (Standing Item)	JF																												
	Joan Foster Permission for northern section gained from three landowners but not the Church Commissioners. • Are in talks with the agent. • Sarah Sharp is involved. • The concerns are that there may be minerals on the land. • Jesse Brown Fuller MP is also involved. BM – any success with his contact? Savills not helpful. Church of England took over. No response yet. CC – is this permanent or permissive. JF - amenable to permissive but WSCC wont fund.																													
9	Updates from MPP partners and subgroups	All																												
	• Written updates circulated. • MWHG Newsletter: 9th March 2026 If there are any further updates, please send to JC by email.																													
9	Any Other Business and future topics	All																												
	JC - Selsey Coastal Scheme events: Selsey residents can look forward to public events in April, where the shortlisted Selsey Coastal Scheme options will be showcased. These sessions will take place at The Selsey Centre on April 17 and 18, offering a chance to learn more and share your views. For updates, visit www.coastalpartners.org.uk or follow Coastal Partners on Facebook and Instagram																													
10	Dates for future meetings	JF																												
	MPP meeting dates for 2026: Mon 22 June – please note date change from 29 June Mon 28 Sept Mon 7 Dec All meetings take place online between 10.00–11.30 unless specified otherwise																													

Action Point summary:

Sustrans has changed its name. The new name should be in the ToR (23/03/2026 completed).