



Minutes of the special meeting of the **Council** held in the Council Chamber East Pallant House Chichester on Monday 19 June 2017 at 14:00

**Members Present**

Mrs E Hamilton (Chairman), Mrs N Graves (Vice-Chairman), Mrs C Apel, Mr J Brown, Mr A Collins, Mr J Connor, Mr A Dignum, Mrs P Dignum, Mr J F Elliott, Mr N Galloway, Mr M Hall, Mrs P Hardwick, Mr R Hayes, Mr L Hixson, Mr F Hobbs, Mrs J Kilby, Mrs E Lintill, Mr L Macey, Mr G McAra, Mr K Martin, Mr S Morley, Mr S Oakley, Mr C Page, Mrs P Plant, Mr R Plowman, Mr H Potter, Mrs C Purnell, Mr J Ransley, Mr A Shaxson, Mrs S Taylor, Mr N Thomas, Mr D Wakeham and Mr P Wilding

**Members Absent**

Mr G Barrett, Mr R Barrow, Mr P Budge, Mr T Dempster, Mrs J Duncton, Mr M Dunn, Mr J W Elliott, Mr G Hicks, Mrs G Keegan, Mr S Lloyd-Williams, Caroline Neville, Mr J Ridd, Mrs J Tassell, Mrs P Tull and Mrs S Westacott

**Officers Present for All Items**

Mr S Carvell (Executive Director), Mr P E Over (Executive Director), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Mr G Thrussell (Senior Member Services Officer) and Mr J Ward (Head of Finance and Governance Services)

**219 Chairman's Announcements**

Mrs Hamilton alluded to the fact that the agenda for this special meeting did not include the usual standing item of Questions to the Executive. This was because in the case of special meetings Chichester District Council's (CDC) *Constitution* provided that certain agenda items were not to feature unless the Chairman of the Council otherwise directed. She had decided to permit the inclusion of Public Question Time, in view of the nature and importance of the three recommendations to the Council in agenda items 5, 6 and 7 and Late Items. She had not so directed, however, with respect to Questions to the Executive.

She outlined the emergency evacuation procedure.

Mrs Hamilton then invited the Chief Executive, Diane Shepherd, to make the following statement with respect to the recent fire in London and CDC's response to this terrible tragedy.

*Statement by the Chief Executive – Grenfell Tower North Kensington London*

'The fire that swept through Grenfell Tower in North Kensington was horrific and my thoughts are with all of those who lost their lives, those who were affected by this dreadful incident, and of course the heroic emergency services working at the site.

A detailed e-mail was sent to all members on Friday setting out the current position in Chichester District. I do not intend to read the contents of the e-mail today but I would like to reassure members of the public that we have robust fire safety measures in place and I, along with the senior management team, are reviewing these procedures to double check whether there is anything further that we can do to ensure the safety of residents. We are also complying with any advice coming from the government.

We no longer manage our own housing stock and there are no high-rise buildings within the District. However, all of the accommodation that we do own, including our temporary accommodation at Westward House, meets safety standards.

We are required by law to complete fire risk assessments for all buildings where we have landlord responsibilities and we are required to identify hazards and people at risk and evaluate, remove or reduce fire risks. This places a clear duty on the person responsible to ensure that fire hazards are removed and that precautions are provided such as detection and warning, fire-fighting equipment, escape routes, lighting, signs and maintenance and maintenance. We have in place fire risk assessments for all our buildings.

We are also responsible for licensing houses in multiple occupation. We do not issue a licence until we are satisfied that the appropriate fire safety standards are met. However, it must be emphasised that it is the landlord's responsibility to ensure that the building is free of fire hazards. In addition we operate a private letting scheme, Homefinder. All accommodation situated within the District is inspected by a member of the Environmental Housing Team to ensure that it is free from category 1 hazards under the Housing Health and Safety Rating System and such assessments consider the issue of fire safety.

We have buildings in the Estates portfolio with residential accommodation either at ground-floor level or arranged as maisonettes at first/second floor level. We carry out annual fire risk assessments (FRA) of common user areas and regular inspections to ensure exit routes are clear etc.

We have recently audited the three Westgate leisure centres and all their FRAs are up to date.

The safety of our residents and businesses is paramount. We work very closely with West Sussex Fire and Rescue and together we actively promote fire safety and encourage businesses, landlords and residents to make sure that they are meeting the correct safety standards. West Sussex Fire and Rescue have issued guidance for residents and businesses since this dreadful incident and we really would urge people to visit their website <https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/fire-emergencies-and-crime/west-sussex-fire-rescue-service/> to make sure that they are aware of the latest fire safety advice.'

Mrs Shepherd added that CDC would be publishing a media release today which would include details of where and how the public could access that information. In addition, its emergency plans and business continuity procedures were all correctly in place having all been reviewed following the recent terrorist incidents. Those two areas were also the subject of scrutiny by CDC's Corporate Governance and Audit Committee. The risk register was fully updated. She wished to reassure the public that SLT was checking all relevant issues and matters to be absolutely sure that all extant systems and procedures contained the correct mitigation measures. She intended to e-mail members with an update during the next week or so.

Mrs Hamilton thanked Mrs Shepherd for making the foregoing statement.

Mrs Hamilton advised that the following apologies for absence had been received: Mr Barrett, Mr Barrow, Mr Budge, Mrs Duncton, Mr Dunn, Mr J W Elliott, Mr Hicks, Mrs Keegan, Mr Lloyd-Williams, Caroline Neville, Mr Ridd, Mrs Tassell, Mrs Tull and Mrs Westacott.

Mrs Hamilton informed members that there were no late items for consideration under agenda item 9 (a) and (b).

## **220      Approval of the Minutes**

The Council received the minutes of the Annual Council meeting on Tuesday 16 May 2017, which had been circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

There were no proposed changes to the minutes.

### *Decision*

The Council voted unanimously on a show of hands to make the following resolution.

### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the Annual Council meeting on Tuesday 16 May 2017 be approved without making any amendments.

Mrs Hamilton then duly signed and dated the final (eighteenth) page of the official version of the aforesaid minutes as a correct record.

## **221      Declarations of Interests**

Declarations of personal interests were made in respect of agenda items 5 (Chichester Local Plan Review: Timetable and Issues and Options Consultation), 6 (Draft Statement of Community Involvement) and 7 (Draft Southern Gateway Masterplan for Public Consultation) by the undermentioned who were members of the stated councils which had been or would be consulted during the consultation periods:

### *Chichester City Council*

(1) Mrs Apel

(2) Mr Budge

(3) Mr Dignum

(4) Mr Galloway

(5) Mr Hixson

(6) Mrs Kilby

(7) Mr Macey

(8) Mr Plowman

*West Sussex County Council*

(1) Mrs Duncton

(2) Mr Oakley

(3) Mrs Purnell

**222 Public Question Time**

No public questions had been submitted for this meeting.

[**Note** Minute paras 223 to 228 below summarise the consideration of and conclusion to agenda items 8 to 10 inclusive but for full details please refer to the audio recording facility via this link:

<http://chichester.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=132&MId=963&Ver=4> ]

**223 Chichester Local Plan Review: Timetable and Issues and Options Consultation**

The Council considered the recommendations made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting earlier in the day as set out on the face of the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes), the details in respect of which were contained in the report on pages 13 to 21 of the agenda for that meeting and also in the three appendices to the report on pages 1 to 118 of the agenda supplement. All CDC members had received a copy of the Cabinet agenda and agenda supplement.

Mrs Taylor (the Cabinet Member for Planning Services) formally moved the recommendations of the Cabinet which had been made earlier in the day and this was seconded by Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council).

Mrs Taylor said that this review of the *Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029* (CLP), which had been adopted in July 2015, was imposed by the planning inspector in pronouncing the CLP to be sound. The requirement for a review within five years was due to the annual housing figure in the CLP of 435 homes per year falling short of meeting the objectively assessed need (OAN) at that time of 505 homes per year. Satisfying the OAN was a particular challenge for Chichester District since 70% of the area fell within the South Downs National Park and so outside the CLP area. A portion of the remaining 30% was either in the AONB or subject to environmental constraints eg flooding. In addition Chichester District was adjacent to other large urban areas with growth in employment and housing requirements, particularly in Arun District Council and Havant Borough Council areas. Moreover, it was evident from recent examinations of other local authorities' local plans that councils had to plan for very substantial increases in housing numbers and CDC could not assume that it would be exempt at the review examination. Despite not being able at this stage to estimate the scale of development for which CDC would be required to allocate land, the plan-making process had to be commenced now. The timetable was

set out in appendix 1 (page 9) and would require close adherence in order to ensure adoption was completed within five years ie by July 2020. The absence of a new local plan could render the CLP area vulnerable to speculative development in inappropriate and even damaging locations instead of the most suitable sites which balanced meeting demand with minimising harm to the area's wonderful natural heritage.

The first main stage of the review process was the Issues and Options consultation which was due to run from 22 June to 3 August 2017, using a questionnaire to engage the community (parish councils and their residents) and drawing out comments and information to help CDC draft a strategy and preferred policy options to be included in the CLP review document. Community engagement was a very important process. The possible locations for housing development listed in the consultation were described only in broad terms at this stage. As the plan-making process progressed, the options would become narrower in range and more clearly defined.

The consultation would be accompanied by a sustainability appraisal (SA) which would deal specifically with the locations in questions 11 and 14. A SA assessed *inter alia* the social, environmental and economic impacts of the development options in the CLP review. At this preliminary stage this SA provided only an outline summary of the positive and negative impacts of options.

The consultation documents were amended in the light of comments made by CDC's Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel on 3 May 2017 (para 6.9 of the report).

The consultation on the SA and the Habitat Regulations Assessment would run in parallel with the issues identified in the CLP review questionnaire. During the ensuing discussion (full details of which are available via the audio recording on CDC's web-site) members made comments and asked questions about various matters and received where appropriate answers from Mrs Taylor or officers, namely Mr Allgrove, Mr Carvell and Mr Frost. The subjects included:

- (a) The need to enable participation by everyone including those who did not have access to the online consultation facility – hard copy responses would be accepted; there was at this early stage of the review process no need to arrange public meetings; parish councils should consider arranging a special meeting if the consultation dates did not conveniently fit in with the usual cycle of ordinary meetings.
- (b) The importance of building to higher density levels where appropriate and avoid a 'sprawl and expansion' approach – this was an issue for later in the consultation.
- (c) The significant contribution to the consultation process that could and should be made by the local councillor and political parties – such participation was welcome.
- (d) The absence of any explicit reference in the consultation document to (a) the likely number of additional houses that the Local Plan Review will have to address, bearing in mind that the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) Issues and Evidence Report in appendix 3 to the Cabinet agenda report referred to at least a further 3,500 new dwellings and (b) how that number was derived – a benchmark figure (which was not definitive) was necessary at this stage for the purposes of the consultation and was calculated in accordance with a set formula details of which could be provided after this meeting.

- (e) The reason for a cut-off figure of 500 dwellings between strategic and non-strategic sites given that the current CLP referred to a lower number being considered strategic – a suggested baseline figure had been selected at this change but it was not definitive and could be changed later.
- (f) The quality and inconsistency of the SA in appendix 2 to the agenda report was a cause for considerable concern since the SA had been cited against CDC at a planning appeal inquiry the previous week. The lack of depth with respect to issues such as cumulative impact on the Medmerry site was reminiscent of problems experienced with CDC's SHLAA document in the lead up to the CLP – concerns about the SA could be submitted during the consultation but officers considered it to be a high quality, comprehensive document; reference to Medmerry (which was treated as if it were a Special Protection Area) was made on page 107 in appendix 3 to the agenda report; note should be taken of the text for Next Steps on page 117.
- (g) The Local Plan Review process would take two years to undertake and (a) it would be open to scrutiny by developers once CDC published its updated OAN figures, which might then be used by the development industry in planning appeals and (b) the clear direction of travel by the government to increase rates of housing delivery which again could be used to argue for higher levels of development than envisaged in the CLP – CDC's CLP was currently up-to-date, there was a plan-led process and developers and planning inspectors would be expected to conform to and uphold the CLP.
- (h) The target audience for the consultation should be identified as it was desirable for responses not to be principally limited to individuals – it would have a wide ambit but replies from individuals were welcome.
- (i) The reference to the needs of older people was pleasing.
- (j) The review was an extensive undertaking and there needed to be a sufficient willingness to compromise in order to achieve an overall satisfactory outcome.
- (k) The statement on page 117 in appendix 3 was not easy to understand - what it meant was that the Habitats Regulations Assessment would be reiterated and updated during the course of the Local Plan Review process.
- (l) The local planning authority would need to give increasing weight by 2019-2020 to the emerging numbers while also continuing to pay regard to the extant CLP.

At the end of the debate the following decision was made by the Council.

### *Decision*

The Council voted with respect to the recommendations made to it by the Cabinet and on a show of hands it was in favour of making the resolutions set out below, with no votes against and two abstentions.

## RESOLVED

- (1) That the published Local Development Scheme 2017-2020 be amended by adding the key dates for the Local Plan Review set out in paragraph 6.3 of the agenda report.
- (2) That the Local Plan Review Issues and Options documents presented as appendices to the agenda report be approved for a six-week period of public consultation from 22 June to 3 August 2017.
- (3) That the Head of Planning Services be authorised following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning Services to make minor amendments to the consultation documents prior to their publication.

## 224      **Draft Statement of Community Involvement for Public Consultation**

The Council considered the recommendations made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting earlier in the day as set out on the face of the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes), the details in respect of which were contained in the report on pages 22 to 24 of the agenda for that meeting and also in the appendix to the report on pages 119 to 132 of the agenda supplement. All CDC members had received a copy of the Cabinet agenda and agenda supplement.

Mrs Taylor (the Cabinet Member for Planning Services) formally moved the recommendations of the Cabinet which had been made earlier in the day and this was seconded by Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council).

Mrs Taylor explained that it was a legal requirement for a local authority to produce a statement of community involvement (SCI), which would set out CDC's approach to engage the public and other interested parties, including specific organisations that had to be consulted, in all planning policy and development management matters. An SCI explained the different categories of planning documents, the stages applicable to them and how the development management system worked. There were five engagement commitments to guide CDC in undertaking consultations (para 3.1 page 124): (a) be clear about what we are doing; (b) be inclusive; (c) be accessible; (d) be transparent; (e) be accountable. The current SCI was adopted in 2013. Although not caught by the prospective requirement under the recently enacted *Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017* to review an SCI every five years, given the review of the *Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029* (CLP) now underway this was an appropriate time to review the SCI. The SCI was not the subject of amendments when considered by CDC's Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel on 3 May 2017 (para 8.2 of the report). If approved by the Council the draft SCI would be made available for public consultation for a period of six weeks between 22 June 2017 and 3 August 2017.

During the ensuing discussion (full details of which are available via the audio recording on CDC's web-site) members made comments and asked questions about various matters and received where appropriate answers from Mr Dignum, Mrs Taylor or officers, namely Mr Allgrove, Mr Frost and Mrs Shepherd. The subjects included:

- (a) The initiation of a neighbourhood development plan (para 3.14 on page 127 of the agenda supplement) - this had to be by a parish or town or city council in the case of the whole parish area or if less than the whole parish area eg a city or town centre area, then it could be initiated by a neighbourhood planning forum; whether

there had been a change in the relevant regulations to require in the latter case the initiation and support by a parish etc council would be checked by officers.

- (b) The section 3.4 on page 125 'Who do we involve?' and whether parish councils, particularly Chichester City Council, were entitled to nominate residents associations etc (representing significant numbers of people with important points of view to express) to receive the consultation documents directly rather than the parish council itself having to supply the papers upon request to such organisations – links were provided to view the consultation documents online; paras 3.5 to 3.7 covered the specific point, whereas para 3.4 related to bodies which were required by statute to be consulted, and in the light of para 3.7 parish councils should be encouraging such organisations to ensure they were registered on CDC's consultation database.
- (c) The desirability of inserting a short reference or para between paras 3.7 and 3.8 on page 126 stating that communities could engage at the independent examination stage by in certain circumstances giving evidence, there being a brief mention of the examination in the diagram on page 123 – this had been agreed by the Cabinet at its meeting earlier in the day to be a sound suggestion and action would be taken to add such a reference but in order to avoid delaying the start of the consultation this might have to wait until it had been concluded.
- (d) The reference in para 2.9 on page 122 was to different preparation and consultation stages for development plan documents and supplementary planning documents but the diagram on page 123 did not differentiate between them but referred instead in the 'Inspect' box to development plan documents' – this was an editorial issue which could be addressed during the consultation.

At the end of the debate the following decision was made by the Council meeting.

#### *Decision*

The Council voted with respect to the recommendations made to it by the Cabinet and on a show of hands it was unanimously in favour of making the resolutions set out below, with no votes against and no abstentions.

#### **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the Statement of Community Involvement be approved for a six-week public consultation.
- (2) That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning Services following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning Services to enable minor amendments to be made to the document prior to and following public consultation.

#### **225 Draft Southern Gateway Masterplan for Public Consultation**

The Council considered the recommendations made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting earlier in the day as set out on the face of the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes), the details in respect of which were contained in the report on pages 25 to 29 of the agenda for that meeting and also in the appendix to the report on pages 133 to 212 of the agenda supplement. All CDC members had received a copy of the Cabinet agenda and agenda supplement.



Mr Dignum (the leader of the Council) formally moved the recommendations of the Cabinet and this was seconded by Mrs Lintill (the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community Services).

In addition to the relevant CDC officers who were in attendance for this item, Matthew Lappin of David Lock Associates, the town planning and urban design consultants engaged for the Chichester Southern Gateway Draft Masterplan (CSG DM) project (which included preparation of the Strategic Environmental Assessment), and Phil Brady of Peter Brett Associates, the development and infrastructure consultants engaged to produce the transport appraisal for the CSG DM, were present. Mr Lappin would give a PowerPoint presentation following Mr Dignum's introduction, after which he and Mr Brady would reply to members' questions.

Mr Dignum presented the report about the proposal to hold a public consultation on the CSG DM. He explained the relationship between the draft Chichester Vision process (he read out its theme) and the CSG DM (para 5.3 of the report). The CSG MP was not prescriptive but indicative. The Vision, which supported the enhanced role and function of the city centre as a leading visitor destination with a vibrant and growing economy that was also accessible and attractive, identified three major projects: CSG, the Northern Gateway and the West Street Piazza. The intention was to enhance the Southern Gateway area of the city, which was a key point of arrival, by developing parcels of land to produce a comprehensive mixed use of housing, retail and commercial development, the last of which might include a hotel. The Canal Basin was identified as an important component in the masterplan scheme and that area would be greatly enhanced. Key priorities included (a) reducing the dominance of road traffic and congestion and (b) improving safety in the Southgate Gyratory and design quality (no building to be higher than four storeys). CDC was working closely with its partners West Sussex County Council and the Homes and Community Agency and negotiations were taking place with Stagecoach and Royal Mail to explore the relocation of their operations. This scheme had clear potential for delivery and there was a strong local appetite for the proposed residential and mixed use development. Funding was addressed in section 7 of the report and funding options would include the Local Enterprise Partnership and other government sources.

The slides in Mr Lappin's aforementioned PowerPoint presentation (a colour copy of which is attached to the official minutes only) covered *inter alia* the following matters:

- Context for Preparing the Masterplan
- Project Stages
- Baseline Review and Statistical Review
- Opportunities and Constraints – Chichester
- Southern Gateway Strengths - Chichester
- Southern Gateway Weaknesses - Chichester
- Draft Masterplan Objectives and Proposals
- City Role and Function – Chichester
- Key Concept Diagram – Chichester
- Development Opportunities and Public Realm Priorities Composite – Chichester
- The Law Courts and Bus Station
- Option A and Option B (maps and photographs)
- Basin Road Car Park and Bus Depot
- Royal Mail Sorting Office (photographs)
- Police Station and Land at the High School

- Public Realm Priorities – Chichester
- Option A and Option B
- Level Crossings
- Artistic impression of the development
- Delivery Strategy
- Viability Testing
- Next Steps

During the ensuing debate (full details of which are available via the audio recording on CDC's web-site) members made comments and asked questions about various matters and received where appropriate answers from Mr Brady, the Leader of the Council or CDC officers, namely Mr Allgrove, Mr Carvell and Mr Over. The subjects included:

- (a) *The approach adopted to addressing traffic congestion issues in Options A and B*  
Each option had undergone modelling and would have a different level of restraint on the road network; the principal differences between A and B were summarised; the key for the transport appraisal brief was to improve access for those who wished to come to the city and to encourage the use of alternative routes for those who sought to go through the city; the options aimed to remove congestion from key areas, rather than entirely, in order to improve for example pedestrian routes and bus connectivity; if the Southgate gyratory were to be retained the congestion would be relieved by diverting through city traffic onto other roads.
- (b) *The maps for Option A and B should use colour to aid comprehension and interpretation during the consultation* Noted.
- (c) *The city faced the building of a significant number of houses and the opportunity to take full advantage of this by addressing how the city should be developed as a result could be missed if the focus was only on the one small area which was the subject of the CSG MP; there was a need for the CSG MP to be more ambitious than it was currently and should consider transport infrastructure across the city and surrounding area with a view to achieving considerably more* The practical challenges and environmental/aesthetical considerations involved in constructing a bridge or tunnel to circumvent the railway line crossings were outlined; waste water capacity would be addressed as part of any proposed development and within the Local Plan Review process; the transport appraisal had a city-wide perspective and took into account the surrounding A27 and growth up to 2035.
- (d) *The CSG MP was extremely ambitious and exciting: it was a 30-acre site and far greater in scope than the Northgate Gyratory and West Street Piazza proposals, the nature of each of which was less ambitious and they were currently far from being realised* Noted.
- (e) *The relocation of the bus station was essential to the success of the CSG MP and if not achieved the scheme would surely fail* CDC had been in negotiation with Royal Mail and Stagecoach for about 12 months about relocation and it was believed that the needs of each organisation could be successfully accommodated in moving from their current sites; certainly the relocation of the bus station/depot was a challenge which was being actively addressed; the CSG MP contemplated short, medium and long-term opportunities.

- (f) *The CSG MP aimed, to quote the Leader of the Council, something major and ambitious but it would not achieve that objective unless a way could be found for traffic etc to traverse with ease the existing railway line* The contrary view was that even if the funds were available to afford a bridge or tunnel, the aesthetical/environmental considerations militated against doing so.
- (g) *The history since 2000 of the unrealised or only partially successful attempts to redevelop this area of the city meant that the opportunity presented by the CSG MP should not be lost but maximised to achieve the many housing and mixed-use benefits the scheme envisaged and the reality of having to live with and plan development around the level crossing gates had to be accepted and embraced positively* A determination not to fail was essential to the success of the CSG MP.
- (h) *The several references to the River Lavant in the CSG MP were very positive and the use of public art could enhance the Canal Basin entrance* Chichester City Council was eager to take on responsibility for cleaning up the River Lavant.
- (i) *The two major constraints which had been serious constraints on development in the city for 40 years were the A27 and the level crossings; the CSG MP was perhaps the last opportunity to be rid of the level crossings (a Victorian solution not fit for purpose today) and if it were not now grasped and exploited the problem would only deteriorate; it was imperative to explore all engineering options to see if a viable solution existed; a further option would be to lower the rail lines and build a new station; such options should be fully investigated before undertaking the consultation; the level crossing gates could be down for significant periods of time, as much even as 40 minutes in an hour-long period* Fifteen options (including A and B which were recommended for bringing forward the CSG MP) had been considered with modelling taking into account existing railway signal timings and projected if these were altered eg by introducing bus priority and pedestrian use in Stockbridge Road; full closure of both level crossings had been shown to have a major impact on traffic congestion in and around the rest of the city including the A27; a bridge or tunnel would overcome the traffic queues at the railway line but in consequence traffic would be drawn into the area, whereas one aim of the transport appraisal was to restrain traffic entering the area thereby improving the public realm; in fact the level crossings actually helped to afford some respite for pedestrians and cyclists from vehicular traffic flows; there had been discussions with Network Rail about how the crossings were operated including down times for the gates and since the schemes in the draft CSG MP proposed bus priority and pedestrian routes along Stockbridge Road, this would enable the signal timings to be altered at both crossings and thereby reduce a little the current down-times for the gates; the transport appraisal consultant (an engineering firm itself) had not contacted engineering consultants but was fully aware of the cost and construction issues (logistics, amenity impact) involved in having a bridge (including a pedestrian crossing) or tunnel; the cost benefit analysis favoured the two options in the draft CSG MP; Network Rail had been asked about lowering the rail line and whilst acknowledging that it was a possibility, a considerable amount of land would have to be lowered and the line shut for a long period of time (up to two years – up to about a year for a bridge to be built), the cost of which would be very considerable.
- (j) *The CSG MP gave rise to two concerns and a practical suggestion: (1) the Vision for Chichester City Centre document referred to attracting new businesses into the centre but this objective could be undermined by the CSG MP proposal for new*

*business units at the CSG site (page 142), (ii) there appeared to be in the CSG MP remarkably little parking provision and the problems were wider than the masterplan area namely the unresolved issues with the A27 and (iii) the Option A and B diagrams on pages 210-211 should be made clearer by the better use of colour, improved traffic flow explanations and the inclusion of before and after traffic flow diagrams* As to: (i) the CSG MP recognised the lack within the city centre of new custom-built retail/business units, which was a constraint on attracting new business to Chichester, hence its commercial proposals for the site; (ii) parking provision varied according to the nature and location of properties, there was a proposal to make better use of currently zoned side streets in the city for parking while keeping the main highway arteries clear of parked vehicles and to extend the geographical reach of controlled parking zones, and the modelling had taken into account what the *Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029* (CLP) stipulated with regard to highways improvement works; and (iii) officers would be requested to implement those helpful suggestions for improvements.

- (k) *The obligation to meet the CLP area's housing requirement and to seek to do so by building as much as possible on brownfield sites meant that it was imperative to proceed expeditiously with the CSG MP notwithstanding many issues which would need to be addressed as the scheme was progressed* Noted.

Towards the end of the debate Mr Ransley proposed an alternative approach to the Cabinet's recommendations and details of his motion appear below. He explained his proposal as follows.

He said that in common with most members he had had little time to read through the CSG MP published very recently as part of the Cabinet agenda papers or the online transport appraisal or any background detail. He remained of the same opinion as he had expressed at CDC's Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel on 15 June 2017 when he and other CDC members received a CSG MP PowerPoint presentation, namely that in his view the CSG MP was extremely disappointing and had not been considered in the context of the city-wide area. Whilst the site was the most important one to shape the city centre that would come forward for a decade or more, the driving force behind the production of the CSG MP appeared to be focused on speed of delivery rather than quality, members having insufficient opportunity to consider and debate it. Although he had been advised by Mr Dignum that 'a resolution of the long standing traffic congestion and delays caused by the level crossings have been a focus of the work', the CSG MP did not incorporate a proposal for this; option 8 in the transport appraisal achieved that objective but it was not being pursued. The Transport Assessment Options and Modelling summary (page 80) stated that any option that had a material (un-quantified) impact on local or regional network had been set aside resulting in the only options for consideration being those which did not meet the objective or focus of the work. The development capacity being proposed was a potential of 390 to 450 residential units and about 380,000 square feet of mixed commercial/office space and 72,000 square feet of retail space; the commercial space alone was equivalent to seven football pitches. He could not find any reference to the provision of parking for that large new commercial space or what the resultant increase in worker/visitor vehicle trips to that new commercial area in the city would have on the transport modelling or even its potential economic consequence. The CSG MP recognised that this volume of development would also need to demonstrate 'no net increase in flow' to the Apuldram waste water treatment works and so the scheme might not be deliverable until either a long-term solution was found for Apuldram or an on-site sewage facility was utilised. This delay could be put to good effect by working further on the CSG MP.

In his view, the CSG MP was a quickly assembled proposal which was likely to be financially attractive for speculative developers (the viability appraisals were still being updated and had yet to be reviewed by the steering group) but delivering very little benefit to the residents of Chichester City and potentially reducing rather than improving the existing city-wide quality of place that was currently enjoyed. In his view, as to which he said he was not alone, the correct process would be for the City Vision to be finalised first before the CSG MP consultation draft was in turn completed and he favoured a pause in the CSG MP process and to use that time (a) to improve it by placing it in the wider city context, along with the Northern Gateway and other initiatives which were being planned and (b) to undertake a more meaningful briefing of and consultation with members and others including residents.

Accordingly he proposed the following motion:

‘The public consultation on the Draft Southern Gateway Master Plan be delayed until after the City Vision has been adopted by the Council and that the Master Plan is expanded to incorporate other significant city-wide scheme proposals such as the Northern Gateway, and that all city-wide beneficial transport options be considered by members for inclusion in the public consultation draft.’

Mr Ransley’s motion was seconded by Mr Plowman.

Mr Dignum responded by pointing out that the CSG MP had not been rushed but had been developed over many months by CDC, West Sussex County Council and the Homes and Community Agency, with extensive consultations with Network Rail, Royal Mail and Stagecoach. As to sequencing, the final version of the Vision for Chichester City Centre would be presented to the Council at its meeting on 25 July 2017 and so would in fact precede the CSG MP, the consultation for which had yet to start and during which members were entitled of course as part of the democratic process of a consultation to submit their comments and proposals eg for alternative solutions for the level crossings and they were not, therefore, in any less favourable position than the stakeholders. As had been pointed out earlier in the debate, there had been since 2000 various abortive attempts to develop a scheme for this area of the city and this ought not to be allowed to be yet another instance of those failures. In his opinion Mr Ransley’s proposal was a delaying tactic which would benefit neither CDC nor the community and if it succeeded it would show that CDC was avoiding the big issues which needed to be confronted.

Mrs Apel expressed concern that since the CLP Plan Review Issues and Options consultation would run simultaneously with that for the CSG MP this would be confusing for the public. Mr Dignum commented that there was a week’s difference in the two timetables and those consultations related to two very different geographical areas.

There were no questions asked with regard to Mr Ransley’s proposal.

A vote by a show of hands was taken on Mr Ransley’s proposal and the outcome was as follows: ten members were in favour, 23 were against and there were no abstentions. The proposal was not therefore carried.

The Council was then asked, the debate having ended, to vote with respect to the recommendation in section 2 of the agenda report and the following decision was made.

### *Decision*

The Council voted with respect to the recommendations made to it by the Cabinet and on a show of hands 24 members were in favour of making the resolutions set out below; some members voted against or abstained, but those were not counted.

### **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the Draft Southern Gateway Masterplan (as set out in the appendix to the agenda report) be approved for public consultation.
- (2) That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning Services following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning Services to enable minor amendments to be made to the document prior to public consultation.

[**Note** At the end of this item Mrs Hamilton announced that there would be a short adjournment in proceedings before the final agenda item was considered and this break lasted between 16:27 and 16:37]

### **226 Amended Appointment to Committees 2017-2018**

The Council considered the agenda report on page 19 (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Hamilton briefly introduced the report, which proposed one change to the committee memberships for 2017-2018 which had been approved at the Annual Council meeting on 16 May 2017.

She advised that in addition Mrs L C Purnell would replace Mrs J L Kilby as the vice-chairman of the Planning Committee for 2017-2018. This change was in consequence of Mrs Kilby having recently been appointed to the Cabinet and Mrs Purnell having left the Cabinet following her election in May 2017 as a member of West Sussex County Council.

There was no discussion of this item.

Mrs Hamilton proposed that the recommendation in para 2.1 of the report and the additional appointment relating to the Planning Committee be approved.

### *Decision*

The Council voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of making the resolution below.

### **RESOLVED**

That (1) Mrs P C Plant be appointed in the place of Mr J C P Connor to serve on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for 2017-2018 and (2) Mrs L C Purnell be appointed in place of Mrs J L Kilby as the vice-chairman of the Planning Committee for 2017-2018.

227      **Late Items**

As announced by the Chairman of the Council at agenda item 1 (see minute 219 above) there were no late items for consideration at this meeting.

228      **Exclusion of the Press and the Public**

In the absence of any Part II items on the agenda for this meeting a resolution to exclude the press and the public was not required.

[**Note** The meeting ended at 16:37]

---

CHAIRMAN

---

DATE