

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD

Director of Corporate Services

Contact: Democratic Services

Email: democraticservices@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House

1 East Pallant

Chichester

West Sussex

PO19 1TY

Tel: 01243 785166

www.chichester.gov.uk



A meeting of **Council** will be held in **Virtual** on **Tuesday 2 March 2021** at **2.00 pm**.

MEMBERS: Mrs E Hamilton (Chairman), Mrs C Apel (Vice-Chairman), Mrs T Bangert, Mr G Barrett, Miss H Barrie, Mr M Bell, Rev J H Bowden, Mr R Briscoe, Mr J Brown, Mr A Dignum, Mrs J Duncton, Mr J Elliott, Mr G Evans, Mrs J Fowler, Mrs N Graves, Mr F Hobbs, Mr K Hughes, Mrs D Johnson, Mr T Johnson, Mrs E Lintill, Mrs S Lishman, Mr G McAra, Mr A Moss, Mr S Oakley, Dr K O'Kelly, Mr C Page, Mr D Palmer, Mrs P Plant, Mr R Plowman, Mr H Potter, Mrs C Purnell, Mr D Rodgers, Mrs S Sharp, Mr A Sutton, Mrs S Taylor and Mr P Wilding

SUPPLEMENT TO AGENDA

5 Public Question Time (Pages 1 - 4)

Supplementary Public Questions and Answers.

This page is intentionally left blank

Chichester District Council

Full Council

2 March 2021

Supplement Public Questions and Answers Sheet

Supplementary Questions from Andrew Kerry-Bedell:

1. *How can Brownfield Sites with extant planning permission outside a defined settlement boundary be excluded from the brownfield register, yet a Greenfield site outside the settlement boundary deemed to be suitable and potentially permissible?*

2. *In the 2020 HELAA for Chidham and Hambrook there are 8 greenfield sites classed as developable that are outside the settlement boundaries of Nutbourne East or Hambrook. Why haven't all of these sites been immediately discounted, as they were on the 2018 HELAA? **Please indicate specific reasons for each site:***
 - *HCH0009 (outside settlement boundary of Hambrook)*
 - *HCH0022 (outside all settlement boundaries and red under HELAA 2018)*
 - *HCH0023 (outside all settlement boundaries and red under HELAA 2018)*
 - *HCH0025 (outside Hambrook settlement boundary and red under HELAA 2018)*
 - *HCH0013 (red on the 2018 HELAA, artificially recategorized as HCH0012a, outside all settlement boundaries, right over the new Nutbourne Wildlife Corridor, yet a live planning application has been allowed)*
 - *HCH0015 (artificially recategorized as HCH0014a and in a CDC landscape settlement gap, yet a live planning application has been allowed)*
 - *HCH0014 and 16 (red on the 2018 HELAA, artificially recategorized as HCH0014a, outside Nutbourne East settlement boundary and in a CDC landscape settlement gap)*

Answer from Cllr Taylor:

1. It is not clear what brownfield sites are being referred to in the first supplementary question. In any event, the Brownfield land register is something quite different to the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). The criteria for including a site in the brownfield land register is set out in national regulations and is available on the Council's website – but critically includes the following –

The site must be 'suitable' for residential development - the land has extant planning permission for housing or housing-led development; has been allocated for development in the Local Plan, Site Allocation DPD or a Neighbourhood Plan; or is considered appropriate under Local Plan policy;

For that reason, brownfield sites outside the settlement boundary are not considered to meet this criteria and are not included.

By contrast, the HELAA treats both brownfield and greenfield sites equally – indeed, this is a change for the methodology used for the 2018 HELAA which excluded many previously developed sites.

2. The methodology for the 2020 HELAA contained a number of changes for the 2018 document. They are set out in detail in the document *HELAA Methodology 2020 document* which is available on the Council's website. All of the sites listed in this second supplementary question meet the criteria set out in that methodology document.

Supplementary question from Maureen O'Grady:

I would like to ask you about the Climate Assembly, that the Chichester District Council are planning to start this year. My question is about the timing of this. This is because you have decided to hold this first meeting, not until after the COP 26 conference in November this year in the UK.

In this case, I would like to know why this is?

Since this is too far away, so I want to ask why this is, because it is necessary to discuss the climate emergency earlier than this; in which case I would appreciate your response in the form of a letter to me.

Answer from Cllr Plant:

Within the Climate Emergency Action Plan, the Citizens' Assembly was proposed for November to capitalise on the publicity for COP26 but primarily to ensure that it was a well-planned and well-run event which will achieve the outcomes for which it was intended. We are aware from similar events run by other Sussex local authorities that Climate Assemblies are resource intensive and therefore we wanted to ensure that we had sufficient time not only to plan for it but also to clearly establish the most effective way for us to run the event and what we hope it will achieve. For us to do this there are a number of issues to address:

- Securing support from our Communications Team - The Council's Communication Teams run the communications/PR for all the Council's Projects and Services and therefore any projects coming forward need to be booked in with the Communications Team in advance to ensure that there is sufficient capacity within their team to support the work. This has been particularly important due to the demands on them in providing up-to-date information in relation to the covid pandemic.
- Scoping out the Citizens' Assembly – CDC initially planned to hold a Citizens' Jury but the public consultation demonstrated a preference for an event which involved a large number of residents and therefore it was proposed to expand the event to a wider Citizens' Assembly. However, this will have implications

for both the logistics and cost of the event and therefore requires further detailed consideration.

- Public Engagement Post Pandemic – the covid pandemic has impacted on all the Council's public engagement work. It is likely that the lack of direct face to face engagement on the climate change action plan consultation impacted on the number of responses to the consultation. Therefore although we are open to holding the Assembly online if necessary, the option of holding a face-to-face event will mean a delay.
- Resource implications of current opportunities – within the Climate Emergency Action Plan the Council's view is that reducing the emissions from our own estate and activities is our immediate priority. We consider that this is essential for us to show leadership on this issue and demonstrate to our residents and our partners what progress we have made on reducing our own emissions. Actions relevant to our own emissions have included:
 - Switching to a green energy tariff;
 - Progressing our Green Staff Travel Plan;
 - Providing training to Officers and Members on climate change;
 - Securing an Energy Saving Trust review of mileage and routes of our vehicle fleet including the refuse collection vehicles;
 - Engaging with Officers on Service Plan items which may have climate change implications;
 - Securing funding from the government's Covid green economic recovery funds to investigate implementing low carbon measures into CDC's estate.

Looking outside CDC, we have been working on reducing the area's emissions by:

- Reviewing the implications of a draft taxi licensing policy on taxi emissions;
- Influencing the building standards within the local plan;
- Promoting the Solar Together Scheme, increasing domestic PV installations;
- Securing funding from Covid green recovery funds for decarbonisation retrofits of the homes of residents in the district with below average incomes;
- Winning £400k from DEFRA for a large-scale tree planting scheme;
- Securing £567k Community Infrastructure Levy funding for a biodiversity enhancement project.

Many of these opportunities are time dependent as they involve securing money from Covid green economic recovery funds and using it within specified deadlines. We have seized upon these opportunities due to uncertainty over whether future funding will be forthcoming and they will enable us to achieve real carbon reduction savings towards our published targets. However these projects are resource intensive and we need to prioritise them. As a consequence we are currently reviewing the priorities in the Action Plan and will update it accordingly in due course.

Supplementary question from Jane Towers:

I received this answer to a question I asked in Public Open Forum:

In this respect, sites that are detached from the settlement boundary are not considered to be appropriate for residential development and cannot be included on the Brownfield Land Register. Greenfield land is also not suitable for inclusion on the Register.

Please could you explain what the greenfield Register is? Isn't this actually the HELAA and there appear to be many inclusions of sites that are outside the settlement boundary. Could you clarify the situation?

Answer from Cllr Taylor:

There is no such thing as a Greenfield Register, and the Council is not expected to prepare and maintain such a Register. To clarify the previous response, greenfield land is not suitable for inclusion on the Brownfield Register.

The HELAA assesses both greenfield and brownfield sites, within and outside of settlement boundaries, and considers their availability, developability and deliverability. The criteria for assessing sites within the HELAA differs from that of the Brownfield Register hence why a site outside of the settlement boundary in the HELAA may be assessed as suitable.

The HELAA Methodology sets out the criteria for assessing sites for inclusion in the HELAA, and the Council's Brownfield Land Register Accessible Summary provides the criteria against which to assess sites for the Brownfield Land Register. Both documents are available on the Council's website.