



Minutes of the meeting of the **Full Council** held in the Committee Rooms - East Pallant House on Tuesday 20 July 2021 at 2.00 pm

**Members Present:** Mrs E Hamilton (Chairman), Mr H Potter (Vice-Chairman), Mrs C Apel, Mrs T Bangert, Mr G Barrett, Mr M Bell, Rev J H Bowden, Mr B Brisbane, 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, Mrs D Johnson, Mr T Johnson, 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, Mrs C Purnell, Mr D Rodgers, Mrs S Sharp, Mrs S Taylor and Mr P Wilding

**Members not present:** Miss H Barrie, Mrs E Lintill, Mrs S Lishman and Mr A Sutton

**Officers present all items:** Mr N Bennett (Divisional Manager for Democratic Services), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Director of Growth and Place), Mrs L Rudziak (Director of Housing and Communities), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive) and Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services)

## 19 **Minutes**

### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on 27 April 2021 and the Special Council held on 22 June 2021 be approved.

## 20 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items.

## 21 **Declarations of Interests**

Declarations of Interest were declared as follows:

- Cllr Dignum declared a personal interest in agenda item 9 as the Chichester District Council representative on the BID and explained that he would not speak or vote on the item.
- Cllr Duncton declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 as a member of West Sussex County Council.
- Cllr Donna Johnson declared a personal interest in agenda item 8 as the Vice-Chair of Selsey Town Council and in agenda item 14 as a member of West Sussex County Council.
- Cllr O'Kelly declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 as a member of West Sussex County Council.

- Cllr Oakley declared a personal interest in agenda item 8 as a Member of the West Sussex County Council Electoral Review Panel and in agenda item 14 as a member of West Sussex County Council.
- Cllr Plowman declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 as the Chairman of Goodwood Motor Circuit Consultative Committee.
- Cllr Potter declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 as a member of the South Downs National Park Authority.
- Cllr Purnell declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 as a member of Selsey Town Council.
- Cllr Sharp declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 as a member of West Sussex County Council.

## 22 **Chair's Announcements**

Apologies were received from Cllr Barrie, Cllr Lintill, Cllr Lishman and Cllr Sutton.

The Chair welcomed Cllr Bill Brisbane to his first meeting. He received a round of applause from members to welcome him to the council.

The Chair then explained that she had been undergoing medical treatment for cancer during the pandemic and wished to raise awareness of the importance of seeking early medical intervention. The Chair received a round of applause from members for her courage in sharing her story.

## 23 **Public Question Time**

The following public questions and answers were heard:

### **Question from Lucia Withers and 62 others:**

The following questions are from 63 undersigned individuals, many of whom attended the CDC Climate Emergency Action Plan (CEAP) progress meeting hosted by Extinction Rebellion Chichester on 6 June 2021. They are submitted collectively to demonstrate the continued high level of interest and concern around CDC's progress towards implementing its CEAP, and to call for accelerated action and greater public engagement on it.

It is two years since the CDC declared a climate emergency (19 July 2019); 18 months since the initial CEAP was approved (January 2020); and more than six months since the final plan was approved (January 2021). Presentations by Council Officers on 6 June highlighted the significant number of actions that have been taken over the past months to implement the plan. However, most were focused on internal processes and/or achieving greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) reductions from CDC operations. While action on this front is commendable, CDC GHG emissions only account for around 1-2% of emissions in the district. It is therefore of serious concern that 18 months into the five-year CEAP, little or no progress appears to have been made on implementing actions that relate to area-wide targets, and there is still no coherent strategy which sets out what needs to be done to achieve 10% year on year area-wide reductions of GHG to 2025.

The logic of declaring an EMERGENCY is that urgent action should be taken. We believe that the climate emergency should therefore be treated on a par with the response to the crisis resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. As with the health crisis, the climate emergency presents new challenges and will require different ways of working that take

account both of what the CDC can influence directly, but also where it needs to lead and inspire others to play their role and/or to work collaboratively with others.

Either way, urgent action is needed -- as noted in the December 2020 Climate Change Committee's report, "Local Authorities and the Sixth Carbon Budget" (whose author briefed the CDC in March 2021), "*Actions taken now locally will grow the pipeline of projects, jobs and skills to scale up delivery of zero carbon buildings and transport, waste reduction and low carbon land use. For local authorities, this does not entail focused emissions cuts in separate sectors, but means transforming whole places towards Net Zero, working with residents, communities and businesses to deliver the right changes and investments for the area.*"

### **Questions to the Cabinet Member for the Environment:**

- According to presentations on the 6 June, CDC divisional annual services plans have been reviewed for their carbon implications and guidance developed on factoring climate change in to CDC decisions. *In the interests of transparency, will the CDC publish the reviews of service plans so that we can be assured that all plans support, and do not in any way undermine, GHG-reduction targets. Further will CDC make it mandatory that all council decisions, not only factor-in climate change, but actively support GHG reduction targets?*
- Transparency, communication and public engagement will be fundamental to achieving the levels of change needed to come close to reaching GHG emission reductions in the district, yet, the 6 June event represented the first public update on the CEAP since its adoption, and was initiated and hosted not by the CDC but by Extinction Rebellion Chichester. *Will the CDC commit to facilitating regular (three monthly) meetings to update the public on the CEAP and its implementation, that could also act as a forum for engagement and dialogue with local climate/environmental groups, activists and others to support the further development and implementation of area-wide plans?*
- Under the CEAP, the CDC committed to holding a Citizens' Assembly in 2021 as one of the core elements of the area-wide strategy. We were informed on 6 June that research has been done but no information was provided on when this action will be implemented. *Please provide details on when the Citizens' Assembly is expected to take place and what format it will take? If it is not now scheduled for 2021, please explain why not?*

### **Answer from Cllr Plant:**

Responding to climate change is a top priority for the council and we have already started to deliver a number of projects from our adopted Climate Change Action Plan. We are working closely with our partners and are carefully reviewing the delivery of each project with the council's Environment Panel. Alongside this, West Sussex County Council has been developing a Climate Change communications campaign that all district and borough councils plan to use. This campaign will be heavily promoted through all of our communication channels and will target various stakeholder groups.

The climate change communications campaign is not the sole means of engagement. We are establishing a renewable energy working group and have had discussions with employers about how to bring them together to identify how they can work together to

reduce greenhouse gas emissions. These discussions are focussed on action, implementing projects to reduce emissions. If there is local support, we are also proposing as part of the engagement campaign, to run practical workshops for residents giving them the opportunity to talk to experts about various carbon saving technologies that might be suitable for domestic properties.

As we have explored other areas' experiences of Citizens' assemblies, some of the feedback has made us re-consider the approach in the Action Plan. Assemblies are primarily useful for providing feedback to the council decision makers, from an informed and representative group of people. When it comes to raising general awareness, this is at best a side-benefit. The one off nature of the event is also a concern and these points underlie the proposal for the alternatives options for engagement which will be presented to Cabinet for approval. As well as the actions already outlined above, we will be utilising the Council's existing Let's Talk Panel and targeting specific demographics to get a better spread of individuals engaged on climate change; utilising existing communication routes such as those for the Local Plan Newsletter and formalising the holding of twice-yearly public meetings on the progress under the Climate Emergency Action Plan.

We believe all these approaches will enable us to have ongoing conversations with a wider base of residents and businesses and by involving a wider audience will be more effective. They will be recommended to Cabinet, which will make a final decision at its meeting in September.

We will make our regular updates on Action Plan progress available, and these will include all the operational projects from the Council's Service plans that have a climate change implication to them. The template for Committee Reports has also been amended to ensure that the climate change implications have been considered for all project and new policy proposals. All key future decisions for the Cabinet are detailed within the Council's Forward Plan which is on our website.

We should not discount action to reduce the Council's own carbon footprint as a means to lead and inspire others – demonstrating what can be done. We have secured an investment of £1.3m to reduce carbon emissions from Westgate Leisure Centre and are also evaluating and prioritising further action across our estate and vehicle fleet.

With regards to transforming whole places towards Net Zero, we cannot achieve this alone, other public sector organisation, private sector employers and, crucially, central government will have to set out their plans for decarbonisation in order for a whole District target to be achieved.

#### **Question to the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive:**

We recognise that achieving the area-wide target was always going to require national and regional action but the target was set because it was recognised that CDC could nevertheless play a leadership role, working in partnership with local organisations and communities to drive progress towards it. *In the absence of any regular community engagement, a plan for a Citizens' Assembly or any alternative means of galvanising public support for change, is the Council's corporate leadership really committed to this target? What resourcing is being provided to meet it, and is it sufficient? How does this compare with other Council priorities?*

### **Answer from Cllr Lintill read by Cllr Taylor:**

Yes, the Council's leadership are committed to leading action on both the Council's internal carbon emissions target and the District target. Yes, we are putting resources in, and I welcome your acknowledgement that we need others to also lead and work alongside us. Tackling the Climate Emergency is one of the key priorities in our new Corporate Plan. However, we are still in a pandemic and the Council has many urgent and competing priorities, and so over the summer we are considering all the options in order to set a sustainable budget that delivers the range of actions our District needs. Without unlimited resources, it is especially important that we succeed in winning funding from outside the Council. We are doing just that - £400,000 for tree planting, £185,000 for improving the energy efficiency of households in fuel poverty with £364,000 more to come. As Cllr Plant has already outlined, we are investing in our own estate and fleet vehicles and alongside the range of methods for engagement and dialogue with local residents, interested groups and businesses, we aim to strike the right balance between action and communication.

### **Question from Deborah May read by Nick Bennett:**

Councillors will have noticed that there is a silent protest outside the Council offices today. One of the main concerns is the dreadful state of the water quality in Chichester harbour, and the discharges of raw sewage into the harbour by Southern Water. Only last week Southern Water (SW) were fined £90m for discharges between 2010 and 2015. Yet still these discharges persist.

Just this week a young local family had a child hospitalised after playing near one of the discharge pipes. There are numerous reports of sewage floating in the harbour along with sanitary products. Is this what we really want our harbour to look like? As I write this on 13 July, SW has discharged for a total of 49.98 hours from 2 locations in Chichester harbour - so this has been continuous since sometime yesterday. It just isn't good enough. The discharges are not timed to coincide with an outgoing tide, and so the releases just get washed back up the harbour. There are also no notices warning residents and visitors about reporting sewage to the Environment Agency - this should be speedily rectified.

So - the law and heavy fines don't really affect Southern Water as it persists in releasing untreated sewage into the harbour, which is illegal if done on an almost continual basis. Directors are not held personally liable, and so the practice continues. What could CDC do to stop this ruination of our harbour?

One solution could be to STOP allowing planning permission for new homes, as it is clear that SW cannot legally manage the sewage it already has. More homes = more sewage. It's quite simple really.

Someone has to take a stand. Would CDC consider saying to central government "We won't build any more new homes until Southern Water can effectively and legally manage the sewage they currently have"?

I don't see how anyone in government could object to this stance. If CDC continues to allow further housing, knowing that there is a huge issue with legally disposing of sewage, councillors are actually aiding Southern Water's illegal sewage-dumping activity. So my question is, Please could CDC take this above suggestion of limiting the number of new homes seriously, and undertake to come up with a solution - perhaps in partnership

with Natural England and other agencies. We really can't have any more homes built until sewage can be properly disposed of - legally! No more excuses. No more passing the blame to someone else.

As a resident of CDC, I am fed up with the rapidly declining state of the water quality in Chichester Harbour and demand that something more be done. Agencies must find a better way to work together so that companies do not run rings around government and local government, creating a mockery of the rules and flouting common sense to the detriment of our environment.

Deborah May

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

Southern Water is the statutory sewage undertaker responsible for collecting, conveying and treating wastewater. As such Southern Water has a statutory duty to serve new development and to meet environmental criteria set by the Environment Agency. Investment is planned in 5 year periods and is informed by the Local Plan – this means that Southern Water's business planning and bids to OFWAT for funding to deliver new infrastructure take account of additional development proposed in Local Plans, and are reviewed on a 5 yearly cycle.

CDC officers have been working closely with both Southern Water and the Environment Agency to agree a position in relation to future provision of waste water treatment and to understand if the significant environmental constraints in the area will limit or delay the treatment that Southern Water can provide. Southern Water will be considering all the options through preparation of their Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP). CDC officers are fully engaged in this process so that emerging outcomes can be used to inform the Local Plan ahead of the DWMP being finalised.

When planning applications are considered, if further infrastructure improvements are required to support the development, this will often be secured as part of any planning permission, however it is for the statutory sewage undertaker to make necessary adjustments to their network.

In addition to this, Southern Water and the Environment Agency agreed a Position Statement in 2018 which limits new connections to Apuldram Waste Water Treatment Works.

The Environment Agency (EA) issues permits to Southern Water for the regulation of their treatment works that discharge to the harbour. The treatment works are obliged by the EA permits to report sewage discharges to the harbour. As such to suggest that the public should also report sightings of sewage would only duplicate the information that the EA already receive.

However, Southern Water has an online notification system, called Beachbuoy. [Beachbuoy \(southernwater.co.uk\)](https://www.southernwater.co.uk/Beachbuoy) This is available free to the public, is very accurate, shows live data on pollution events and from the exact locations shown on the map.

Cllr Moss commented that he felt that a further response should be provided as some of questions had not been sufficiently answered.

## 24 Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2020-21 Annual Report

Cllr Moss introduced the report and wished to thank officers for their support over the last year. In particular he wished to thank Katherine Davis from Democratic Services. Cllr Moss explained that he would be stepping down as Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committee but wanted to highlight the role of scrutiny in democracy.

Cllr Moss proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Bangert. In a vote the following resolution was agreed.

### RESOLVED

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2020-21 Annual Report be noted.

## 25 Recommendation from the Boundary Review Panel - 25 June 2021

Cllr Oakley proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Taylor.

In a vote the following resolution was agreed.

### RESOLVED

That the number of councillors elected to Rogate Parish Council be reduced from 13 to 9.

## 26 Recommendation from the Boundary Review Panel - 5 July 2021

Cllr Purnell proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Taylor. Mr Mildred then introduced the item. He noted the recent concerns raised by Littlehampton Parish Council.

Cllr Brown then proposed the following alternative:

*Both of these options are – **for this area** - preferable to your proposals as they maintain the strong and obvious links between the Manhood Peninsula and Chichester City. Some wards in the north of Chichester District are used to being in a separate constituency (previously Arundel and Southdowns) and this reflects the linkages with Chichester as a major settlement being less exclusive in the northern wards.*

***It is recognised that further thought would need to be given to the knock-on impact on the two constituencies to the east. In particular we look forward to studying proposals being promoted by our neighbours in the second round of consultations.***

Cllr Moss seconded Cllr Brown's proposal.

Cllr Oakley thanked officers Mr Mildred for his work in providing members with options to consider in a short space of time.

Cllr Donna Johnson asked members to support maintaining a cohesive Manhood Peninsula.

Cllr Tim Johnson compared splitting up the city into different political constituencies and explained how the scenario would mirror if the Manhood Peninsula were separated.

Cllr Sharp supported maintaining the Manhood Peninsula as a whole but wished to for completeness share the views she had received from some residents who would prefer that it be linked with the local seaside town of Bognor Regis.

Cllr O’Kelly explained that she saw unsatisfactory options proposed and could not support the Boundary Review Panel recommendations.

Cllr Page explained that he would not feel comfortable splitting the Manhood Peninsula.

Cllr Moss explained he would be concerned splitting the following areas of Littlehampton, the Manhood Peninsula and Easebourne each into two constituencies.

Cllr Duncton explained that her preference would be to keep the district under one Member of Parliament. However, she confirmed that she would support the recommendation.

Cllr Purnell reminded members that they would be voting for a consultation not a final decision.

Cllr Briscoe explained that he would prefer not to see the Manhood Peninsula split. He suggested that the proposals put forward remain the best options for the district.

In a vote the original recommendation with the amendment by Cllr Brown to the final paragraph 13 was carried:

## **RESOLVED**

That the council’s response to the Boundary Commission for England’s initial proposals for the 2023 Parliamentary Constituency boundaries is as attached (pages 19 to 27 of the agenda pack) subject to the amendment to paragraph 13 read as follows:

Both of these options are – **for this area** - preferable to your proposals as they maintain the strong and obvious links between the Manhood Peninsula and Chichester City. Some wards in the north of Chichester District are used to being in a separate constituency (previously Arundel and Southdowns) and this reflects the linkages with Chichester as a major settlement being less exclusive in the northern wards.

**It is recognised that further thought would need to be given to the knock-on impact on the two constituencies to the east. In particular we look forward to studying proposals being promoted by our neighbours in the second round of consultations.**

## **27 Chichester Business Improvement District Ballot**

Cllr Taylor proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Briscoe.

Cllr Taylor then introduced the report.

Cllr Plowman requested stronger action from the BID.

Cllr Hobbs gave his support to the BID.

Cllr Moss explained that the BID had brought a report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. He commended its new leadership.

Cllr Sharp gave her support to the BID.

Cllr Bell explained that he felt the BID levy is good value for money for the council.

Cllr Purnell explained that she would abstain as members were not voting on the BID only to allow the Leader to cast a vote.

In a vote the following resolution was carried:

#### **RESOLVED**

That subject to section 2.1 of the report, that the Council delegates to the Leader the authority to vote in accordance with Cabinet's decision in relation to the ballot to renew the BID.

### **28 Chichester District Council Annual Report 2020-21**

Cllr Taylor proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Briscoe.

Cllr Bowden gave support to the recommendation. With regard to page 31 he commended the Chichester Contract Service for maintaining its service to the community throughout the pandemic. With regard to page 36 he requested further information of when the CO2 emissions outturn figures would be available. With regard to page 49 he requested clarification of whether there had been any major planning applications in the South Downs National Park Authority. Taking the last question first Cllr Taylor clarified that a major application is for an application of over 20 dwellings. In the absence of the Director for Planning and Environment she sought to come back to Cllr Bowden on the number of applications in the South Downs National Park Authority. With regard to the CO2 emissions Mr Buckley was able to confirm that there had been 5.2 tonnes of CO2 in the 2019 data and an overall reduction of 40% over the last 14 years.

Cllr O'Kelly with regard to page 30 requested that the number of people receiving financial assistance could be greater as the target figure had been met and the number of affordable homes could also be greater. With regard to page 33 she requested a greater detail of the Performance Indicators in next year's Annual Report. Mrs Rudziak explained in relation to LPI 002 that the level of affordable homes is set out in the Housing Strategy as 1000 homes over six years. She clarified that where it can be exceeded the council would want to do so.

Cllr Brown requested more plans on how to decarbonise the district. Mr Buckley explained that members had been invited to a session to revisit the Corporate Plan in the coming weeks.

Cllr Graves wished to note that the Sygenta site has been approved after 15 years of work.

Cllr Hobbs wished to highlight that the council is actively looking at ways to declare real Climate Emergency investment publically.

Further to Cllr Bowden's comments Cllr Apel recommended that all members go out on a round with the Chichester Contract Services team as she had done. She congratulated the team on their hard work.

Cllr Bangert congratulated the Housing Team on the Rough Sleeper Initiative and hoped to see more long term work in this area.

Cllr McAra outlined how a Community Land Trust works following a recent site of that nature being completed in Midhurst.

In a vote the following resolution was carried:

**RESOLVED**

That the Chichester District Council Annual Report 2020-21 be received.

**29 Covid Outbreak Management Fund**

Cllr Wilding proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Taylor. Cllr Wilding then introduced the item.

Cllr Bowden with reference to page 53 asked how value for money is measured in relation to the Covid-19 post allocations. He also requested clarification on the part time/full time split of the cost of the Environmental Health post. Cllr Wilding confirmed that the higher salary of £102,000 relates to a contractor. Mr Ward agreed to seek written response from Mr Frost.

Cllr O'Kelly requested an update on the current situation with the Test, Trace, Contain work. Mrs Shepherd clarified that the Test, Trace, Contain work is a West Sussex County Council's responsibility and a protocol had been agreed with the Districts and Borough that they would assist if requested. She suggested as Cllr O'Kelly is a County Councillor she could contact the County Council for an update.

In a vote the following resolutions were carried:

**RESOLVED**

1. That the Covid Outbreak Management Fund grant allocation be spent as set out in section 5.
2. That delegation be given to The Chief Executive to vary allocations of funding between the headings in section 5 following consultation with the Leader of the Council.

**30 Local Plan Review Budget Update**

Cllr Taylor proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Briscoe. Cllr Taylor then introduced the item.

Cllr Brisbane requested further information on the cost of the Local Plan 2016. Mrs Shepherd agreed to seek written response from Mr Frost.

Cllr Tim Johnson with regard to page 149 queried the costings detailed. Mrs Shepherd clarified that the costings related to transport may vary following members discussion at the All Member Session on 29 July 2021.

In a vote the following resolution was carried:

**RESOLVED**

That Council approves the release of £500,000 from the Local Plan Reserve in 2021/22 and £275,000 in 2022/23 to fund necessary Local Plan technical work, specialist advice and examination costs.

**31 Independent Persons**

Cllr Plowman as Chairman of the Standards Committee proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Taylor. He then introduced the item.

Mr Bennett, the Monitoring Officer explained the process before inviting the candidates Mr Andrews and Mr Thompson to introduce themselves.

In a vote the following resolutions were carried:

**RESOLVED**

1. To note that the Standards Committee have completed their interview and consideration process and recommend the appointment of two persons to Council as Independent Persons.
2. To appoint those persons as Independent Persons as provided for under the Council Constitution.

**32 The Council's proposed Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy and Conditions 2021**

Cllr Briscoe proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Taylor. He then introduced the item.

In a vote the following resolution was carried:

**RESOLVED**

That the revised proposed Hackney Carriage (Taxi) and Private Hire Licensing Policy 2021 at Appendix C be approved.

**33 Motion from Cllr Page**

Cllr Page proposed his motion. Cllr Bell seconded.

Cllr Page outlined as follows:

The Local Plan Review's Transport Policies are limited only to mitigate that plan's effect on the A27 at Chichester, in other words to make things no worse. It promises no improvement. Inevitably therefore there will be increasing pressure from new development

in Chichester and adjacent Districts and Boroughs. Road transport (however it is powered) will remain necessary for economic and social purposes.

As a result:

- 1. The already unacceptable levels of congestion and safety issues on the A27 Chichester by-pass will continue to worsen, with all the environmental, social and economic harm that entails.*
- 2. The District's local highway network will see increasing amounts of traffic along mainly minor roads and through the City seeking to avoid the congested A27 by-pass junctions and lengthening queues on to those junctions.*
- 3. Local Plan A27 by-pass junction mitigation works themselves will result in enormous disruption and inconvenience over a number of years and have very limited benefit before further works are required.*

*Recommendation:*

*Given the above, this Council,*

- a. is convinced that only a by-pass that separates local traffic from through traffic will provide a cost effective and comprehensive long term solution for the strategic road network at Chichester, and*
- b. that only such a by-pass will allow sufficient existing local highway network road space to be reallocated for walking, cycling and bus infrastructure to make a significant change in local residents' travel choices.*

*As the Council's preferred solution to this problem is a mitigated northern route as proposed by the BABA27 study, and noting that Highways England have announced that the A27 is among the list of projects to be developed for possible future funding with public participation, this Council calls on the Secretary of State for Transport to ensure that all options, including a northern route, will be the subject of earliest possible consideration by Highways England to resolve the chronic traffic problems of Chichester once and for all, and invites the support of Chichester's MP and WSCC.*

Cllr Taylor as portfolio holder was invited to speak next. She responded as follows:

*Thank you Councillor Page for your motion.*

*Can I say firstly that the Council has long sought a scheme of government funded improvements to the A27 at Chichester in order to address issues of capacity, congestion, journey reliability and environmental issues such as air quality. The A27 corridor is a key foundation for our efforts to deliver housing and economic growth in this part of West Sussex but if no improvements are forthcoming for the A27 at Chichester, then it is clear that severe congestion will continue to occur. This will constrain the performance of the local economy and delivery of the Government's objectives to deliver economic growth and housing. A well designed improvement at Chichester is needed that provides long term benefits and also addresses local concerns.*

*Following the cancellation by the Secretary of State for Transport of the A27 Chichester Bypass scheme within Road Investment Strategy 1 (RIS1) in 2017 due to a lack of local consensus, I'm sure many members will recall the BABA27 initiative which this Council actively supported and which resulted in two conceptual options prepared by consultants Systra being considered by this Council in June 2018. At that meeting, the Council resolved that in promoting a scheme to the government for inclusion in RIS2 our preference was for the 'Mitigated Northern Route' to be developed by Highways England with the 'Full Southern Route' as an alternative.*

*We were regrettably subsequently advised by Highways England that neither scheme was workable or affordable and so would not be taken forward within RIS2 although Chichester was included as a RIS3 Pipeline scheme meaning that funding was allocated for feasibility work and development of options. I understand that Highways England have now begun the Pipeline project and will assess the feasibility and viability of all potential options, including northern route options and that they intend to engage with stakeholders this Autumn.*

*Whilst this is positive news and Highways England have on many occasions indicated that they consider Chichester to be a priority, they have also made it clear that there is no guarantee of funding for a scheme within RIS3. We do nevertheless have a clear opportunity through this process to press our case for inclusion of a scheme for Chichester within RIS3.*

*I therefore support this motion that we do all we can as a Council to lobby the Secretary of State for Transport to ensure that all options, including a northern route, are fully considered by Highways England and agree that we should seek the support of our MP's and WSCC in this process.*

Cllr Palmer then spoke in opposition of a northern route. He explained that he agreed with all but the last paragraph of the motion.

Cllr Duncton supported the motion. She explained that it encouraged all options to be considered.

Cllr Bowden supported the motion. He asked members to consider the economy when evaluating the best route.

Cllr O'Kelly spoke about the levels of the congestion on the A27 and the A272 and explained that the traffic often deters cyclists and walkers.

Cllr Potter explained that he could not support the motion whilst it included a northern bypass option.

Cllr Oakley asked members to consider all options and all evidence.

Cllr Plowman explained that he supported all but the final paragraph of the motion. He requested the opportunity to propose an amendment. The Chair used her discretion and decided in line with the Motions Procedure as set out in the Constitution that the amendment would be too significant to take at the meeting.

Cllr Brown spoke in favour of a northern route being the most environmental route.

Cllr Bangert and Cllr Moss both gave their support to the motion.

Cllr Sharp asked members to provide a full consultation for residents. She then spoke about making bus journeys, cycling and walking more convenient ways to travel.

Cllr Barrett explained that the Manhood Peninsula Forum fully supported the motion.

Cllr Tim Johnson asked members to consider every route. He proposed a minor amendment to add an 's' to the end of motion to read 'northern routes' plural.

Cllr Page was then invited to sum up his motion and agreed to the inclusion of the additional 's' as proposed by Cllr Tim Johnson.

Cllr Bell requested a recorded vote which was supported by members.

The recorded vote was as follows:

Cllr Apel – For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – For  
Cllr Barrie – Absent  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Brisbane – For  
Cllr Briscoe – For  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – For  
Cllr Duncton – For  
Cllr Elliott – For  
Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For  
Cllr Graves – For  
Cllr Hamilton – For  
Cllr Hobbs – For  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Tim Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill – Absent  
Cllr Lishman – Absent  
Cllr McAra – For  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – For  
Cllr O'Kelly – For  
Cllr Palmer – Against  
Cllr Page – For  
Cllr Plant – Abstain  
Cllr Plowman – Against  
Cllr Potter – Abstain  
Cllr Purnell – For  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – Abstain  
Cllr Sutton – Absent  
Cllr Taylor – For

Cllr Wilding – Abstain

For = 26

Against = 3

Abstain = 3

Absent = 4

The following motion was therefore carried:

*This Council,*

*a. is convinced that only a by-pass that separates local traffic from through traffic will provide a cost effective and comprehensive long term solution for the strategic road network at Chichester, and*

*b. that only such a by-pass will allow sufficient existing local highway network road space to be reallocated for walking, cycling and bus infrastructure to make a significant change in local residents' travel choices.*

*As the Council's preferred solution to this problem is a mitigated northern route as proposed by the BABA27 study, and noting that Highways England have announced that the A27 is among the list of projects to be developed for possible future funding with public participation, this Council calls on the Secretary of State for Transport to ensure that all options, including northern routes, will be the subject of earliest possible consideration by Highways England to resolve the chronic traffic problems of Chichester once and for all, and invites the support of Chichester's MP and WSCC.*

#### **34 Delegation to Chief Executive - Local Plan Review Update**

Cllr Taylor proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Briscoe. Mr Ward then introduced the item.

Cllr Bowden thanked Mr Ward and Mr Bennett for the change to the meeting arrangements.

Cllr Oakley requested clarification of any legal implications. Mr Ward explained that this had been fully considered and no difficulties were anticipated. Mr Bennett added that he had discussed the decision with a number of other Monitoring Officers before reaching a final conclusion.

Cllr Moss endorsed the approach and requested an email confirmation of the outcome of the meeting as soon as practicable afterwards. Mrs Shepherd confirmed she would be emailing all members after the meeting to detail what had been agreed.

Cllr Taylor explained that the session would be webcast live and would provide an opportunity for public question time.

In a vote the following resolution was carried:

## **RESOLVED**

That Council gives an administrative delegation to the Chief Executive to enact all decisions from the remote session of Councillors on 29 July 2021, and to report that enactment to the next Full Council.

### **35 Review of Political Balance**

Cllr Taylor proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Briscoe. Mr Bennett then introduced the item.

Mr Bennett explained that the final seat on Corporate Governance and Audit Committee was to be gifted to Cllr Tim Johnson from the Liberal Democrats. Mr Bennett sought any disagreement from members in including this in the vote on the recommendations. No member disagreed with the approach.

In a vote the following resolutions were carried:

## **RESOLVED**

That:

1. the review of political balance arrangements set out in this report be approved.
2. the memberships set out in appendix being circulated at the meeting be approved.

### **36 Urgent Decision Notice - Welcome Back Fund**

On behalf of the Council the Chair noted the Urgent Decision Notice relating to the Welcome Back Fund as detailed on pages 39 to 40 of the agenda pack.

### **37 Questions to the Executive**

Members were advised to submit any Questions to the Executive to Democratic Services who would collate the responses.

### **38 Late Items**

There were no late items.

### **39 Exclusion of the press and public**

Cllr Taylor moved the recommendation to go into part II which was seconded by Cllr Briscoe.

Members voted in favour.

## **RESOLVED**

The in respect of agenda items 22 and 23 the public, including the press, should be excluded from the meeting on the grounds of exemption under Parts I to 7 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as indicated against the item and because, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption of that information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

40      **CCS Refuse Collection Vehicle Procurement Strategy**

Cllr Plant proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Taylor. Cllr Plant then introduced the item.

In a vote the following resolutions were carried:

**RESOLVED**

That Council resolves to make the resolutions as set out in section 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 of the Cabinet report.

41      **Urgent Decision Notice - St James**

On behalf of the Council the Chair noted the Urgent Decision Notice relating to St James as detailed on pages 41 to 43 of the agenda pack.

The meeting ended at 6.18 pm

---

CHAIRMAN

---

Date: