



Minutes of the meeting of the **All Member Session** held in Virtual on Thursday 29 July 2021 at 9.30 am

**Members Present:** Mrs C Apel, Mrs T Bangert, Mr G Barrett, Miss H Barrie, 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 E Hamilton, Mr F Hobbs, Mrs D Johnson, Mr T Johnson, Mrs E Lintill, Mrs S Lishman, Mr G McAra, Mr A Moss, Dr K O'Kelly, Mr S Oakley, 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

**Members not present:** Mrs N Graves

**In attendance by invitation:**

**Officers present all items:** Mr N Bennett (Divisional Manager for Democratic Services), Mr T Ayling (Divisional Manager for Planning Policy), Mrs F Baker (Democratic Services Officer), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive) and Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services)

## 1 **Announcements and Apologies for Absence**

The Chair opened the briefing session and welcomed all those present. She explained that the All Member Session was not a meeting being held under the Local Government Act 1972 meeting legislation and as such a resolution had been passed at the Full Council meeting on 20 July 2021 to allow the Chief Executive to enact the exact recommendations agreed by members at the Session.

Apologies were received from Cllr Graves (post meeting).

The following declarations of interest were made:

Cllr Brisbane declared a personal interest in Peter Brett as an old work associate of the company. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that Cllr Brisbane had sought his advice on the declaration and confirmed that as he had had no association with the company since 2014 and was therefore able to stay and vote on the recommendations being discussed.

Cllr Duncton declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council.

Cllr Donna Johnson declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council.

Cllr Oakley declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council.

Cllr Sharp declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council.

## 2 **Public Question Time**

The Chair explained that no subsidiary questions would be allowed. The following questions and answers were received:

### **Question from Jane Towers:**

The Local Plan and Strategic Infrastructure Update shows that waste water treatment infrastructure is a significant constraint on the level of and location of housing development. It is well known that Thornham Wastewater Treatment works has finite capacity and does not have the technical or environmental conditions to be upgraded in the near future. Yet the actual capacity is still not in the public domain. It is therefore essential there is a Statement of Common Ground for Thornham, exactly as for Apuldram, and signed off by CDC, Havant BC, Southern Water and the EA as quickly as possible. This will enable Chidham and Hambrook, Southbourne and Westbourne in our District and Emsworth in Havant to better defend what is now well over 1000 houses in planning applications.

1. When will you put in the public domain the remaining capacity for each Waste Water Treatment Plant?

### **Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*An estimate of the capacity at each WWTW, made by comparing the EA permit to the average Dry Weather Flow information from Southern Water can be made available in August. This information will change each year as new Dry Weather Flow data becomes available.*

*This estimate will be supplemented by information on recent completions and permissions - an update to this information is currently in progress alongside work on the Five Year Housing Supply for the Chichester plan area.*

*We are currently working with both Southern Water and the Environment on a Statement of Common Ground which will include this information, with Southern Water also providing information on development in other Districts using WWTWs in the Chichester plan area. Further updates may be needed to reflect any changes in the emerging Local Plan Review Development Strategy. Once this Statement of Common Ground is agreed it will be published on the Council's website at the earliest opportunity.*

2. Given the simplicity of the current Apuldram Position Statement that has been in place since 2018, and the urgency with respect to planning applications, what is the barrier to getting an individual Position Statements issued for Thornham by the end of August?

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*We are currently in discussion with Southern Water and the Environment Agency concerning the need for and content of a Position Statement for Thornham and will also be discussing this with Havant. Subject to the agreement of all parties it is anticipated that a position statement will be progressed shortly.*

**Question from Roderick Hague, Chair of Oving Parish Council – read by Ruth Palmer, Clerk of Oving Parish Council**

1. Given the letters that were sent out to all of the Parish Councils on the 26th November 2020, would this Council (if they agree to item 10.4) include in those letters the analysis of each of those proposed allocations for their impact on the new revised situation of only minor mitigation measures along the A27? This will be critical part of many ongoing Neighbourhood Plan processes.

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*It is envisaged that following this meeting parish councils are written to outlining the current position with the local plan and the implications for neighbourhood plans.*

2. Given the recommendations of the Stantec Modelling Review is the distribution of housing likely to be changed again to reflect this new information, particularly its recommendation on the Development Distribution?

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*It is very likely that the distribution of development which was communicated to Parish councils in November 2020 will change before the Plan is finalised, either in location or phasing of development. This will require further work and in particular an agreed way forward with the highway authorities and others to consider the transport and waste water issues. Parish councils will be kept informed of progress.*

**Question from Mrs Susan Milnes:**

The Chichester District Council website states that the new local Plan will be published in Spring 2022, submitted to the Inspector in Summer 2022 and the Examination will commence in Autumn 2022. How reliable are these dates considering the delays already experienced, the latest developments and need to reassess the location and size of development sites taking into account the limitation of funding for transport improvements and challenges around waste water?

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*The report today provides an update for Members on the transport work for the local plan, and a snapshot of the progress with securing a deliverable, affordable package of measures for the A27 in the absence of a national scheme. The report does not propose an amendment to the local plan timetable at this point. Clearly this issue has the potential to delay the local plan process, but it is only when further discussions have been held with the highway authorities that any implications for the local plan programme can be determined.*

**Question from Mr Andrew Kerry-Beddell:**

Since the Local Plan went out of date exactly a year ago, all Parishes have been inundated with developer planning applications, due to the false promise the CDC HELAA gives them and which still includes many entirely unsuitable sites with no mains sewage, lack of transport access, unsafe road widths and regular site flooding.

The only defence any Parishes have from developers is delivered by a Council with an up to date Local Plan, a 5 Year Housing Land Supply and a robust road and sewage infrastructure plan.

Precisely what dates are these three key factors – the Local Plan, 5 Year Housing Land Supply and detailed road and sewage plans going to be in the public domain, in order to try and deliver the number of houses Government insists the Council take based on its mutant new housing calculation system?

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*The report today provides an update for Members on the transport work for the local plan, and a snapshot of the progress with securing a deliverable, affordable package of measures for the A27 in the absence of a national scheme. The report does not propose an amendment to the local plan timetable at this point. Clearly this issue has the potential to delay the local plan process, but it is only until further discussions have been held with the highway authorities that any implications for the local plan programme can be determined.*

*Regarding the next 5 year housing supply position, the Council has procured the advice of consultants who specialise in this matter to ensure that it sets out the best possible defensible case on housing supply. An exact date is not fixed, but it is expected that this statement will be published in August.*

*Regarding road and sewerage, the relevant infrastructure providers are working to their own timescales. Southern Water's Drainage Waste Management Plan is due to be finalised in 2023. West Sussex County Council's Transport Plan is due to be finalised in early 2022. Highways England's next Road Investment Strategy is expected to cover the period 2025-2030, though it is anticipated that a consultation on the A27 will be undertaken in in the next year. The Local Plan can only reflect as best it can the progress made by those partners at any particular point in time, which is why the report being considered by Members proposes further discussions to*

*seek an agreed basis for managing development (and bringing forward the Local Plan) in the meantime.*

**Question from David King:**

Given that it has recently been reported that CDC officers have concluded that the Stockbridge link Road “is currently not fundable or deliverable through the local plan process and therefore should not be proceeded with” and that “it is clear that from projected funding sources it is not currently possible to fully secure the money necessary to be able to deliver the full level of development envisaged in the preferred approach plan published in late 2018:-

**Will Chichester District Council now pause the progress of the Southbourne Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan?**

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*The examination of the Southbourne Neighbourhood Parish Plan Review will formally commence once the independent examiner has been appointed and received the documents that are required to be submitted to him/her. However the plan can be withdrawn at any time by the qualifying body, Southbourne Parish Council, and that is a decision for the Parish Council.*

**3 Local Plan and Strategic Infrastructure Update**

(Please note that the full debate can be viewed online:  
<https://chichester.nucast.live/frontend/meeting/4105153>)

The Chair explained that the Session is not a meeting being held under the Local Government Act 1972 meeting legislation and as such a resolution was passed at the Full Council meeting on 20 July 2021 for the Chief Executive to enact the exact recommendations agreed by members.

Cllr Taylor proposed the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Sutton. Cllr Taylor then introduced the report.

Cllr Moss proposed amendments which were seconded by Cllr Brown which read in full as follows:

- 1. That in the absence of significant external strategic infrastructure funding, the full scheme of improvements for the A27 Chichester Bypass prepared by Stantec consultants to support the Local Plan review including the proposed Stockbridge Link Road is undeliverable. Therefore the full package (and the Stockbridge Link Road) will not be progressed further as part of the Local Plan process barring a significant change in the availability and likelihood of securing public sector funding support.*
- 2. That on the basis of recommendation 2.1 above, the Local Plan Review is unable to meet full housing needs and the Plan strategy should therefore*

*focus on delivering as much development as possible based upon the capacity of the plan area to accommodate development within an affordable and deliverable package of transport mitigation taking into account all sources of available funding.*

- 3. That discussions are held with Highways England and West Sussex County Council to agree a revised phased distribution of development for further testing of highways capacity within the Chichester Plan Area until any decision is confirmed regarding the A27 Chichester Bypass.*
- 4. That, notwithstanding the Council's commitment to securing national funding for improvements to the A27 through the RIS scheme, the opportunity must be taken to develop the district's sustainable transport infrastructure. The District's, County's and Country's climate change obligations cannot be met without a modal shift in the way we travel. The "deliverable package of transport mitigation" must therefore include sustainable travel options, such as walking, cycling and bus improvements, all of which will contribute to reducing the impact of development upon our local and national road network.*
- 5. That the Council undertakes to review the Local Plan within 5 years of the date of adoption of the emerging Local Plan Review once clarity regarding a national scheme for the A27 at Chichester has been obtained.*
- 6. That the Council's position in respect of the Duty to Cooperate with other local authorities is updated to reflect that the Council is unable to meet the full housing needs of the Chichester plan area.*
- 7. That a Statement of Common Ground between Chichester District Council, the Environment Agency (EA) and Southern Water (SW) is urgently published that clearly and unambiguously states the challenges and issues surrounding the limitations and restrictions affecting Waste water Treatment Works ( WwTWs) operated by Southern Water in the District.*
- 8. That the EA be urgently requested to formally recognise the need for development to be phased so that it aligns with infrastructure provision. Consequently the Council will liaise with the EA, Natural England and SW to agree a phased programme of WwTW capacity enhancements. This programme will assist in determining the location and phasing of future housing provision in the Local Plan Review. Furthermore, the Council, SW and EA will jointly prepare Position Statements for all WWTWs with insufficient headroom capacity at 2025, to ensure that decisions made prior to the adoption of the LPR will reflect the predicted cumulative effect of future development proposals.*
- 9. That the EA provides comprehensive, current data on the flood risks to the coastal and harbour areas by way of a Position Statement for the District, to support planning officers and developers working within this District.*

*10. That this Council requests the Secretary of State to now re-validate the policies on house numbers in the existing 2015-2029 Local Plan, given the new evidence on transport option costs and the absence of adequate wastewater treatment capacity now shown to have caused a serious deterioration to Chichester Harbour (resulting in a unprecedented £90million fine for Southern Water).*

This relates to the Inspectors Report by Sue Turner 18th May of 2015, which requested the following modification to: Include a commitment to an early review of the Plan (5 years) in recognition of the limitations of the transport study and to enable full and detailed consideration of the potential offered through the proposed government funding for upgrading of the A27. We now have confirmation that the current Local Plan Review cannot rely upon government funding for upgrading the A27.

Cllr Lintill then proposed that all recommendations on the report remain the same except two minor recommendations to add 'from the date of adoption' to recommendation 2.4 and to add the words in recommendation 2.5 'likely to be' after the word is and before the word unable. This was seconded by Cllr Sutton. The Chair confirmed that these would be classed as minor amendments and therefore would be allowed.

Cllr Tim Johnson then proposed a minor amendment to recommendation 2.2 by inserting in brackets after 'to accommodate development' (demonstrating that prioritising brownfield sites and the re-designation of unused commercial land is our priority). This was seconded by Cllr Donna Johnson.

Cllr Sharp then proposed the following amendment if the amendments put forward by Cllr Moss were to not be carried. The amendment would read 'that housing, sewage and transport developments are phased in a staged approach'. Cllr Sharp also put forward some minor amendments. Recommendation 2.2 and 2.5 to change the word 'needs' to 'quota' and add 'improvements to alterations for the A27' and recommendation 2.4 to add the words 'measures to reduce the need to travel'. All amendments were seconded by Cllr Barrie.

The Chair then invited Cllr Moss to speak on his amendment motion. Cllr Moss confirmed he was happy to include Cllr Sharp's minor amendment to recommendation 2.4 to add the words 'measures to reduce the need to travel'. Cllr Moss then outlined his amendment motion.

Cllr Moss then called for the Cabinet Member for Planning to step down from her role.

Cllr Lintill was then invited to respond. With regard to the call for the Cabinet Member for Planning to move on Cllr Lintill clarified that it is the Leader's decision as to who the Cabinet Member is. With regard to the amendment motion Cllr Lintill outlined the reasons why she could not support the amendments.

Mrs Shepherd was then invited to outline advice from The Planning Inspectorate (PINS).

Mr Ayling was invited to speak. He wished to advise members that by not including the words 'likely to not meet housing needs' in recommendation 2.2 it will not demonstrate to PINS that we have done all that we can do to try and meet housing needs. Mrs Shepherd clarified that to come to the conclusion that the housing need cannot be met without investigating all options would not provide evidence for the PINS. Cllr Moss confirmed that he would leave 'likely to be' in recommendation 2.2 and withdraw his proposed amendment on that point.

Cllr Taylor was then invited to speak. She explained the steps she had taken in working on the Local Plan as Cabinet Member for Planning. This included the challenges faced and the ongoing work.

The Chair then opened up for debate.

Cllr Plowman wished to comment on amendment 2.10. He wished the Leader to go back to the Secretary of State. Cllr Lintill confirmed that she had gone back to the Secretary of State.

Cllr Sharp wished to comment on the concerns and worries of residents.

Cllr Oakley commented on focussing on enabling officers to progress Highways work within the constraints. Cllr Taylor responded to Cllr Oakley's question on funding for the current Local Plan mitigation. Mr Ayling added that £12.8 million mitigation costs package was from five years ago. To date £14 million has been collected to date. He clarified that it would not be enough to carry out all of the mitigation measures.

Cllr Apel wished to comment on Southern Water and contamination of Chichester Harbour. Cllr Taylor explained that sewage discharge into the contributed approximately 10% to contamination the main source was from farmland.

Cllr Brown commented on the need to move forward with the Local Plan by putting pressure on the agencies that have yet to provide the information the council requires. He also wished to question the level of support given by the MP for the local area in relation to supporting progress with the Local Plan.

Cllr Briscoe raised concerns that adding additional amendments could cause further delays to the Local Plan.

Cllr O'Kelly wished to draw attention to the need for school places and doctors surgeries. She asked that the reason for the A27 delay be addressed. Mrs Shepherd reminded members that the discussion should relate to the infrastructure attached to the Local Plan.

The Chair used her discretion to move on to the next speaker.

Cllr Plant wished it to go on record that she did not agree with the Cllr Brown's comments regarding the local MP. Mr Bennett reminded members of the Code of

Conduct and speaking of others who are not present and able to respond to comments made.

Cllr Purnell raised concerns that the amendments put forward are less clear than the original recommendations.

Cllr Brisbane requested more detail on sewer water capacity re: amended recommendation 2.8.

Cllr Evans read a statement on behalf of a number of northern parishes he represents. The statement outlined concerns relating to percentage growth rate, infrastructure provision and provision of foul water drainage. Cllr Taylor responded by explaining that when different areas of the district are considered the provisions will form part of the consideration.

Cllr Hobbs commented on the need for a simple, impactful and clear message from the resolution made.

Cllr Donna Johnson raised concerns about lack of support for the Local Plan, flooding and the delays caused by the A27.

Cllr Potter commented on Southern Water waste water capacity and raised concerns that there would not be capacity to support any further development.

The Chair called a 10 minute break.

Cllr Tim Johnson outlined his minor amendment. He explained that he felt it would help accommodate redevelopment such as creation of more affordable rent housing.

Cllr Rodgers raised concerns that Chidham and Hambrook had not been considered. Cllr Taylor explained that many of the issues raised are applicable for other areas.

In summing up Cllr Lintill agreed to include Cllr Tim Johnson's amendment within her proposed amendments. Cllr Tim Johnson agreed to the approach.

In summing up Cllr Moss agreed to maintain recommendation 2.2 and also agreed the inclusion of Cllr Tim Johnson's minor amendment.

In summing up Cllr Sharp explained her amendments sought to include neutral words.

Mr Ward asked Cllr Moss whether he accepted Cllr Sharp's amendments to his amendments. Cllr Moss confirmed he would accept the amendment to his amendment to recommendation 2.4 only.

Cllr Tim Johnson confirmed his amendment could be included within Cllr Lintill's amendment.

In summing up Cllr Taylor reminded members of the duty to have a Local Plan. She directed members to the PINs report, page 96 regarding the districts housing need being met. In that before reaching a conclusion that housing needs cannot be met, the Council needs to determine:

- what level of housing could be achieved based on the required improvements to the A27 without undermining viability, and thus deliverability;
- whether the housing needs could be met in another way, which includes taking a step back and reassessing the spatial strategy and distribution of development in other parts of the district; and
- if not, then whether housing needs could be met elsewhere through constructive, active and on-going engagement as part of the Duty to Cooperate.

As requested a recorded vote was carried out.

Mr Bennett confirmed that Cllr Fowler had joined after the meeting and would need to decide whether she had heard the full debate. Cllr Lishman would be voting via the chat function due to technical issues. Cllr Fowler confirmed that she had watched the webcast from the start.

Cllr Moss's amendment on 2.1 and 2.2 which incorporated the amendment put forward by Cllr Timothy Johnson for clarity was as follows:

- 2.1 That in the absence of significant external strategic infrastructure funding, the full scheme of improvements for the A27 Chichester Bypass prepared by Stantec consultants to support the Local Plan review including the proposed Stockbridge Link Road is undeliverable. Therefore the full package (and the Stockbridge Link Road) will not be progressed further as part of the Local Plan process barring a significant change in the availability and likelihood of securing public sector funding support.
- 2.2 That on the basis of recommendation 2.1 above, the Local Plan Review is ~~likely to be~~ unable to meet full housing needs and the Plan strategy should therefore focus on delivering as much development as possible based upon the capacity of the plan area to accommodate development demonstrating that prioritising brownfield sites and the re-designation of unused commercial land is our priority within an affordable and deliverable package of transport mitigation taking into account all sources of available funding.

The vote for Cllr Moss's amendment on 2.1 and 2.2 which incorporated the amendment put forward by Cllr Timothy Johnson was as follows:

Cllr Apel – For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – For  
Cllr Barrie – Abstain

Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Briscoe – For  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – For  
Cllr Duncton – For  
Cllr Elliott – For  
Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For  
Cllr Graves – Absent  
Cllr Hamilton – For  
Cllr Hobbs – For  
Cllr Brisbane – For  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Timothy Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill – For  
Cllr Lishman – For  
Cllr McAra – For  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – For  
Cllr O’Kelly – For  
Cllr Page – Absent  
Cllr Palmer – For  
Cllr Plant – For  
Cllr Plowman – For  
Cllr Potter – For  
Cllr Purnell – For  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – Abstain  
Cllr Sutton – For  
Cllr Taylor – For  
Cllr Wilding – For

The result of the vote was 32 For, 2 Abstain and 2 Absent. The motion was carried.

The vote for Cllr Moss’s amendment on 2.3 was as follows:

Cllr Apel – For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – Against  
Cllr Barrie – For  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Briscoe – Against  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – Against  
Cllr Duncton – Against  
Cllr Elliott – Against  
Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For

Cllr Graves – Absent  
Cllr Hamilton – Against  
Cllr Hobbs – Against  
Cllr Brisbane – For  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Timothy Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill – Against  
Cllr Lishman – For  
Cllr McAra – Against  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – Against  
Cllr O'Kelly – For  
Cllr Page – Absent  
Cllr Palmer – Against  
Cllr Plant – Against  
Cllr Plowman – For  
Cllr Potter – Against  
Cllr Purnell – Against  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – For  
Cllr Sutton – Against  
Cllr Taylor – Against  
Cllr Wilding – Against

The result of the vote was 17 For and 17 Against, the Chairman used their casting vote to vote against the recommendation. The Motion was not carried.

The vote for Cllr Moss's amendment on 2.4 was as follows:

Cllr Apel – For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – Against  
Cllr Barrie – For  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Briscoe – Against  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – Against  
Cllr Duncton – Against  
Cllr Elliott – Against  
Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For  
Cllr Graves – Absent  
Cllr Hamilton – Against  
Cllr Hobbs – Against  
Cllr Brisbane – For  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Timothy Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill - Against  
Cllr Lishman – For

Cllr McAra – Against  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – Against  
Cllr O’Kelly – For  
Cllr Page – Absent  
Cllr Palmer – Against  
Cllr Plant – Against  
Cllr Plowman – For  
Cllr Potter – Against  
Cllr Purnell – Against  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – For  
Cllr Sutton – Against  
Cllr Taylor – Against  
Cllr Wilding – Against

The result of the vote was 17 For and 17 Against. The Chair used their casting vote to vote against the recommendation. The Motion was not carried.

The vote for Cllr Moss’s amendment on 2.5 was as follows:

Cllr Apel – For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – Against  
Cllr Barrie – For  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Briscoe – Against  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – Against  
Cllr Duncton – Against  
Cllr Elliott – Against  
Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For  
Cllr Graves – Absent  
Cllr Hamilton – Against  
Cllr Hobbs – Against  
Cllr Brisbane – For  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Timothy Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill – Against  
Cllr Lishman – For  
Cllr McAra – Against  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – Against  
Cllr O’Kelly – For  
Cllr Page – Absent  
Cllr Palmer – Against  
Cllr Plant – Against  
Cllr Plowman – For

Cllr Potter – Against  
Cllr Purnell – Against  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – For  
Cllr Sutton – Against  
Cllr Taylor – Against  
Cllr Wilding – Against

The result of the vote was 17 For and 17 Against. The Chair used their casting vote to vote against the recommendation. The Motion was not carried.

The vote for Cllr Moss's amendment on 2.6 which incorporated the motion put forward by Cllr Eileen Lintill was as follows:

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

The result of the vote was 33 For, 1 Abstain and 2 Absent. The Motion was carried.

The vote for Cllr Moss's amendment on 2.7 was as follows:

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

The result of the vote was 17 For and 17 Against. The Chair used their casting vote to vote against the recommendation. The Motion was not carried.

The vote for Cllr Moss's amendment on 2.8 was as follows:

Cllr Apel – For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – Against

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

The result of the vote was 17 For and 17 Against. The Chair used their casting vote to vote against the recommendation. The Motion was not carried.

The vote for Cllr Moss’s amendment on 2.9 was as follows:

Cllr Apel – For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – Against  
Cllr Barrie – For  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Briscoe – Against  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – Against  
Cllr Duncton – Against  
Cllr Elliott – Against

Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For  
Cllr Graves – Absent  
Cllr Hamilton – Against  
Cllr Hobbs – Against  
Cllr Brisbane – For  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Timothy Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill – Against  
Cllr Lishman – For  
Cllr McAra – Against  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – Against  
Cllr O’Kelly – For  
Cllr Page – Absent  
Cllr Palmer – Against  
Cllr Plant – Against  
Cllr Plowman – For  
Cllr Potter – Against  
Cllr Purnell – Against  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – For  
Cllr Sutton – Against  
Cllr Taylor – Against  
Cllr Wilding – Against

The result of the vote was 17 For and 17 Against. The Chair used their casting vote to vote against the recommendation. The Motion was not carried.

The vote for Cllr Moss’s amendment on 2.10 was as follows:

Cllr Apel - For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – Against  
Cllr Barrie – For  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Briscoe – Against  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – Against  
Cllr Duncton – Against  
Cllr Elliott – Against  
Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For  
Cllr Graves – Absent  
Cllr Hamilton – Against  
Cllr Hobbs – Against  
Cllr Brisbane – For  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Timothy Johnson – For

Cllr Lintill – Against  
Cllr Lishman – For  
Cllr McAra – Against  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – Against  
Cllr O’Kelly – For  
Cllr Page – Absent  
Cllr Palmer – Against  
Cllr Plant – Against  
Cllr Plowman – For  
Cllr Potter – Against  
Cllr Purnell – Against  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – For  
Cllr Sutton – Against  
Cllr Taylor – Against  
Cllr Wilding – Against

The result of the vote was 17 For and 17 Against. The Chair used their casting vote to vote against the recommendation. The Motion was not carried.

A recorded vote for the report recommendations 2.3 and 2.4 was as follows:

The vote for Cllr Moss’s amendment on 2.9 was as follows:

Cllr Apel – Abstain  
Cllr Bangert – Abstain  
Cllr Barrett – For  
Cllr Barrie – Abstain  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Briscoe – For  
Cllr Brown – Abstain  
Cllr Dignum – For  
Cllr Duncton – For  
Cllr Elliott – For  
Cllr Evans – Abstain  
Cllr Fowler – Abstain  
Cllr Graves – Absent  
Cllr Hamilton – For  
Cllr Hobbs – For  
Cllr Brisbane – Against  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Timothy Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill – For  
Cllr Lishman – Abstain  
Cllr McAra – For  
Cllr Moss – Abstain  
Cllr Oakley – For  
Cllr O’Kelly – Abstain

Cllr Page – Absent  
Cllr Palmer – For  
Cllr Plant – For  
Cllr Plowman – Abstain  
Cllr Potter – For  
Cllr Purnell – For  
Cllr Rodgers – Abstain  
Cllr Sharp – Against  
Cllr Sutton – For  
Cllr Taylor – For  
Cllr Wilding – For

The result of the vote was 21 For, 1 Against and 12 Abstain. The Motion was carried.

### **RESOLVED**

1. That in the absence of significant external strategic infrastructure funding, the full scheme of improvements for the A27 Chichester Bypass prepared by Stantec consultants to support the Local Plan review including the proposed Stockbridge Link Road is undeliverable. Therefore the full package (and the Stockbridge Link Road) will not be progressed further as part of the Local Plan process barring a significant change in the availability and likelihood of securing public sector funding support.
2. That on the basis of recommendation 2.1 above, the Local Plan Review is likely to be unable to meet full housing needs and the Plan strategy should therefore focus on delivering as much development as possible based upon the capacity of the plan area to accommodate development (demonstrating that prioritising brownfield sites and the re-designation of unused commercial land is our priority) within an affordable and deliverable package of transport mitigation taking into account all sources of available funding.
3. That discussions are held with the highway authorities seeking to agree a basis for delivering growth in the Chichester Plan Area until any decision is confirmed regarding a national road scheme for the A27 Chichester Bypass, to inform (along with waste water and other constraints) a revised distribution of development for further testing.
4. That the Council undertakes to review the Local Plan within 5 years from date of adoption, or earlier if a national scheme of improvements for the A27 Chichester Bypass is agreed by government via the Roads Investment Strategy 3 (RIS).
5. That the Council's position in respect of the Duty to Cooperate with other local authorities is updated to reflect that the Council is likely to be unable to meet the full housing needs of the Chichester plan area.

*\*Cllr Page left the meeting at 10.15.*

*\*Cllr Fowler joined the meeting at 11.15.*

4 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There was no requirement to exclude the press or public.

The meeting ended at 2.03 pm

---

CHAIRMAN

---

Date: