



Minutes of the special meeting of the **Cabinet** held in the Committee Rooms at East Pallant House Chichester on Tuesday 20 September 2016 at 09:33

Members Present Mr A Dignum (Chairman), Mrs E Lintill (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Barrow, Mr B Finch, Mrs P Hardwick, Mrs G Keegan and Mrs S Taylor

Members Absent

Officers Present Mr M Allgrove (Planning Policy Conservation and Design Service Manager), Mr S Carvell (Executive Director), Mrs K Dower (Principal Planning Policy Officer (Infrastructure Planning)), Mr R Davidson (Principal Planning Policy Officer (Strategic Planning)), Mrs V Dobson (Neighbourhood Planning Officer), Mr A Frost (Head of Planning Services), Mr P E Over (Executive Director), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive) and Mr G Thrussell (Senior Member Services Officer)

250 **Chairman's Announcements**

Mr Dignum welcomed everyone present to this special meeting of the Cabinet.

He had no specific announcements to make.

There were no late items which due to special circumstances required the Cabinet's urgent consideration under agenda item 7 b).

There were no apologies for absence. All members of the Cabinet were present at the start of the meeting save for Mr Finch who arrived at 10:03 owing to another commitment.

[Note As stated on the first page of the agenda front sheets, the minutes of the Cabinet's meeting on Tuesday 6 September 2016 would be presented for approval at the Cabinet's next ordinary meeting on Tuesday 4 October 2016]

251 **Declarations of Interests**

The following declarations of a personal interest were made in respect of agenda item 4 (A27 Consultation Bypass Improvement Scheme Response to Highways

England Public Consultation) on the basis that the named parish councils were consultees:

- Mr Dignum as a member of Chichester City Council
- Mrs Taylor as a member of West Itchenor Parish Council

[**Note** Minute paras 252 to 255 below summarise the consideration of and conclusion to agenda items 4, 5 and 6 but for full details please refer to the audio recording facility via this link:

<http://chichester.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MIId=781&Ver=4>]

252 **Public Question Time**

One public question had been received from Dr Linda Boize, who was a resident of Chichester.

At Mr Dignum's invitation Dr Boize came forward and read out the text of her question after she had first expressed (a) her gratitude for being able to ask a question and (b) the concern she and local residents felt at only having become aware of this special meeting and the ensuing Council meeting during the late weekend, in consequence of which she felt that there was likely to be a lower public attendance at both meetings.

The text of Dr Boize's question and the reply which was then read out by Mrs Taylor had been circulated in hard copy before the start of the meeting (copy attached to the official minutes) and were as follows:

Question by Dr Linda Boize

'Do you think it acceptable to support Option 2 which focuses on cars and lorries when the impact on south Chichester people will be so damaging in loss of houses and trade, loss of connectivity including cyclist, pedestrian and electric buggy connectivity, loss of local green spaces, over 3 years of construction noise, reduced access and increased pollution especially of particulates, flyovers making a concrete ugly scar and to only ask for serious consideration to the seven mitigation points listed in red in the Agenda Supplement, when at the very least implementing these mitigation points is what is needed. And do you think it is acceptable to ignore the widespread call for reopening the case for a northern alternative.'

Response by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning

Before reading out the reply Mrs Taylor thanked Dr Boize for her question.

'There are two points raised in this question. In response to the first point about the disruption and potential adverse impacts resulting from Option 2, it should be

emphasised that the proposed response to Highways England (which Council is being asked to endorse) does not only include the Cabinet report recommendations themselves, but also the very detailed comments in Appendix 3 of the report which set out a range of additional work which Council officers consider that HE should undertake to develop a better A27 scheme to avoid or mitigate potential adverse impacts.

With regard to a northern bypass route, the proposed Council response seeks to respond specifically to the options proposed in the current Highways England consultation. As indicated in Paragraphs 6.5 – 6.6 of the Cabinet report, it is not considered appropriate for the Council to seek to assess options that do not form part of the current consultation, and it is clear that the Department for Transport and Highways England are now only looking to bring forward an online scheme. In any case, it is not clear that alternative offline options would perform better than Option 2 in terms of benefits weighed against environmental costs.'

Supplementary Question by Dr Linda Boize

Mr Dignum acceded to a request by Dr Boize to ask an oral supplementary question, the substance of which was as follows (not a *verbatim* record). Dr Boize first thanked Mrs Taylor for her reply. She then raised in terms the following point:

'Do you not think it would be acceptable for Chichester District Council to do what Chichester City Council and West Sussex County Council have already both done namely listen to what their local residents have been saying and then to widen their imagination regarding this strategically important decision which we are all facing and take it upon themselves to raise the issue of the northern route option, notwithstanding that obviously we do not possess the requisite information available for that route as we do for the southern routes?'

Response by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning

Mrs Taylor replied by saying that she was unable to comment on the views expressed or positions adopted by those two councils, each of which was a consultee in its own right and had to respond as it saw fit. Chichester District Council would do likewise later today at the Council meeting when this matter would be fully debated in the light of the recommendations made the Cabinet at this meeting.

253 **A27 Chichester Bypass Improvement Scheme Response to Highways England Public Consultation**

[**Note** Mr Finch was not present for this agenda item]

The Cabinet considered the agenda report and its three appendices and also the report update sheet with a revised set of recommendations which had been circulated electronically and published online the previous Friday and was available in hard copy at this meeting (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was presented by Mrs Taylor.

Mr Allgrove, Mr Davidson and Mr Frost were in attendance.

Mrs Taylor summarised the background to the Highways England consultation on the five published options (summarised in para 3.5 of the report), which would end on 22 September 2016 and the analysis undertaken by Chichester District Council (CDC) officers (section 5 of the report) which had led to the recommendations in para 2.1 of the report in favour of Option 2 albeit this was qualified by concerns regarding the potentially significant impacts on the landscape, natural and historic environment and on some residential areas. The officers' overall conclusion regarding the options was set out in paras 5.27 to 5.30 of the report. It should be noted that the report did not address (in the absence of any supporting evidence) other possible options eg the formerly mooted northern route. She drew attention to the third appendix which contained CDC's formal comments in response to the consultation. At its meeting on 15 September 2016 CDC's Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel considered this matter and recommended some amendments to the recommendations in para 2.1 of the report. These were set out in red text in the report update sheet circulated at this meeting.

During the debate two Cabinet members commented as follows.

Mr Barrow said that it was clearly not advisable to favour no option. He commended officers for their work, particularly section 5 of the report. Whilst he was inclined to agree with the recommendation in favour of option 2 as being the most favourable option for Chichester and the local/through traffic flows, he did not consider that the option did a great deal for the Manhood Peninsula, having listened to the views of many local residents and parish councils, particularly with regard to the proposed Stockbridge Link Road. He outlined the route which would be used by drivers travelling from the Manhood Peninsula using the Option 2 routes and highlighted traffic/road problems which he foresaw would be encountered. He questioned whether the mitigation measures would adequately address the environmental impacts of Option 2 on the AONB and expressed concern about the demolition of 20 properties. A northern route had not been included in the consultation but this was an option strongly supported by those who lived in the south of Chichester District. It would not be right to ignore such a high level of support for a northern route. It was very unfortunate that Highways England had excluded this as an option; its omission had dashed the hopes of many southern residents. Accordingly he felt unable to support the recommendations as currently framed. He advocated the need first to seek much greater detail about the environmental and community impacts of Option 2 and the need to comment on options not being proposed by Highways England ie a northern route. The Cabinet's remit was to make recommendations to the Council meeting and he felt that the opportunity should not be missed to invite the Council to address other potential options with a view to inviting Highways England to seek a review of the northern option.

Mr Dignum said that Mr Barrow's concern about the length of the link road was in fact shared and in his view it should be reduced but Mr Barrow replied that he did not see how a reduction would assist. Mr Dignum added that the northern route option was one for the Council meeting.

Mrs Hardwick said that she awaited the Council debate later in the day with great interest. Option 2 clearly met the objectives best of facilitating the east-west traffic flows around Chichester. Many of the concerns expressed by local residents were real and important but the benefits of maximising traffic flows for local traffic were not to be underestimated and the need to ameliorate the impact on roads of the considerable population growth in the southern England had to be recognised. Moreover with good design there could be an aesthetically pleasing result. Nevertheless it was a very difficult decision to make and was causing worry to many residents. Her current position was to favour Option 2.

The officers present were not asked any questions.

Decision

The Cabinet voted (with Mr Finch not present at this stage of the meeting) by a show of hands in favour of the recommendation in para 2.1 of the report by five votes to none against and one abstention (Mr Barrow).

RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL

That the Council:

- (1) Agrees the overall conclusions of the report set out in paragraphs 5.27 to 5.29, providing qualified support for Option 2, based on the information published by Highways England at this stage.
- (2) Approves the comments set out in Appendix 3 (including the Annex) for submission as Chichester District Council's formal response to the Highways England consultation on options for the A27 Chichester Bypass Improvement Scheme.
- (3) Advises Highways England that Chichester District Council is only minded to support Option 2 provided that Highways England gives serious consideration to the following:
 - i. Strategic improvements to the Portfield roundabout to increase east-west capacity, possibly including an eastbound flyover for cars and light vans only using the A27;
 - ii. The provision of good access for traffic going from the B2145 to the east of Chichester without impeding through east-west traffic (possibly by a slip road from the Whyke Road flyover down to the A27 or a right turn from the flyover down to the A27);
 - iii. The reduction of the length of the Stockbridge Link Road, either to only a section from the A286 to the Fishbourne roundabout or to the two sections from the B2201 via the A286 to the Fishbourne roundabout;

- iv. The provision of safe, segregated crossings of the A27 for cyclists and pedestrians at the Bognor Road, Whyke Road and Stockbridge Road junctions;
- v. The installation of noise abatement screens on the flyovers;
- vi. The examination of the scope for lowering the roundabouts and flyovers at the Bognor Road and especially Fishbourne junctions;
- vii. The use of Highways England's Designated Fund to finance the mitigation measures listed above.

(4) Gives delegated authority to the Head of Planning Services to make any consequential amendments to Appendix 3 in agreement with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing.

[Note At the end of agenda item 6 (minute 255 below) and immediately before the meeting ended, Mr Finch, who had been absent for this item, stated that he supported the recommendations (as amended) in the report and he would have voted in favour of them had he been present]

254 **Making the Chidham and Hambrook Neighbourhood Development Plan**

[Note Mr Finch was not present for this agenda item]

The Cabinet considered the agenda report (copy attached to the official minutes).

The report was introduced by Mrs Taylor.

Mr Allgrove, Mrs Dobson and Mr Frost were in attendance.

Mrs Taylor summarised section 3 of the report.

Mrs Dobson did not wish to add to Mrs Taylor's presentation.

There were no questions or comments by members of the Cabinet.

Decision

The Cabinet (Mr Finch was not present at this stage of the meeting) voted unanimously by a show of hands in favour of the recommendation in para 2.1 of the report.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL

That the Council makes the Chidham and Hambrook Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park).

255 **Approval of the Infrastructure Business Plan 2017-2022 for Consultation with the City, Town and Parish Councils and Key Infrastructure Delivery Commissioners**

[**Note** Mr Finch arrived in the meeting at 10:03 during the course of Mrs Taylor's introductory remarks]

The Cabinet considered the agenda report and its appendix (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was presented by Mrs Taylor.

Mr Allgrove, Mrs Dower and Mr Frost were in attendance.

Mrs Taylor explained the purpose of the Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) in terms of establishing which strategic or local infrastructure projects should be prioritised for funding via the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) (the CIL Charging Schedule came into effect on 1 February 2016). The IBP also identified which projects would be funded from section 106 or section 178 agreements or other sources in order to deliver the growth identified in the *Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029*, particularly during 2017-2022. The IBP was a living document which would undergo an annual review. CDC placed great emphasis on consultation, hence the workshops in late April 2016 (section 8 of the report) and the Infrastructure Joint Member Liaison Group (IJMLG) (consisting of members and officers from both CDC and West Sussex County Council (WSCC)) which met on 2 September 2016. She referred specifically to the long list of short-term projects listed in table 3 in section 5 of the appended IBP (pages 101 to 110 of the agenda report) and the projects shortlisted from this, shown in table 11 (page 124). The latter had been considered by the IJMLG at the start of this month when it was agreed that the proposals for Smarter Choices, primary school provision and a medical centre at the West of Chichester strategic development location site should be subjected to further detailed evaluation. Prioritisation of infrastructure proposals was of critical importance given the projected CIL funding shortfall for the short term period 2016-2021 of £2,503,870. The course of the IBP after the six-week consultation period was set out in section 4.3 of the report.

Mr Dignum referred to the recent IJMLG meeting, which he had chaired, and confirmed that the CDC members had emphasised the need for evidence to be presented to its next meeting on 8 December 2016 to demonstrate (a) the cost of new primary school places sought by WSCC and (b) how WSCC's Smarter Choices measures would yield results compared with their preference for hard infrastructure measures such as segregated cycleways.

Mrs Dower did not wish to add to Mrs Taylor's presentation.

There were no questions or comments by members of the Cabinet.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously by a show of hands in favour of the recommendation in para 2.1 of the report.

RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL

That the Council approves the Infrastructure Business Plan 2017-2022 for consultation with the city, town and parish councils, neighbouring local authorities including the South Downs National Park Authority and key infrastructure delivery commissioners for a period of six weeks from 3 October to 14 November 2016.

256 Late Items

There were no late items for urgent consideration by the Cabinet at this meeting.

257 Exclusion of the Press and Public

The Cabinet did not resolve to exclude the public and the press from any part of this meeting.

[Note The meeting ended at 10:08]

CHAIRMAN

DATE