

PLANNING POLICY SUB-COMMITTEE

23 February 2021 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Mrs Yeates (Chairman), Bennett, Bower, Dixon, Elkins, Hughes, Lury, Ms Thurston, Tilbrook and Coster (Substitute for Huntley)

[Note: Councillor Hughes was absent during consideration of the matters referred to in the following minutes – Minute 32 to Minute 35 (Part)].

32. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for Absence had been received from Councillors Chapman, Charles, Mrs Daniells, Huntley and Jones.

33. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made.

34. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Sub-Committee meeting held on 15 December 2020 were approved by the Sub-Committee as a correct record and would be signed by the Chairman at the earliest opportunity.

35. LOCAL PLAN UPDATE - VISION AND OBJECTIVES

The Sub-Committee received a report from the Principal Planning Policy Team Leader which set out the background as to why the Council was formulating the proposed Vision and Objectives and it set out the process followed to get to this point. The Council was updating the Arun Local Plan 2018 following a Full Council decision made on 15 January 2020. This had been triggered due to issues surrounding housing delivery performance and as the Council had declared a climate change emergency and had identified its key sustainability priorities which had driven this process forward. Also, In July 2020, the Council had adopted the Local Development Scheme which set out the plan making programme and the timescale by which the Council would adopt a new updated plan by 2023 identifying that development management policies and environmental standards would be looked at but also strategic policies in reviewing the update to the Local Plan.

It was explained that the Vision and Objectives was a very important step in the process where the Council came to a view about the direction of travel it wanted to take in undertaking its Local Plan update. It also set out the overall direction of travel and the scope of the Plan in terms of the work that needed to be undertaken and so was a critical step.

The Sub-Committee was reminded that three Member workshops had been held in December 2020 and January 2021 as well as a question and answer session; presentation and further background information and a feedback form to steer the work and collate Member input. The draft Vision and Objectives, which had been attached to the report as Appendix 1, had accommodated a range of Member views that were important to include and reflected emerging best practice and national policy. However, in doing so, to make the Vision and Objectives read concisely, Officers had streamlined it to make sure that it still covered the key points raised but at a general level in order to allow more detailed policies to emerge that would address the more detailed considerations raised.

The Planning Policy Team Leader then worked through the Vision and Objectives document explaining its key themes and stated that the Sub-Committee was being asked to consider it and hopefully agree its content so that it could then be recommended onto Full Council on 17 March 2021 for adoption.

The Chairman then invited debate on this item. In view of the detail and number of queries and points raised, these have been summarised in the bullet points below:

- On the Vision it was felt that this did not put enough emphasis onto the economic activity that was necessary to support the District.
- There were also some areas that were beyond the scope of the Council that needed to be taken up with third parties under the Economic and Infrastructure section such as high quality education and the prospects of schools. It was felt that these would only be achieved if the Council got buy in from West Sussex County Council (WSCC) or other parties that should be involved and so it was vital to ensure that these third parties be consulted and should agree to what the Council was stating.
- It was felt that there needed to be a minimum 15-year period from adoption and clarification was sought as the NPPF stated that strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption to anticipate and respond to long term requirements and opportunities. Another point raised was what implications there would be for the Local Plan with the Government dropping the algorithm as this would bring the Council's housing number per annum down from 2,000 to 1,300. It was felt that the 5-year extension approved in January 2020 was a mistake as this would mean that it would be out of date before it was even adopted as the process would take 3-5 years.
- In response to this, the Planning Policy Team Leader confirmed that the reference made to the NPPF was correct and that it did state that strategic policies should look ahead to 15 years. The Council had taken its decision to review its plan to 2036 on the basis that it had some priorities in terms of the climate change issues and the policy standards in the Local Plan. There were precedents for plans being adopted with 13 year (Arun's adopted Local Plan) and 10 year (Bedford Borough Council's

Local Plan trajectories – but Inspectors would need to understand the reasons and would be expected to require immediate/early plan reviews.

- Discussion then looked at how this might affect evidence base work. It was explained that the next agenda item described the work undertaken to date and what was planned. There was flexibility on the timing which would help to prioritise and avoid abortive work should national guidance change. The first stages of work were already underway on updating the transport model. Looking at scenarios would be the next phase; followed by the active travel study, whilst progress was underway on the Active Travel Study. Briefs for the next phase of studies were being prepared so these could be built into those timescales ensuring that the evidence required covered the right time period.
- Discussing the plan period 2036 and 2040 – one thing to bear in mind was the Council's declaration of a climate emergency and the Council's need to reach net zero by 2030 which was a commitment for District Council operations but not for the whole District and so caution needed to be applied when using the date of 2036 for that purpose.
- On the wording for the Economy and Infrastructure – alternative wording to the introduction was suggested that "Arun District will be progressing towards zero carbon targets" and this should be added onto the end of the Vision in view of its importance.
- Under Economy and Infrastructure on the introduction and the points listed, none of the items listed would achieve zero carbon emissions by 2030 and so this was not clearly worded enough. Alternative wording proposed was "Arun will develop a thriving economy **by** but the zero carbon emissions point could not be used to identify how the Council would achieve this. It was felt that this needed to be moved up to the Vision section and then add the following wording to the end of the Vision **"Arun District will be progressing towards its zero carbon target commitments"**, as it was difficult to agree on a date. The importance of working with partners to achieve these targets was emphasised as it was impossible for the Council to achieve this in isolation. It was agreed that this had been a difficult task to bring all the comments together, although progress had been made. Points were made that the appendix needed more editing before it could be finally adopted.
- There were three mentions of flooding in three different places and three mentions of skills in the Economy section and so another request for rewording the document was made.
- It was felt that the layout needed to also be changed as the Sustainable Communities section should be combined with the Place Making section. It was also pointed out that some sections had an introduction, and some didn't and that the document needed to be consistent with more standardisation and less repetition and more focus on climate change.

Planning Policy Sub-Committee - 23.02.21

- In terms of education it was pointed out that the Council had no control but did encourage collaborative partnerships and so this was one of the most important things that the Council needed to do.
- It was vital to improve waste levels as well and also important to acknowledge the points made earlier i.e. if it had already been decided to spend a large amount of money on this, it was not logical to do that for just a 5 year extension which could be out of date by the time it was introduced. Would it cost more to have a 10-year extension and not a 5-year extension?
- On the Vision, there were things that had been left out. One was comfortable unobstructed convenient and independent transport facilities for all age groups – this could be electric cars or buses. This was because the Council was heading towards increasing congestion and so there was need to make sure that there would be independent transport facilities for all age groups – this had to be included in the Vision.
- There was also the need to include prompt and easily accessible health facilities for all types – although this had been referenced it was not very specific.
- Also, that residents should be able to live in easy reach of open and rural environments – this had a lot of implications in terms of what the Council was going to build and where it was planning to build it.
- It was felt that the wording “focussed in centres” should be removed from the Vision – should the Council bind itself to this as it may not be able to achieve this.
- On Place Making and the second bullet point on flooding, it was felt that this did not make sense and needed to be reworded to “Existing and proposed communities should be protected through flood prevention and by avoiding development in areas that were known to be at risk of flooding” to make it more succinct and to the point.
- The fourth bullet point under Place Making – the words places and spaces were too vague and the word buildings needed to be added.
- On bullet point 6 – that the words “that through new development – be deleted as this was not logical
- On the Environment concern was expressed on bullet point 2 and the words “high quality farmland” – it was felt that the Council was not doing this now and was allowing consents on high quality farmland now so was this a change of approach?

In view of the number of points raised, the Group Head of Planning interjected wishing to clarify what the purpose of the Vision and Objectives document was. He stated that many of the comments made were almost ‘pseudo policies’ as opposed to overarching aims. This document set out what this Council’s aspirations would be, it was not stating that this was what the Council would categorically do.

Debate recommenced on the Appendix:

- Grammatical changes were requested.
- Under Vision – should the word ‘urban’ be added to focussed in centres.
- On Economy and Infrastructure and the introduction – did this relate to zero targets for the District or the Council – this was because the Council had little control over the whole district.
- On the first bullet point for Economy and Infrastructure, clarity was sought on the wording “attracts inwards investment and quality new employers to increase wealth and earnings”. It was felt that this needed to include existing employers as well and be reworded to include higher quality better paid employment.
- The mention of SUDS in place making was not accepted as it was felt that SUDS did not work well in this area with such a high water table and the Lidsey Surface Water Management Plan confirmed this.
- The last bullet point on Place Making – the word construction needed to be removed and replaced with new buildings.
- It was important that local identity was protected. In the Environment section the Council did have an element of outstanding landscape, coastal gaps and historic character that needed to be protected. A unique situation was highlighted by Councillor Elkins where up to the Worthing Borough boundary there was land within the gap which was contiguous with Arun. Worthing Borough Council in its Local Plan also had this gap protected but had it strengthened by having it classed as a local green space which was within their proposal. Their studies had been completed in conjunction with both Councils giving evidence to the benefits of including this area within a local green space. Councillor Elkins stated that he was looking to strengthen this for this area where there was a unique setting between adjacent authorities and asked that this area be protected by use of local green space and guidance was sought.

The Chairman asked for an opinion from the Sub-Committee how this document could be moved forward in view of the many points raised and requests for changes made.

The Group Head of Planning assisted stating that what was needed was a resolution from the Sub-Committee providing a steer in terms of what it wanted Officers to do. Was this to defer the item and request Officers to go away and work up a revised Aims and Objectives document as all that had been achieved so far was a long list of individual Member comments. Did the Sub-Committee agree with these changes and suggestions or did it wish for Officers to rework up a revised document. A suggestion was made as to whether the changes discussed could be listed and agreed through an exchange of emails or whether it was possible to convene a further meeting of the Sub-Committee to work through the revisions suggested. The consequences of not being able to finalise the Aims and Objectives document were explained to the Sub-Committee by the Planning Policy Team Leader. The view of the Sub-Committee was

that this needed to be finalised and forwarded to Full Council on 17 March 2021 for final adoption.

Councillor Elkins requested to receive a response to the point he had raised under the Environment heading with regard to making a local green space. The Group Head of Planning stated that this was referring to a specific site whereas the Visions and Objectives were not site specific and should not be site specific. What Worthing Borough Council had done within its Borough had been following evidence and consultation to allocate a piece of land through a policy not via a vision and objectives document. For Arun to do this, it would need to apply the same process if this was where the Council wished to end up, which was to consider allocating a piece of land as a local green space or a protected area designating some description. That would be a site-specific matter for a policy.

The Chairman then proceeded to raise each of the amendments made to the Aims and Objectives document one by one to see if these could be approved stating that coastal and rural gaps should be included within the Aims and Objectives document.

The Chairman invited further comment from the Sub-Committee.

It was the view of one Member that having heard the discussion there were other points that needed to be made. For the Council to potentially look forward in terms of the length of the local plan, the less certain the evidence base became and so needed to be considered with some caution. It was hoped and believed that Government would change the rules for local plans in terms of making them 5-year spans meaning that the view of setting a goal for 2036, 2038 or 2040 was somewhat pointless. This suggested that the Aims and Objectives looking that far ahead would not be achievable because so much would change. It was also felt that to set goals for the whole of the District in terms of climate change was not achievable either as the Council could not apply legislation onto companies and residents. It was essential that this reflected all of the discussion that had taken place and that all of the Sub-Committee was in agreement with the wording in the document before it went to Full Council for final approval.

There were Members of the Sub-Committee who agreed that the Aims and Objectives document needed to be resolved so that it could be debated at Full Council somehow but that the document needed to be revised and edited and agreed before Full Council debate. It was agreed that the document needed to be rewritten and edited. Suggestions were made to convene a further meeting of the Sub-Committee to complete this task, but there was insufficient time to do this in view of Full Council deadlines. The Chairman asked if she could make the consequential changes requested.

The Planning Policy Team Leader provided input and advice reminding Members that the Vision and Objective document represented the Council's aspirations at this point. It was accepted that this was always going to be a difficult task, but this was why the various Member workshops and presentations had been held earlier to cover the viewpoints raised. It was important to finalise this document as it would become the

corporate vision for the authority to help engage with all other stakeholders to help align respective plan making and strategies for example WSCC on education and partnerships.

The Chairman proposed that all of the issues raised be voted upon so that the document could be revised and presented to Full Council. In attempting to action this, it proved too difficult to achieve.

The Planning Policy Team Leader was asked to confirm what the implications would be if the document was deferred for further consideration. Members were advised that if this route was approved, then the document would be reported to the first meeting of the new Planning Policy Committee on 1 June 2021 and so would impact the Local Plan Review and the update on the evidence base which would delay the engagement process with other Local Authorities; infrastructure providers and agencies, causing a consequential domino effect on the Local Plan timetable.

Further discussion took place and suggestions were made as to whether it was possible to finalise the document outside of the meeting with all Members of the Sub-Committee being involved. This suggestion was not recommended as a sensible way forward.

Following further debate, and having discussed how this matter could be progressed to allow the document to be finalised and recommended onto Full Council it was suggested that the Sub-Committee could give delegated authority to the Chairman; Vice-Chairman; the Cabinet Member for Planning in consultation with the Group Head of Planning to finalise the document and in full consultation with the Sub-Committee to allow it to be presented to Full Council on 17 March 2021.

Following further lengthy debate, Councillor Bennett put forward this proposal and this was seconded by Councillor Ms Thurston.

Debate on this proposal then took place and it was suggested that the Shadow Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Charles, be included in those that would be given delegated authority. A suggestion was then made that Councillor Charles be replaced with Councillor Bower. A suggestion was then made that Councillor Dixon be included and a further suggestion was then made that Councillor Ms Thurston be included. As no consensus agreement could be reached, Councillor Bennett requested that his proposal be put to the vote.

A recorded vote was requested.

Those voting for Councillor Bennett's proposal were Councillors Bennett, Lury, Ms Thurston, Tilbrook and Mrs Yeates (5). Those voting against were Councillor Bower (1). Councillors Coster, Dixon, Elkins and Hughes abstained from voting (4).

This amendment was therefore CARRIED.

Planning Policy Sub-Committee - 23.02.21

The Chairman stated that this was the only way that would allow for the Aims and Objectives document to be finalised and recommended onto Full Council for approval.

Following further discussion,

The Sub-Committee

RESOLVED

That delegated authority be given to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Planning Policy Sub-Committee; the Cabinet Member for Planning, in consultation with the Group Head of Planning to finalise the Vision and Objectives document, in consultation with the Sub-Committee, based on the comments and suggestions raised during the meeting so that it could be recommended onto Full Council on 17 March 2021 for adoption.

36. LOCAL PLAN EVIDENCE UPDATE

The Sub-Committee received a report from the Planning Policy Team Leader which provided an update on the current and pending evidence studies being progressed to inform the update of the Arun Local Plan 2018. The Sub-Committee was being asked to note this update report.

The Planning Policy Team Leader explained that the Council had updated its Local Development Scheme in July 2020 which had set the overall plan making timetable and reflected the Council's priorities for urgently updating the Development Management policies. The current and future programme of work and studies had been set out within the report and these were briefly explained.

In discussing the report, support was given to updating the Arun Transport Model as this had last been completed in 2015. It was also recognised that it was desperately important to undertake this work in light of all that was going on with highways and transport. As this subject was so key to the development of the revised plan, Councillors were interested to learn what opportunity there would be for them to have input into developing these studies as it was important for Councillors to begin to understand what would be proposed and what was going to happen with Arun transport as this was a developing issue now and would be one that would continue to become an even bigger issue in the future. Similarly, this also applied to the issue of climate change and sustainable design standards. Looking at the 20-minute communities' study, it was hoped that this study would reflect on the realities of life accepting that everyone had different needs, and this then impacted transport modes.

In response it was explained that as the evidence studies were prepared, they would follow the normal reporting route through Committee, and this would apply in terms of the new Committee structure that would commence in May 2021. This meant that as and when evidence reports were completed or draft reports prepared, then these would be brought to the new Planning Policy Committee to update Members in

terms of progress and to allow for proper scrutiny. The Group Head of Planning explained how this had taken place before via holding informal briefings with all Members outside of the Committee on all evidence based documents.

The inclusion of the Biodiversity Study was very much welcomed, and it was felt that with the evidence outlined, the Council would have an excellent plan in place.

Looking at the various studies to be undertaken, clarification was sought regarding local green spaces to establish which studies would materially address this issue; the development strategy or an environmental assessment and in view of the Worthing Borough Council Local Plan and would a study be undertaken for the particular two gaps associated with each authority on the eastern boundary. It was explained that this matter would become clearer through the 20 minute community study together with the landscaping study. The strategic gaps in Arun in terms of supporting the current adopted Local Plan did have evidence base behind them in terms of the quality of the landscape and the impact of the landscape and so this would be a key study that would address this issue. Councillor Elkins asked how the landscaping of the area that he was referring to would be moved forward? It was explained that this would take place at the appropriate time and it would be necessary to work out what the Council's development strategy might be which would then be tested by the landscape study. Councillor Elkins asked that it be included in the minutes that the Council would also seek the evidence that Worthing Borough Council had used to help define its local plan. The last item on the agenda was referred to by the Planning Policy Team Leader as this touched upon the cross-boundary duty to co-operate relationship with neighbouring authorities and, in particular, Worthing.

An observation was made about the cost of reviewing the Local Plan at £1m and that not all of the studies listed had a cost attributed to them. It was hoped that if a study was not a statutory requirement then it would not then be progressed to save money. It was also pointed out that there might be the need to add further studies and so Officers were asked to keep a close eye on this and to look at opportunities where money could be saved. It was explained that all of the studies had been budgeted for and that their nature was very typical of what was needed for a Local Plan, they all had a reason behind them to ensure a successful examination and sound evidence led approach to plan making, proving that it was deliverable and achievable was essential.

Following further discussion,

The Sub-Committee

RESOLVED

That the Arun Local Plan Update – Evidence Base be noted.

37. INTERIM HOUSING STATEMENT

The Sub-Committee received a report from the Planning Policy Team Leader confirming that the Council had prepared an Interim Housing Statement because it had been unable to demonstrate a 5-year Housing Land Supply. It was explained that this document provided the Council with a mechanism for inviting landowners, developers and promoters to submit planning applications in the right locations at the right scale by providing a high level tick list and RAG rating of the existing Development Plan and National Policy Guidance matters, which if addressed by applicants, would help speed up decision making. If approved, the interim Housing Statement would operate until a 5-year housing land supply could be demonstrated.

A range of issues were raised in considering this report. With the HELAA sites it did feel like a dangerous road to go down as it seemed that if a site made it onto the HELAA, then it tended to progress onto full blown planning consent eventually. Was this dangerous in terms of how it fitted in with the Local Plan in that it was not cohesive. It was explained that in reality the Council was unable to demonstrate a 5 year land supply and so proposals for development that might conflict with the policies of the Local Plan could come forward and have the risk of being determined favourably at appeal if the Council wanted to refuse them. It was also about giving some guidance to landowners in terms of where we would prefer them to look, as the HEELA was not meant to apply down to a level of decision making for planning applications. Its purpose was to help the Council to look for the most suitable land available. All sites still had to go through a level of evidence gathering through the plan making process which they might not survive. The key point was whether the Council should provide guidance to potential applicants about where the authority saw where any proposals should come forward.

Another issue of concern around land supply was that of land banking and the question was asked as to whether this contributed to the figures being so low in Arun. There was a significant level of unimplemented planning consents to a figure of around 4,000 dwellings and that there were different reasons for this. If the implementation of 4,000 homes that had planning permission already, would it bring the Council back up to the 5-years and if it did, then this meant that the Council was in the position it was in due to developers. In response, it was confirmed that the 4,000 was already in the Council's 5-year classed as commitments.

Another point raised was that the Council's position with regard to housing delivery was presumably measured against the phasing in the Local Plan and was this established or could it be changed. Also, if the Council was doing a review of the Local Plan then the phasing needed to be changed and adjusted to avoid the Council being penalised. The Group Head of Planning confirmed that the Council could amend the trajectory but could not manipulate it.

It was clear that the 5-year land supply was something that was beyond the Council's control and a matter for developers to deal with. In view of this, a report was requested to outline what developers were responsible for the 4,000 figure and what the delays were on these sites. It was felt that this information was needed before Councillors could provide a view on the interim housing statement.

The Group Head of Planning confirmed that this work was underway to an extent, but a lack of staff resource made it difficult to contact the promoters of the committed sites.

It was pointed out that the Council had written to the Housing Minister questioning these targets with little success and so the targets needed to be challenged nationally as this was an issue that affected so many other Councils. The RAG system introduced was thought to be helpful but appeared to set higher targets than what was currently requested. The concern was that this approach might not yield the developments that the Council was looking for and that it would not be a quick process. The Group Head of Planning pointed out that this was existing policy and that not all criteria would necessarily apply depending on relevance.

Councillor Dixon confirmed that he had received a representation from a member of the public which he read out to the Sub-Committee. The question asked was whether Option 1 in the report, which was to agree the interim Housing Statement, was this a lawful option. The Group Head of Planning responded stating that there were two elements of housing land supply and delivery which would ensure that a Policy afforded full development plan status. One of those was the 5-Year Land Supply and the other was the Housing Delivery Test which were national policies which operated with the statutory development plan and required authorities to act in to address delivery. The Sub-Committee therefore needed to satisfy both measures in relation to housing delivery in order for the titled 'presumption' not to apply. He confirmed that Option 1 was therefore a lawful option.

Following further discussion, the Sub-Committee

The Sub-Committee

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL

That the Housing Interim Statement is recommended to Full Council on 17 March 2021 for approval.

38. WALBERTON VILLAGE AND VILLAGE GREEN CONSERVATION AREA CHARACTER APPRAISALS

The Sub-Committee received a report from the Principal Conservation Officer outlining that the Council had 29 Conservation Areas within its Local Planning Authority Area (LPAA). In order to be able to fully preserve and enhance its Conservation Areas, the Council proposed to prepare individual Conservation Area Character Appraisals which would define what was special, and worthy of protection. They would also review

Planning Policy Sub-Committee - 23.02.21

the existing boundaries of the Conservation Areas and would recommend whether there was potential for them to be amended.

It was explained that two separate Conservation Area Character Appraisals had been prepared for the Walberton Village and Walberton Green Conservation Area and this report sought agreement to publish them for public consultation.

The Sub-Committee

RESOLVED – That

- (1) It be agreed that the Walberton Village and Walberton Green Conservation Area Character Appraisals be published for a six-week period of consultation; and
- (2) The Cabinet Member for Planning in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Policy Sub-Committee and the Group Head of Planning be given delegated authority to agree minor editorial changes prior to publication.

39. WORTHING AND CRAWLEY LOCAL PLAN REGULATION 19 - PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATIONS

The Sub-Committee received a report from the Planning Policy Team Leader advising Members on Worthing Borough Council's and Crawley Borough Council's 'Pre-Submission' Local Plan (Regulation 19) public consultations.

The Sub-Committee was being asked to agree to the suggested responses to these consultations as outlined in the report. In looking at Crawley Borough Council's pre-submission Local Plan first, the response was that the Council was satisfied with the approach to the Crawley Publication (Regulation 19) Local Plan and Duty to Co-operate based on the fact that Crawley be urged to secure a Statement of Common Ground with Arun in order to clarify its approach to securing unmet need within the North Sussex Housing Market Area (HMA) before submitting its Plan.

Looking at the situation for Worthing Borough Council, Councillors were referred to Paragraph 1.4 of the report setting out the background to the Worthing Local Plan. Arun had objected to the original Plan and since making that objection, several Duty to Co-operate meetings had taken place to overcome the objection including through progressing the Plan's supporting evidence base and approach. The points covered were explained by the Planning Policy Team Leader.

It was explained that Worthing was facing a significant housing shortfall and was only meeting around 26% of its overall Plan requirement and there was no plan in place to overcome the issue. In view of this, the report was proposing that whilst they had addressed the concerns over evidence base, the level of unmet need was still an issue and no resolution had been reached in terms of which and how Local Authorities would

assist with that number. The Council had been asked if it could help to accommodate that unmet need. The Council's proposed response was that it would remove the objection originally lodged on the evidence base but that Worthing Borough Council be urged to pause its plan timetable in order to progress Statements of Common Ground and joint progress working other authorities within its HMA to look at potential development options.

Debate on this item raised questions about the delay to the Local Strategic Statement 3 process (LSS3) and the issues surrounding this were explained. Other observations made were what the responses were made by other local authorities as it would have been useful to have seen their comments. It was explained that the consultation deadline was 23 March 2021 and so other Local Authorities still had not made their consultation response. Officers were asked what discussions they had had with other authorities and if they were in a position to meet that need. It was explained that discussions had taken place with Horsham and the South Downs National Park on the basis of Duty to Co-Operate and the issue about unmet need across the sub-region.

Following further discussion, the Sub-Committee

RESOLVED – That

(1) That the Council's outstanding objection to the Worthing Local Plan is resolved, however, Worthing Borough Council is urged to pause its plan timetable in order to progress Statement of Common Ground and joint working with neighbouring authorities within its Housing Market Area, in order to address the significant level of unmet housing need; and

(2) Arun is satisfied with the approach to the Crawley publication (Regulation 19_ Local Plan and the Duty to Co-Operate, however, the authority is urged to secure a Statement of Common Ground with Arun in order to clarify its approach to securing unmet need within the North Sussex HMA before submitting its Plan.

(The meeting concluded at 9.30 pm)