



Public Document Pack

Arun District Council
Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

Tel: (01903 737500)
Fax: (01903) 730442
DX: 57406 Littlehampton
Minicom: 01903 732765

e-mail: committees@arun.gov.uk

Committee Manager Andrew Bishop (Ext. 37984)

14 November 2022

PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Planning Policy Committee will be held in the **Council Chamber at the Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF** on **Thursday 24 November 2022 at 6.00 pm** and you are requested to attend.

Members: Councillors Bower (Chair), Hughes (Vice-Chair), Chapman, Coster, Edwards, Elkins, Goodheart, Jones, Lury, Thurston and Yeates

PLEASE NOTE: Where public meetings are being held at the Arun Civic Centre, to best manage safe space available, members of the public are encouraged to watch the meeting online via the [Committee's webpage](#).

1. Where a member of the public wishes to attend the meeting or has registered a request to take part in Public Question Time, they will be invited to submit the question in advance of the meeting to be read out by an Officer, but of course can attend the meeting in person.
2. We request members of the public do not attend any face to face meeting if they have Covid-19 symptoms.

Any members of the public wishing to address the Committee meeting during Public Question Time, will need to email Committees@arun.gov.uk by 5.15 pm on **Wednesday 16 November 2022** in line with current Committee Meeting Procedure Rules.

It will be at the Chief Executive's/Chair's discretion if any questions received after this deadline are considered.

For further information on the items to be discussed, please contact Committees@arun.gov.uk.

A G E N D A

1. APOLOGIES

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members and Officers are invited to make any declaration of pecuniary, personal and/or prejudicial interests that they may have in relation to items on this agenda, and are reminded that they should re-declare their interest before consideration of the items or as soon as the interest becomes apparent.

Members and Officers should make their declaration by stating:

- a) the item they have the interest in
- b) whether it is a pecuniary/personal interest and/or prejudicial interest
- c) the nature of the interest

3. MINUTES

(Pages 1 - 6)

The Committee will be asked to approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Planning Policy Committee held on 21 September 2022.

4. ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA THAT THE CHAIR OF THE MEETING IS OF THE OPINION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY BY REASON OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

5. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

To receive questions from the public (for a period of up to 15 minutes).

6. LOCAL PLAN EVIDENCE UPDATE - BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN STUDY

(Pages 7 - 24)

This report seeks the Committee's endorsement of the Biodiversity Net Gain Study (BNG) as a high-level baseline study, forming part of the evidence base to inform the Local Plan update (when it resumes). In particular, the BNG study informs the spatial application of the 10% net gain metric (when this is finalised in November 2023) through development management decisions. The BNG study will also help engagement with developers and nature recovery stakeholders, to deliver habitat creation/improvement projects in the right places, inform the preparation of an Arun Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) and cross boundary nature recovery planning work e.g. emergent West Sussex County Nature Recovery Network.

7. ARUN TRANSPORT APPORTIONMENT METHODOLOGY UPDATE (Pages 25 - 34)

The report seeks to update the Arun Transport Apportionment Methodology prepared jointly with West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and obtain the Committee's agreement that it be endorsed and be uploaded to the council's evidence base website. This will help to ensure that the development of Arun provided for in the Adopted Arun Local Plan 2018 is sustainable and supported by necessary transport contributions that mitigate the impact of development.

8. ARUN INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING STATEMENT 2021/22 (Pages 35 - 42)

This report updates the Committee on the publication of the council's annual Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS) setting out Section 106 planning obligation contributions and CIL income and spend on the council's infrastructure list from the previous financial year, in accordance with 'The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010' (as amended).

9. LITTLEHAMPTON ECONOMIC GROWTH AREA (LEGA) (Pages 43 - 48)

This report seeks the Committee's agreement that the proposed Littlehampton Economic Growth Area (LEGA) Study update should exclude work on the West Bank Strategic Allocation elements of the Study and focus the study brief on the riverside opportunities and the area between Climping beach and the West Bank. The study would, therefore, aim to complement what might happen on the West Bank through the existing LEGA study and Strategic Allocation in the adopted Arun Local Plan 2018.

10. ARUNDEL TOWN COUNCIL LOCAL WALKING AND CYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN (LCWIP) (Pages 49 - 54)

The report seeks the Committee's agreement in principle to support the development of Arundel Town Council's Local Walking Cycling and Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) because it is consistent with the Council's approach to delivering Active Travel opportunities, through its Active Travel study which was approved as a material consideration.

11. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2022-2026 - QUARTER 2 PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR THE PERIOD 1 APRIL 2022 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2022 (Pages 55 - 60)

This report updates the Committee on the Q2 Performance Outturn for the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) which make up the Corporate Plan, for the period 1 April 2022 to 30 September 2022.

OUTSIDE BODIES - FEEDBACK FROM MEETINGS

12. WORK PROGRAMME

(Pages 61 - 62)

The Work Programme for the remainder of 2022/23 is attached for the Committee's information.

Note: If Members have any detailed questions, they are reminded that they need to inform the Chair and relevant Director in advance of the meeting.

Note: Filming, Photography and Recording at Council Meetings – The District Council supports the principles of openness and transparency in its decision making and permits filming, recording and the taking of photographs at its meetings that are open to the public. This meeting may therefore be recorded, filmed or broadcast by video or audio, by third parties. Arrangements for these activities should operate in accordance with guidelines agreed by the Council and as available via the following link [PART 8 - CP - Section 5 Filming Photographic Protocol](#)

PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

21 September 2022 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Bower (Chair), Hughes (Vice-Chair), Chapman, Coster, Elkins, Kelly (Substitute for Edwards), Lury, Thurston and Yeates

Councillor Gunner was also in attendance for all or part of the meeting.

Apologies: Councillor Edwards

270. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made.

271. MINUTES

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 27 July 2022 were approved by the Committee and signed by the Chair.

272. ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA THAT THE CHAIR OF THE MEETING IS OF THE OPINION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY BY REASON OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

The Chair confirmed that there were no urgent items.

273. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Chair confirmed that there had been no questions from the public submitted for this meeting.

274. BUDGET 2023/2024 - PROCESS

Upon the invitation of the Chair, the Interim Group Head of Finance and Section 151 Officer presented the report which provided Members with a summary of the budget process for 2023/24 as required by the Council's Constitution and having been endorsed by the Policy and Finance Committee on 6 September 2022 [Minute 241]. It was noted that this was the second budget produced under the Committee style of governance and that due to the cost of living crisis more reports might need to go to the Policy and Finance Committee as and when more information became available.

Members then took part in a full debate on the item where a number of points were raised including:

- the situation behind the increased cost identified against 'Employees' in the budget and whether this was due to increased costs for existing employees or due to increased numbers of employees
- the reasons behind the reduced amounts against 'Supplies and Services'

Planning Policy Committee - 21.09.22

- the expectations of reduced income against 'Other Income'
- the zero based budgeting project and the likelihood of it bringing some cost savings

The Interim Group Head of Finance and Section 151 Officer and the Group Head of Planning provided Members with responses to points raised during the debate, including:

- confirmation that there was growth in the number of Full Time Equivalent posts within the Planning Department as part of an on-going restructuring exercise, and that the budget for this (which allowed for the additional posts) was agreed at Full Council in May
- that 'Supplies and Services' expenditure varied mainly due to expenditure on the Local Plan, which was intermittent by nature
- the previous year having been exceptional as far as 'Other Income' was concerned, this being predominantly Development Control fees
- zero based budgeting being outcomes focussed budgeting that moved resources to priorities and sought to avoid the holding onto of resources that might not align with priorities that incremental budgeting could result in

The Committee then noted the Budget process for 2023/24 as outlined in the report.

275. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2022-2026 - QUARTER 1
PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR THE PERIOD 1 APRIL TO 30 JUNE 2022

Upon the invitation of the Chair, the Group Head of Planning presented the report which set out the performance of the Key Performance Indicators at Quarter 1 for the period 1 April 2022 to 30 June 2022. It was explained that this Committee had one KPI to note [CP36 – Number of new homes completed].

Members then took part in a full debate on the item where a number of points were raised, including:

- clarification was sought on when new homes got counted and included in this KPI, for example when they were ready to be lived in or at an earlier stage in the process
- the location within the District of these completed new homes
- whether this figure included all new homes or only affordable ones
- whether the report referenced in the commentary box of the KPI, regarding housing delivery targets and whether the market in the area could actually deliver the required number of homes, would be available to Members and what the timescales involved were
- whether more detail was available to contextualise the 'not achieving' status, for example how far was Arun from reaching the targets, and what needed to be done to achieve them
- whether Arun was in a similar situation to neighbouring Local Authorities in not achieving this target

- the issue for Arun to accommodate higher numbers of houses whilst being bordered by both the sea and a National Park
- that it would be helpful for Members to have a briefing to see how these things have progressed before publication of the housing target deliverability report
- dissatisfaction with the amount of housing Arun has needed to accommodate as part of its Local Plan housing requirements
- the meaninglessness of this target when presented without context
- the unfairness of the Planning Department having this as a target when they are not responsible for building the houses, and therefore whether this Key Measure should be reviewed as it only reflected what builders were building
- the Planning Department, and by extension Arun, being set up to fail with an unrealistic target as it could not force the implementation of approved but yet to be commenced development
- whether the Policy and Finance Committee should be asked to re-evaluate this KPI and seek to amend it so that it was more meaningful in what Arun rather than a third party could actually deliver
- the need to have the figures for planned and unplanned development and the consequences for unplanned development when approved planned development was not built out

The Group Head of Planning provided Members with responses to points raised during the debate, including:

- explanation that the report contained the best interim figures available, which had been taken from new Council Tax records and applications and Building Control completions (recognising that Building Control did not deal with every development within the District as developments could have appointed Inspectors), until the more thorough end-of-year data (which also included site visits, site inspections and direct contact with developers) collected for Annual Monitoring Report purposes became available, which would be reported in January. This report would also include the location of the houses and the figures for planned and unplanned development, which would be resource-intensive poor use of Officer time to report on a quarterly basis
- confirmation that the figure included was for all new homes
- confirmation that Members would receive a briefing on the housing target deliverability report ahead of publication but that Officers were very keen that the report only became available when it was certain that it looked at the issues that it needed to look at, and confirmation that Officers were in active ongoing conversation with the consultants on its preparation
- a finished useable report might be able to be brought to the November meeting of the Committee, though the January meeting was more likely in order to provide Members with a briefing on the report and for it to pass through the Corporate Management Team (CMT) process first
- explanation that the targets were assessed against the Standard Housing Methodology, which had to be used for the purposes of the Annual Monitoring Report, and involved significant amounts of evidence and data

- feeding into how those targets were achieved in a context of changing targets
- Arun being in a unique position within the context of Local Authorities and housing number requirements in terms of the amount of development it had been asked to provide, the contrasts with other Districts with similar requirements (Horsham, Mid Sussex) that were performing better in meeting their targets but that were also more attractive markets being closer to London and Gatwick etc
 - explanation that the targets were set by Arun's statutory Local Plan and how locally agreed targets would be meaningless in the context of planning applications and planning appeals as the Authority would still not be meeting its statutory targets and as an Authority needed to know where it was in relation to its statutory targets at all times

The Chair confirmed that this report was an information paper with no recommendations for the Committee to consider. The Committee then noted the report.

276. THE PROVISION OF RESOURCES TO ASSIST THE COUNCIL ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE A27 ARUNDEL IMPROVEMENTS - FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Upon the invitation of the Chair, the Group Head of Planning presented the report which sought to make financial arrangements to implement the recommendation of the Committee at its meeting of 27 July 2022 [Minute 194] where the future Local Plan work programme of the Planning Policy Team, as a result of the decision of Full Council to approve the continued suspension of work on the Local Plan for 2022/23 [Minute 129], was discussed and agreed.

It was explained that prior to Minute 194, the Committee had considered a report on 'The Provision of Resources to assist the Council on matters relating to the A27 Arundel Improvements' [Minute 193] which contained a recommendation to approve a supplementary revenue estimate of up to £50,000 which would have had a financial implication for the Council, but that in light of the decision made at Minute 194 this meant that some of the budget provision in 2022/23 for the Local Plan was available to fund other matters and that funding the proposed work by virement from another budget was preferable as the net spending of the Council would not be increased although it would mean the funding for the Local Plan would need to be revisited in the future.

After clarification was given on the nature of the professional resource to be employed, the recommendation was proposed by Councillor Chapman and seconded by Councillor Yeates.

The Committee

RESOLVED

To note that a virement from the Local Plan budget of up to £50,000 in 2022/23 to employ, on a 'call-off' basis, a consultant to support Arun's involvement with the National Highways A27 Arundel Bypass scheme had been actioned and that this superseded Minute 193 of the meeting on 27 July 2022.

277. OUTSIDE BODIES

Councillor Thurston provided a verbal update to her report on the South Downs National Park Authority [on Page 1 of the supplement pack] by noting that the Arun Valley project was still on the reserve list for DEFRA funding. The Committee then noted the report.

278. WORK PROGRAMME

One Member raised the need for a seminar on sustainability issues. The Group Head of Planning confirmed that he was in communication with facilitators to provide training to Members after the May 2023 Local Elections and that this would be included as part of that training. The Committee then noted the Work Programme.

(The meeting concluded at 6.35 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT TO:	Planning Policy Committee - 24 November 2022
SUBJECT:	Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Study
LEAD OFFICER:	Charlotte Hardy - Senior Environmental Assessment Officer
LEAD MEMBER:	Councillor Richard Bower
WARDS:	All
CORPORATE PRIORITY / POLICY CONTEXT / CORPORATE VISION: <p>The recommendations supports:-</p> <p>Supporting our environment to support us:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To consider climate change, sustainability, biodiversity and the environment in everything the council is responsible for and encourage its community and local businesses to do the same. • Protect and enhance our natural environment. • Regularly review progress toward Arun's Carbon Neutral Strategy (2022-30) as set out in the annual Climate Action and Biodiversity Work Plan. 	
DIRECTORATE POLICY CONTEXT: <p>The proposals will help to enhance the quality of the natural and built environment, protect the district's natural and heritage assets and to promote economic growth in a sustainable manner, striking a balance between the need for development and the protection of scarce resources. Some of the relevant corporate actions to help achieve this include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement the Carbon Neutral Strategy and Climate Change and Biodiversity Strategies for the council and for the wider district through Planning Policy • Engage and incentivise businesses to commit to working practices which minimise their impact on the environment; • Ensure that climate change and sustainability is at the heart of all council services • Support the Sussex Bay Project to restore marine, coastal and intertidal habitats to improve the biodiversity and carbon footprints of the district 	
FINANCIAL SUMMARY: <p>The cost for this study had already been agreed in the budget for 22/23 for £10k but dependent on future decisions further cost may be entailed if following the study consultation, nature recovery elements and investigation any 'local levy' is wished to be implemented. Further reports would of course come back to Members for agreement at the appropriate Policy and Finance Committee prior to this occurring.</p>	

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1. This report seeks the Committees endorsement of the Biodiversity Net Gain Study (BNG) as a high-level baseline study, forming part of the evidence base

to inform the Local Plan update (when it resumes). In particular, the BNG study informs the spatial application of the 10% net gain metric (when this is finalised in November 2023) through development management decisions. The BNG study will also help engagement with developers and nature recovery stakeholders, to deliver habitat creation/improvement projects in the right places, inform the preparation of an Arun Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) and cross boundary nature recovery planning work e.g. emergent West Sussex County Nature Recovery Network.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

Planning Policy Committee resolve that:-

- 1.2. The key recommendations and actions of the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) study inform the Local Plan Update (when resumed) and that its contents and associated mapping are used as the basis for working jointly with neighbours and stakeholders coordinating and delivering a nature recovery network including through shaping preparation of the Council's Biodiversity Action Plan.
- 1.3. The existing nine Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOA) are strategic high value Core Areas for nature recovery and expansion, including the proposed use of semi strategic medium value wildlife corridors and 'steppingstones' of biodiversity to link habitats and species and for nature recovery.
- 1.4. The proposed model policy approach to Biodiversity Net Gain (compared to Policy ENV DM5 of the Arun Local Plan) to accommodate the 10% Biodiversity Net Gain metric when secondary legislation is implemented, under the Environment Act 2021 (Box 3.3, pages 56 - 57 of the BNG Study).
- 1.5. That the BNG Study be finalised for uploading on the Local Plan evidence webpage.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1. This report advises the Committee on the outputs of the Biodiversity Net Gain Study (Background Paper 6) which provides high level, baseline evidence study confirming the distribution of protected, notable and priority species and habitats in Core BOA areas and proposed corridors and steppingstones. This will help to inform; the spatial priorities and policies of Local Plan update (when it resumes), preparation of a new Arun Biodiversity Action Plan; and the methodology for securing Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) through development management decisions and planning obligations (when the 10% metric secondary legislation is put in place in November 2023).

3. DETAIL

Background

- 3.1. All Council members were invited to an evening presentation on the BNG Study by the consultant (Clearlead Consulting Ltd) on Monday 16 May 2022 which was hosted by the Chairman of Planning Policy Committee and also afforded an opportunity for questions and answers. The overall context for

commissioning of the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) study is summarised in relation to: -

- The Council's declared 'Climate Change Emergency' (Background paper 4 and net zero carbon aspiration (15 January 2020) including the decision to update the adopted Arun Local Plan 2018 biodiversity and energy policies (currently paused);
- Council Motion 199 (16 September 2020) seeking update of Local Plan biodiversity policies informed by the preparation of a new 'Biodiversity Action Plan' (Background paper 5);
- 'National Planning Policy Framework' 2021: *'plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains in biodiversity'* (para 179b);

3.2. The 'Environment Act' December 2021; sets out a duty on local authorities to publish biodiversity reports and to secure mandatory biodiversity net gain via applications from autumn 2023.

3.3. Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and habitats to mitigate the loss arising from built development or adverse impacts of climate change (e.g., extreme weather events including rainfall, flooding or drought and heating) can also play a role in carbon reduction through carbon capture. This is recognised in the Arun 'Carbon Neutral Strategy' 2022-2030 which seeks the: -

'review planning policy to ensure that the Council is supporting and encouraging rewilding, nature-based solutions, and implementation of biodiversity improvements within the district'.

3.4. The Arun Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Study was therefore commissioned, to establish a robust evidence base for the Local Plan update and also provide evidence for work to progress a 'Biodiversity Action Plan' setting out the appropriate actions to be done for the encouragement of nature and biodiversity with all stakeholders.

3.5. The adopted Arun Local Plan policy ENV DM5 already requires developments to seek to achieve a biodiversity net gain and to protect existing habitats on site, well before the Environment Bill was published and its eventual enactment.

3.6. Because the natural world and distribution of habitats and species does not conform to administrative boundaries, the scope of the BNG study necessarily looks at the wider hinterland around Arun District which includes parts of the South Downs National Park (SDNP) to ensure that wildlife corridors and cross boundary habitats are identified and considered by any updated policies and implementation within the Arun Local Planning Authority area (which excludes the SDNP). This will help to ensure that any cross-boundary matters can then be coordinated with adjacent plan making authorities, including Chichester, Worthing and West Sussex County Council.

- 3.7. The 'Environment Act' sets out use of the 'DEFRA biodiversity metric¹' to be used for securing Biodiversity Net Gain (a 10-percentage quota) on site and application of a 'local levy' and national credit scheme applicable to anything delivered off-site through either s106 or conservation covenants, to be applied for a period of 30 years. The principle of Biodiversity Net Gain means that where proposed developments have a material impact on biodiversity, the development proposals should ensure that there is no net loss and must deliver a net gain on the baseline natural asset. Where this is not feasible on site – off site contributions will be necessary. Off-site contributions will need to be delivered through application of the 'local levy' and/or the through the buying of nationally registered biodiversity credits.

Methodology

- 3.8. The BNG study is comprised of four main parts with the following two report stages: -

a. Interim Report

Stage 1 – Species related collation and analysis

Stage 2 – Habitat related mapping and review

b. Final Report

Stage 3 – Delivery and Implementation

Stage 4 – Recommendations

- 3.9. For the first 2 stages, collation, mapping and review of the stock of habitat and species records and data sets held by the statutory and specialist environmental bodies and wildlife partnerships operating across Arun District, including the Sussex Biodiversity Records Centre (SxBRC) and Natural England. Particular attention is also given to the existing defined Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOA), which have been recognised to have characteristics suitable for habitat creation and restoration, identified on the Policies Map of the adopted Arun Local Plan 2018. Particular attention is also given to the existing defined Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOA), which have been recognised to have characteristics suitable for habitat creation and restoration, identified on the Policies Map of the adopted Arun Local Plan 2018.
- 3.10. While the robustness of the data was generally excellent – in some instances the data and mapping work required some rationalisation and interpolation of time series records including point and tile plotting. This is because of the large volume, low resolution and age of some species and habitat data sets - or because of gaps and limitations in the data. This meant that the information overall had to be limited with regard either the time period covered for a particular species, or in some instances, limitation as to which species were included. As such the final list of species covered include:
- All rare species of bats such as those listed on Annexe II of the Habitats Directive;

¹ Biodiversity version 3.0 was published in July 2021, although it is intended that it will be continuously updated with the first, along with supporting documents, published on 21.4.22, which can be seen at [The Biodiversity Metric 3.1 - JP039 \(nepubprod.appspot.com\)](https://necpubprod.appspot.com). The metric uses habitats to give a biodiversity value but does not require or use species information.

- All breeding birds listed in Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, along with key Priority Species which occur in the district (grey partridge, corn bunting, nightjars, tree sparrows);
- All rare wintering bird species such as Annex 1 Birds which are the qualifying feature of the Pagham Harbour SPA; and
- All remaining Priority Species.

3.11. The key designated (nationally down to locally protected) habitats that have been mapped are:

- Special Protected Areas (SPAs)
- Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)
- Marine Conservation Zones (MCZs)
- Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)
- Local Nature Reserves (LNRs)
- Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCIs)²
- Marine SNCIs
- Pagham Harbour Buffers A and B
- Local Geological Sites (LGSs)
- Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), formerly known as SNCI³
- Priority Habitats
- Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs)
- Designated Road Verges

3.12. The above relate and also contain some relevant terrestrial, freshwater and marine 'Priority Habitats'.

3.13. The key outputs of the study were: -

- Identifying those areas where there are known high presence of Protected and Notable species (Species of Principal Importance for Conservation in England listed on Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006) and Sussex Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Priority Species.
- Analysing whether the existing Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) remain the most suitable defined areas of the landscape for the creation of new habitats.
- Identifying supporting delivery opportunities justified with evidence, for securing the objectives of the existing Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, including any necessary boundary expansion or adjustment to help implementation of any biodiversity credit scheme.
- Identifying recommended actions and/or approaches supported by evidence which would be suitable for refining Local Plan policies for the protection and enhancement of those biodiversity assets and specifically for assessing and securing the net gains in biodiversity through planning applications and conditions.

² See LWS below

³ Name changed when SxBRC took over managing scheme on behalf of WSCC in 2018

- Ensuring that the above include the marine environment in terms of its existing value and whether incorporation of any specific projects would be suitable, particularly regarding delivering other Council aims, such as net zero carbon.
- The role of soils in biodiversity and sustainable farming practices.

Interim Report

- 3.14. The Interim Report sets out the methodology, analysis, and interim findings from the first two stages of the BNG study and helps set the 'direction of travel' for how the Council can deliver BNG through the planning system.
- 3.15. After reviewing the data and mapping against the areas within the district where clusters of notable habitats and species are located, these locations have then been compared with the location of the Sussex BOAs identified on the Local Plan Policies Map:-
- Chichester Coastal Plain;
 - Western Escarpment;
 - Climping to Houghton;
 - Arundel Park;
 - Houghton to Coldwaltham;
 - Clapham to Burpham Downs;
 - Central Downs – Arun to Adur;
 - North-east Worthing Downs; and
 - Lidsey Rife.
- 3.16. Following this work, one of the first recommendations is therefore to expand a number of the BOA boundaries (this would be done through the plan making process). It should be noted that the BNG study has looked at the species and habitat distribution unconstrained by artificial administrative boundaries. Some proposals consequently, fall across the boundary (e.g. proposed Bat corridor) or wholly within South Downs National Park or other authority areas, and so are outside the planning remit of Arun Local Planning Authority. The BNG study therefore, provides valuable evidence for potential collaborative cross boundary working. It will also inform the national Local Nature Recover Strategy via the emerging West Sussex Local Nature Recovery Network (West Sussex County Council, Sussex Local Nature Partnership and Biodiversity Record Centre) Cross boundary working is addressed in section 7.3 of the BNG Study.
- 3.17. In addition, it was also noted that the two most abundant habitats in the District are Deciduous Woodland (primarily in the north of the district within the SDNP) and Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh in the south.
- 3.18. Finally, this report and analysis identified that several Priority Habitats that are considered to be 'at risk' due to declines in the extent, condition and/or distribution of these habitats, by The Sussex Local Nature Partnership (SxLNP):-
- Coastal Vegetated Shingle;

- Lowland Fen;
- Reedbed;
- Lowland Heathland;
- Intertidal Mudflats;
- Lowland Meadows; and
- Lowland Calcareous Grassland (primarily in the north and SDNP).

3.19. The data confirms that the majority of the ‘at risk’ habitats, protected species and designated sites above, fall within the BOAs with the exception of the following:-

- Small areas of calcareous grassland in the northeast of the district within the SDNP;
- Lowland meadow associated with the Fontwell Park Racecourse SNCI in the west of the district (outside of the SDNP), and
- Coastal vegetated shingle in the far south of the district.
- Ancient woodland habitat of particularly high value in the northwest of the district (frequently in the SDNP) is not covered by a BOA.
- The Felpham SSSI which is designated for its geological interest and part of the Bognor Regis SSSI;
- Pagham Harbour SPA/Ramsar buffers (supporting sites for the wintering birds) mostly fall outside the BOAs;
- The majority of the bat records are outside the BOAs (particularly the woodlands around Slindon in the SDNP that support colonies of Bechstein’s bats but these are within the buffer associated with the Singleton and Cocking Tunnels SAC including Fontwell and Norton);
- Of the five Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), formerly known as SNCIs, in the District, only the Littlehampton Golf Course and Atherington Beach LWS occurs within a BOA. All the remaining LWSs occur outside of the BOAs.
- Marine habitat is limited within the BOAs with only the Chichester Coastal Plain BOA, however, the marine environment along the district’s coastline contains diverse habitats including large areas of Kelp Forest, which are the subject of the Kelp Restoration Project.

Final Report

3.20. The Final Report makes recommendations including for policy development and implementation as part of the Arun Local Plan update. For policy development and implementation, the study discusses the use of the BOAs as a key focus for nature recovery through BNG which can be taken on board in updating the Local Plan policies and the Policies Map through amending/extending some BOA boundaries and linking corridors and ‘steppingstones’ of biodiversity as well accommodating further opportunity areas.

3.21. Therefore, the first recommendation is for the nine BOAs (identified at para 4.15 above) to be extended to correlate and include the clustering of additional notable habitats and species. The majority of these are focused in the more northern part of Arun Local Planning Authority area, including where they would

cross the boundary into the SDNP, as such requiring conversations and coordination with the SDNP over where and how this may practicably be delivered.

- 3.22. As well as identifying potential extensions to the existing BOAs, the report recommends a further spatial approach of setting:-
- a) 'Core Areas' with High Value should cover the existing Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs); Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs); Local Wildlife Sites (LWS - formerly SNCIs); Ancient Woodland; Local Nature Reserves (LNR); Marine Conservation Zones (MCZs); Pagham Harbour buffer A; the potential Bechstein's Bat Corridor; plus Priority Habitats identified to be 'at risk' through the Sussex Local Nature Partnership; and
 - b) 'Opportunity Areas' with Medium Value are suggested to cover Priority Habitats not at risk; Pagham Harbour B; the wider Singleton to Cocking Tunnels buffer; potential wildlife corridors and B-lines.
- 3.23. A similar approach has been successfully piloted in the Cornwall Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS). The resultant map this would create, if taken forward in Arun, is shown in Background Paper 1 and Background Paper 3.
- 3.24. Further, the BNG Interim Report identified that there are limited marine habitat conservation areas along the district's coastline, which contains a number of diverse habitats. It is recommended that further investigations are undertaken to identify, at a more localised level, potential marine biodiversity improvement areas and activities; e.g. to identify whether there are any other habitats or species which could be enhanced within the Arun coastal / marine area including large areas of Kelp Forest (the subject of the Kelp Restoration Project) including for some other habitats (e.g. seagrass beds). Therefore, a key recommendation of the study is for marine BOAs to be created (e.g. through working collaboratively with the Sussex Local Nature Partnership to establish boundary changes which can be used for the Local Plan Update), to ensure that these would be able to be protected and enhanced in the same fashion as the terrestrial ones that already exist. Marine BOAs may also provide a significant role in helping to contribute towards carbon capture and the Council's overall ambition to be carbon neutral by 2030.
- 3.25. Importantly, the Final BNG Report recommends that a new clear Bechstein's Bat Corridor be identified and potentially designated, around the routes where bats from Singleton and Cocking Tunnels potentially forage, to fall across from the far north west corner of the Arun District, from the Tunnels down to and entering the Local Planning area of Arun at Fontwell, to go westward to the edge of Rewell Wood southwards along Binsted Valley and eastward across to the edge of Tortington Common. This suggested route is shown on Background Papers 2 and 3.
- 3.26. The BNG Study concludes with recommending proposed wildlife corridors to join up the biodiversity network more fully. These could be full corridors or strategically important 'steppingstones' through habitat patches, facilitating

movement. Possible places, initially identified for these, are shown on Background Paper 3. The overall principle would be connecting these with other existing or emerging nature sites (e.g. Bersted Brook) within the Local Plan Strategic Allocations via ‘placemaking’ e.g. Green Infrastructure mitigation including Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDs). The western corridor shown on Background Paper 3 would go down the Lidsey Rife, almost central to Barnham/Eastergate/Westergate and connect to the existing Lidsey BOA before progressing eastward and potentially connecting to Climping - Houghton BOA. Engagement with landowners over where exactly these fall, will be crucial before adoption, or integration into any Local Plan review or other future documents. For example, some species clusters suggest that there may also be potential habitats worth investigating within some of the existing urban areas which warrant enhancement, although the exact routes of these are yet to be determined.

Other Actions

- 3.27. The BNG study should shape working with Sussex Nature Partnership and other partners and internal departments to ensure delivery of the identified strategic BNG opportunities, including where they connect to those areas outside Arun’s planning remit. This will evidence a spatial strategy for the implementation of an Arun ‘local levy’ in line with the Act, to be focused on improving, managing and increasing access to nature.
- 3.28. To further develop the spatial framework above, for any BOA extensions it is recommended to:-
 - Consider an appropriate date by when the objectives should be met – e.g. Local Plan update period or to reflect any set out in national legislation, such as secondary legislation resulting from the Environment Act or any similar documents or guidance issued.
 - Establish the exact extent and condition of each Priority habitat within the area;
 - Establish a short-list of Priority Species within Arun that can be monitored within the BOAs. Species across a range of groups should be used, some indicative of Priority Habitats that occur within the BOAs (e.g., Ramshorn Snail, Brent Geese)
 - The Council specifically identify any existing land in the district managed through the Higher-Level Stewardship Schemes; and
 - Work with Kelp Restoration Project and Sussex Nature Partnership to help investigate the best areas for and establishment of marine BOA approach;
 - There are a number of emergent nature recovery initiatives that will be assisted by the BNG study, providing direction for future work and engagement. For example, “Weald to Wave” - creating a corridor for nature extending from Ashdown Forest to the Climping Gap. This is a collective Authority, Wildlife Trust and Parish initiative which will contribute towards a national Nature Recovery Network (NRN) - a key commitment in the Government’s 25 Year Environment Plan. The NRN will be made up of multiple Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRS). The BNG study therefore supports this approach through

confirming that the meandering spine of the River Arun corridor (and its ecological hinterland), sits within the high value and medium value BOA boundaries in Arun which connect the coast with the South Downs National Park.

3.29. For discussion with neighbouring authorities:

- Share the report particularly identifying the development of draft biodiversity policies to ensure consistency;
- Ensure that partners agree with extent of boundary changes;
- Finalise consistent actions and as far as possible responsibilities.

3.30. And other actions would be:

- Identify if there are any other habitats or species which could be enhanced within the Arun coastal/marine area
- Continue supporting the Sussex Kelp Restoration trawling bylaw;
- Continue engagement opportunities with Sussex Local Nature Partnership to enable this and further work to tie in with the Local Nature Recovery Network;
- Keep up to date with the small sites biodiversity metric;
- Take account of the preferred route for the Arundel bypass (known as the 'Grey Route'), and impact on habitat and species and potential mitigation proposals once available;
- Monitor the forthcoming work currently being undertaken by Natural England and DEFRA into cost of habitat units.

4. CONSULTATION

4.1. A high-level consultation was carried out (1st - 20th June 2022) with neighbours and the main wildlife organisations locally due to the number of cross boundary actions proposed and the general point that nature and species do not tend to respect administrative boundaries in their movements (as evidenced by the BNG Study). This also ensured that the BNG study does not unintentionally cause conflict with or undermine other policy or actions on nature recovery.

4.2. The following bullet points summarise and/or paraphrase, those comments received back from consultees.

West Sussex County Council

- Overall, very good covering all the bases and the recommendations are sound;
- Looking to meet with Arun DC and study consultants to discuss the report and methodology used;
- Assessment of data gaps will be useful collectively, including the critical need to need to deal with data resolution issues going forward e.g. scope for strategic species surveys to be administered through S106/CIL;
- Wish to understand implications/significance of gaps e.g. missing taxa such as moths, and if it is possible to go further with the data used to

increase strategic linkage through the district and the value of heat maps;

- This is a good learning piece – Arun’s work will now become the local benchmark for others to follow and this includes the development of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy.

South Downs National Park Authority

- Broadly welcomes and supportive of the approach and would be glad for the opportunity to work together to explore the ideas and recommendations further;
- Reference to the 12km Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC buffer zone is welcomed and supported; as is the recognition of Slindon as an important location for bats; It is also recommended that the bat corridor be referenced as ‘potential’ rather than ‘proposed’, as this would not be until tested within the Local Plan process;
- It is noted that there are comments in the BOA tables around monitoring, it would be useful to discuss these further for BOAs within SDNP;
- Table 7.1 – reference to SDNPA in third row is welcomed.

Chichester District Council (CDC)

- Welcomes the opportunity for cross-boundary working and to discuss the development of a marine BOA with Sussex Kelp Resoration Project and Pagham Harbour/Chichester Harbour as a strategic high value BOA for nature recovery – also links with the proposed Pagham to Westhampnett Strategic Wildlife Corridor which runs against the district boundary until Runcton;
- Model BNG policies appear consistent with CDC’s policy approach but urges that emphasis should be on site treatment and national BNG credits scheme used as a last resort and then for local networks which should support cross boundary work;
- Questioned whether further Arun Ecological Phase II survey includes missing bat related evidence (i.e., Barbastelle) that might be investigated and its importance for future corridor and stepping stone work.

Worthing District Council

- Thanked for sharing the Arun Bio-diversity Net Gain Study and links to other relevant documents - it is clear that Arun is building a robust evidence base to inform BNG considerations and your LP review;
- Strongly support the identification of land east of Ferring as an Biodiversity Opportunity Area (Strategic High value), the area (including land within Worthing) has recently been designated as a Local Wildlife Site.
- Requested that we keep liaising/updating intentions on potential biodiversity interventions/enhancements of this area as it will be important that each authority is aligned.
- Noted that east of Ferring, Arun’s Green Infrastructure study identifies land at Green Park as a ‘GI Corridor’. There are clear biodiversity / landscape links between this land and Chatsmore Farm to the east

currently depend on the Judicial Review of a planning appeal decision to allow development on the site for 475 dwellings.

Horsham District Council

- Thanked for sharing the Arun Bio-diversity Net Gain Study which is helpful and informative and future opportunities for future engagement;
- Arun is separated from Horsham's planning area by the South Downs National Park, and therefore, the SDNPA is the primary authority to ensure there are appropriate nature recovery links between the districts Arun and Horsham;
- The Wilder Horsham District partnership, comprising Horsham District Council and Sussex Wildlife Trust, has produced a draft Horsham District Nature Recovery Network (Version 1, July 2021). This is referenced in section 7.2 of Arun's BNG Evidence Study – there is a potential need for consistency between the Horsham District NRN plan and the BNG Study before publication;
- It would also be useful to have access to the GIS layers so that this can be explored further as work around nature recovery and Local Nature Recovery Strategies move forward.

Sussex Wildlife Trust/Nature Partnership (SxNP)

- Welcome Arun's Biodiversity Net Gain initiative/ambition; continued engagement and coordination is important with SxNP and WSCC to ensure complementarity and consistency and transparency for especially users - for identification/designation of new corridors;
- Welcome corridors and stepping stones to address connectivity and climate resilience between existing BOA'S, designates sites and priority habitats - including Urban and wider GI to be incorporated into this approach;
- Absence of species records from an area may signal need for more surveys as they may exist but not be recorded;
- Consider whether the model BNG policy can be more ambitious (i.e. the metric %) if the evidence supports e.g. 20% proposed by Worthing through its examination in public awaiting Inspector's Report;
- Overlaying the proposed housing allocations would demonstrate the spatial opportunities or conflicts with BNG and where other land uses are likely to be delivered;
- Considering scope to forecast the potential scale of future BNG requirements via planned/emerging development?

RSPB

- It is fantastic to see your ambition in terms of future delivery of BNG as well as your joined up approach working with partners;
- The RSPB welcomes the inclusion of Lawton's principles of bigger better and more joined up and further encourage work with partners including the Sussex Nature Partnership to ensure consistency and the best use of knowledge when looking to identify new wildlife corridors;
- Welcome the wide range of taxa within the report which has been cross-referenced this with RSPB's important species Pagham Reserve, which

also includes European eel, small flowered buttercup, green winged orchids, water vole and hairy dragonfly;

- The metric advice to Defra from members of the Natural Capital Committee suggests BNG 10% or above is necessary to give reasonable confidence in halting biodiversity losses as an absolute minimum;
- The planning authority for Lichfield District requires a net gain of 20% on new development, which developers are able to meet and often achieve much greater levels of biodiversity net gain.'
- RSPB would therefore encourage that ADC are ambitious when setting their net gain targets to achieve a level of 20%.

4.3. A separate consultation, from 29th June – 15th July, was also carried out with Natural England to gain their views on the study considering BNG and its related evidence is still developing and in its infancy with respect plan-making nationally. Their comments are included below.

Natural England

- Natural England are thrilled that the LPA are being so proactive in their approach to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). BNG is becoming a more prominent part of NE's overall advice.
- The report mentions Metric 3.0 in terms of BOAs. Mentions that new version 3.1 issued in April 2022, but recognise this was difference between the timing of the work and Metric's publication, so won't scrutinize but simply highlight.
- Green Infrastructure (GI) is important part of planning and large amount of NE time dedicated to encouraging greater implementation of GI friendly outcomes. Advise the use of GI standards framework for developing BNG/GI strategies the link is as follows:
- <https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/GreenInfrastructure/Home.aspx>. This tool will greatly assist in mapping and identifying priority areas for greenspaces.
- BNG has a minimum measurable percentage target of 10%. Many LPA's in Kent are beginning to consider 20% as their target, exceeding this is of course welcome. This report seems to have some very promising implications and we are looking forward to seeing what this will develop in to. BNG can be holistically approached to integrate with other key issues such as GI.
- Inclusion of designated sites is vital, and this report specifically highlights these sites. Any BNG projects that may affect designated sites will need further input from Natural England as the features that are highlighted may not be compatible. Net gain on designated sites is calculated. I cannot comment specifically on designated sites included in this report such as Pagham Harbour. I Can say we would encourage investigation and welcome formal consultation with Natural England. We are interested in strategic approaches to Nature recovery and would welcome further discussion on this subject.

4.4. In summary, the study is considered by all to be strongly endorsed and to form a firm robust part of the baseline evidence to be used going forward. Some

technical issues have been raised but follow up meetings with both consultants and those with an interest have been carried out and addressed.

5. Next Steps

- 5.1. Firstly, the BNG Study provides a robust evidence base that will help to inform the Local Plan update (when this resumes) and shape appropriate Biodiversity Net Gain policies. This will identify the spatial framework (to be identified in any updated Policies Map), to guide policy implementation secured through on-site development management obligations and where not feasible, as a last resort, via an off-site 'Arun local levy'. Local levies are in their infancy as these were only recently introduced through the Environment Act and it is intended that further detail will come through secondary legislation. It is expected that a system of national BNG credits will operate in a similar fashion to the existing S106, CIL systems or another new vehicle of conservation covenants. It is important to note that the 10% metric in the BNG study will be a minimum. Based on the high-level consultation response received, which points to examples of higher metrics being applied successfully elsewhere, there may be scope to consider whether it may be appropriate for Arun to apply a higher % metric. However, this will be subject to obtaining necessary feasibility and viability evidence as part of the Local Plan update or other parallel work, similar to those other authorities
- 5.2. Secondly, the BNG Study provides an objective evidence framework that can support the part of the Council Motion 199 (Background Paper 5) relating to preparing a Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP). The BAP can coordinate implementation of the BNG Study spatial priorities, on the ground through various nature recovery projects aimed at rewilding. This would include those projects promoted through other rewilding initiatives at strategic and national level (e.g. 'Weald to Wave' see 4.28 bullet 6 above) through focussing on the strategic high value BOAs and proposed intermediate value corridors and 'steppingstones' identified in the BNG study. The preparatory work on the Council's BAP could form the basis for a 'call for sites' for nature recovery and BNG delivery (which would also inform the Local Plan update when it resumes).
- 5.3. The BNG study is high level and recognises that supporting habitat and species records in some locations, is not always available or of high quality although, biodiversity may nevertheless, exist or be strategically placed to enable nature recovery networks. One of the outputs or actions of the study is therefore for Arun to work with the specialist and other local authority stakeholders to identify the gaps and resolve differences, if necessary, by commissioning nature studies, requiring budget provision where appropriate. The BNG study can help with this by comparing the mosaic of evidenced BOAs and proposed connecting corridors in the study with other emerging nature recovery initiatives arising from development mitigation e.g. to promote strategic connectivity through 'place making' and Green Infrastructure provision within and around Strategic Allocations of the adopted Arun Local Plan (see 6.2 above). For example, the potential corridor to link Pagham Harbour BOA to Bersted Brooks and Lidsey Rife BOA.

- 5.4. Finally, whilst the BNG Study is based on largely objective data, some data is necessarily interpolated to identify opportunities for connectivity corridors and 'steppingstones' looking at land holdings, estate and Green Infrastructure. It is important for the study to be clear that it is not policy but aims to provide evidence to aid policy making in Arun and to complement work of other authorities and agencies including the implementation of new development. Before any proposals in the BNG Study become policy, this will need to go through the normal plan making process to ensure that there are no conflicts (e.g. with existing or proposed development). Therefore, the amended BNG Study (addressing the high-level cross boundary clarifications summarised in this report), should be posted onto the Council's web site as part of the Local Plan update evidence base.

6. OPTIONS / ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

- 6.1. The Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) will become a mandatory requirement to be applied to all planning applications received from November 2023, through the Environment Act 2021. The Council therefore needs information in preparation for how this is to be applied in Arun. Additionally the first stages of this study begins work that was agreed, through a Motion, by Full Council back on 15 January 2020.
- 6.2. As such the alternative to having this study done would have been that internal resources would have had to be found to do this work. This would have impacted on resourcing both within planning and within greenspaces team well beyond that which has been applied anyway through inputting and directing this work.
- 6.3. Finally, if this work had not been committed to then the council would not have a direction of travel to be applied through the Local Plan (when resumed) in terms of nature recovery or more importantly how to apply BNG to planning application negotiation and agreements for delivery.

7. COMMENTS BY THE GROUP HEAD OF CORPORATE SUPPORT/SECTION 151 OFFICER

- 7.1. As stated in the Financial Summary, a sum of £10k is included in the 2022/23 budget for the work. Officers expect the cost will be contained within this sum. Should any further funding be required, Member approval, as required will be sought.

8. RISK ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS

- 8.1. Implementing the recommendation will minimise the risk around further loss of habitats or species and issues around not delivery against nature enhancement responsibilities or any recovery actions that may wish to be implemented.

9. COMMENTS OF THE GROUP HEAD OF LAW AND GOVERNANCE & MONITORING OFFICER

- 9.1. Schedule 17 of the Environment Act 2021 brought in the requirement for 10% net gain to be applied to planning applications. This will become mandatory in November 2023 following the transitional period from its enactment. The study provides the baseline information on which negotiations can be based along with use of the biodiversity metric for any on-site delivery. At present there is no direct proposal for any local level off-site aspect but it is requested for agreement as to whether to begin work on whether this should be implemented or not.

10. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

- 10.1. There would be no human resource impacts.

11. HEALTH & SAFETY IMPACT

- 11.1. No Health and Safety impacts have been identified in relation to the recommendations of this report.

12. PROPERTY & ESTATES IMPACT

- 12.1. There are no direct implications for property or estate at this stage but this may arise in future with proposed implementation projects. However, if this arises then reports to this committee will be made.

13. EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA) / SOCIAL VALUE

- 13.1. No adverse impacts on equality would result from this study and improvements both to the physical environment and personal wellbeing through ease of access to nature is expected.

14. CLIMATE CHANGE & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT/SOCIAL VALUE

- 14.1. This study and associated mapping will have a positive effect through having mapped the existing baseline situation with respect to habitats and species across the District. At this stage it is not possible to be able to accurately predict the exact spatial distribution of enhancement or improvements to result directly, but it is hoped that this will be spread throughout the District and into the marine environment. A such both addressing the climate and biodiversity crises, plus any supplementary improvements to carbon reduction, most likely through capturing and retaining carbon.

15. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

- 15.1. There will be no direct impact to crime and disorder reduction from these proposals, although there may be indirect impacts through increasing and preserving access to nature by residents.

16. HUMAN RIGHTS IMPACT

- 16.1. No human rights would be impacted by this proposal.

17. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION / DATA PROTECTION CONSIDERATIONS

- 17.1. No personal information is contained within the report and all that used in its production have been a collation of existing information that is publicly available data, although some need to be accessed direct from organisations.

CONTACT OFFICER:

Name:	Charlotte Hardy
Job Title:	Senior Environmental Assessment Officer
Contact Number:	01903 737794

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

1. Arun Biodiversity Net Gain Study Figure 6.1 Strategic Areas of High Value (i.e. Core Areas focussed on the Bio Diversity Opportunity Areas):-

<https://www.arun.gov.uk/download.cfm?doc=docm93jjjm4n19222.pdf&ver=21065>

2. Potential Barbastelle and Bechstein's Bat Corridor Figure 5.1:-

<https://www.arun.gov.uk/download.cfm?doc=docm93jjjm4n19221.pdf&ver=21064>

3. Existing BOAS and Potential Wildlife Corridors Figure 6.2 :-

<https://www.arun.gov.uk/download.cfm?doc=docm93jjjm4n19223.pdf&ver=21066>

4. Full Council 15 January 2020 (minute 341) resolving Environment & Scrutiny minutes to declare Climate Emergency and aspiration to achieve Carbon Neutrality by 2030:-

<https://democracy.arun.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=141&MId=771>

5. Council Motion 199 (16 September 2020) in relation to updating biodiversity policies in the Local Plan, informed by the preparation of a Biodiversity Action Plan:-

<https://democracy.arun.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=141&MId=981>

6. Arun Biodiversity Net Gain Evidence Study final Report November 2022:-

<https://www.arun.gov.uk/download.cfm?doc=docm93jjjm4n19224.pdf&ver=21067>

This page is intentionally left blank

Arun District Council

REPORT TO:	Planning Policy Committee - 24 November 2022
SUBJECT:	Arun Transport Apportionment Methodology Update
LEAD OFFICER:	Neil Crowther - Group Head of Planning
LEAD MEMBER:	Councillor Richard Bower
WARDS:	All
CORPORATE PRIORITY / POLICY CONTEXT / CORPORATE VISION: The recommendations supports: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the Wellbeing of Arun e.g. ensuring safe accessible and sustainable transport network serves communities. • Delivering the right homes in the right places e.g. ensuring placemaking is supported by a sustainable transport network. • Supporting our Environment to help us e.g. make low carbon transport including walking and cycling and travel by public transport etc. 	
DIRECTORATE POLICY CONTEXT: The proposals will help to support delivery of sustainable transport infrastructure e.g. more opportunities for cycling and walking and easily accessible green space.	
FINANCIAL SUMMARY: There are no financial implications arising from the Arun Transport Apportionment Study.	

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1. The report seeks to update the Arun Transport Apportionment Methodology prepared jointly with West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and obtain the Committee's agreement that it be endorsed and be uploaded to the Councils evidence base website. This will help to ensure that the development of Arun provided for in the Adopted Arun Local Plan 2018 is sustainable and supported by necessary transport contributions that mitigate the impact of development.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Planning Policy Committee resolve that:-
- 2.1. The Arun Transport Apportionment Study Report (ATS) is updated taking into account the revised cost of transport mitigation schemes, deducting secured s.106 contributions and apportioning the residual costs according to the ATS methodology;
- 2.2. The updated ATS 2022 is published on the Council's web site.

3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 3.1. This report updates the Committee on the updated Arun Transport Apportionment Study Report which includes West Sussex County Council's revised cost estimates for various highway mitigation schemes and a necessary re-apportionment of developer s.106 contributions to be secured from the Strategic Site Allocations. The updated report also takes account of contributions already secured from sites that have come forward.

4. DETAIL

- 4.1. The Arun Transport Apportionment Study Report (ASR) agreed with West Sussex County Council (WSCC) was first reported to the Committee in June 2020 (Background Paper 1). The ASR provides an initial basis for apportioning the cost of highway infrastructure to strategic sites on a proportionate basis, based on their forecast highway impacts. This report updates the ASR in supporting the delivery of the Arun Local Plan 2018 Strategic Allocations and specifically the major highway schemes and junction mitigation measures set out in the Arun Transport Study. These measures are needed in addition to sustainable transport infrastructure and services to ensure the impacts of development are acceptable in planning terms.
- 4.2. The ASR needs to reflect the progress that has been made and accommodate updated scheme cost estimates. The report invites the Committee to consider and agree the updated apportionment of costs in the ASR and for the updated ASR to be posted on the Council's website as the basis for negotiating future s.106 contributions.
- 4.3. The ASR recognises the need to deliver safety improvements to Comet Corner and Oystercatcher Junctions along the A259 between Bognor Regis and Littlehampton to mitigate the impacts of strategic developments. However, the ASR also highlighted the fact that WSCC was also undertaking work to investigate more strategic options for improving the full stretch of the A259 between Bognor Regis and Littlehampton.
- 4.4. The A259 between Bognor Regis and Littlehampton was recognised, through the Local Plan Examination, as a stretch of road that would require enhancement, because of background traffic growth in the district alongside planned strategic development.
- 4.5. Subsequently, this part of the A259 was defined, by the Department for Transport (DfT) as part of the Major Road Network (MRN) because it is a strategically important local road, and its improvement was identified as a top-ten priority scheme by Transport for the South East. In 2020 WSCC included the A259 Bognor Regis to Littlehampton Corridor Enhancement scheme within its capital programme on the basis that the capital cost will be largely externally funded. WSCC have been working up the Business Case since July 2019 and in line with other Major Road Network improvements, there is expected to be a DfT minimum requirement for local contributions of 15% of the scheme cost. It is expected that this will come from developer contributions from the strategic

site allocations in the district, including Climping, Ford, West Bersted and West Bank.

4.6. The ASR is there to ensure that contributions are collected commensurate with the impacts of development as sites come forward. The cost estimates in the ASR are based on the proximity and level of traffic impact. The ASR will need updating (as a 'live document') as planning permissions and s.106 contributions are secured, as well as to reflect latest scheme cost estimates and their apportionment.

4.7. Table 1 shows the change in cost estimates for schemes in the ASR: -

Table 1 Scheme Costs Update ASR 2022

Scheme	Lead Development	2019 Cost estimate (£m) (unless stated)	2022 Cost estimate (£m) (unless stated)	Change (£m)
A27-B2145 Whyke Roundabout	West of Bersted	2.961	3.700	0.739
A27-A259 Bognor Road Roundabout	West of Bersted	0.915	12.000	11.085
A27-B2233 Nyton Road Junction	BEW	0.300	0.400	0.100
A27-A29 Fontwell West Roundabout	BEW	0.595	2.300	1.705
A27-A29 Fontwell East Roundabout	BEW	0.595	1.100	0.505
A27-A284 Ford Road Roundabout	Ford	0.301	0.600	0.299
A27-The Causeway Junction	Angmering N	0.015	0.043	0.028
A27-A280 Northern Roundabout	Angmering N	0.040	0.600	0.560
A29-A259 Rowan Way Junction	West of Bersted	0.620	2.500	1.880
A29-A259 Felpham Relief Road Junction	West of Bersted	0.638	1.300	0.662
A259-Church Lane Junction	Climping	1.200	1.200	0.000
A259-B2187 Bridge Rd Roundabout	Littlehampton Westbank	0.334	1.100	0.766
Ford Road Level Crossing	Ford	9.150*	3.200*	-5.950
Barnham Village Centre Enhancement	BEW	0.500	0.700	0.200
A259-Oystercatcher Junction	Littlehampton Westbank	1.200	5.800	4.600
A259-Comet Corner Junction	West of Bersted	2.200	0.740	-1.460
A29 Realignment	BEW	30.000*	47.965*	17.965

A259 Widening Oystercatcher to Littlehampton (now A259 Bognor Regis to Littlehampton Corridor Enhancement)	Littlehampton Westbank	11.100*	4.400*	-6.700
A259 East Arun Widening (Lyminster Bypass to Body Shop and Station Road to A280)	Littlehampton Westbank	3.000*	3.000*	0.000
Total		65.664	90.943	26.984

* Indicates where the stated amount is the expected developer contribution, not the cost estimate

4.8. The key points to be noted include: -

- Overall increase in scheme cost estimates from £66m to £91m (rounded);
- This is largely driven by inflation in the construction industry which has increased the cost of materials since the 2019 estimates were produced;
- The cost of the A27 Bognor Rd and Whyke junctions in Chichester District will be shared with strategic sites in Chichester, taking account of secured contributions with the contribution from sites in Arun to be determined at the application stage;
- The 'A259 widening Oystercatcher to Littlehampton' scheme has been renamed as 'A259 Bognor Regis to Littlehampton Corridor Enhancement' for consistency with the WSCC project;
- The developer contribution to the A259 Bognor Regis to Littlehampton Corridor Enhancement scheme is £4.4m (i.e. the business case West Sussex County Council prepared to Department of Transport reported to members in December 2020); and
- The developer contribution to the A29 Realignment has increased to £48m in line with latest estimates.

4.9. The next step after assessing the changes to mitigation scheme costs, is to account for those developments that have secured planning permission and signed s.106 contributions towards a mitigation scheme - these are to be deducted.

4.10. Appendix A sets out the current secured s.106 development contributions towards mitigation schemes as at end of September 2022. Overall, based on the information in Appendix A, £12m (rounded) has been secured up to September 2022. In some cases, contributions have been secured that are shared between more than one scheme so to avoid double counting, assumptions have been made about how these contributions will be distributed between schemes. In practice this may mean that the actual contributions from strategic sites to schemes may vary from the amounts shown in Appendix A.

4.11. The ASR apportionment methodology (net of the secured s.106 contributions) will apportion the scheme mitigation costs that remain to be collected. The apportionment methodology is based on assumptions about the scale of development at the strategic site allocations, e.g. West of Bersted and BEW are assumed to be 2,500 and 3,000 dwellings respectively. Any uplift in housing yields in BEW with the endorsed Masterplan will need to be the subject of the

Transport Impact Assessment allied to a planning application to determine the mitigation scheme required and associated costs.

- 4.12. However, where mitigation schemes are yet to be implemented, or planning permissions (and s.106 contributions) lapse, any costs arising from additional inflation (note: all s.106 include inflation provision) or changes to design requirements, will be apportioned according to the ASR methodology to the remaining developments that have a material impact on the junction and in proportion with their impact. These additional residual costs will have to be apportioned equitably using the ASR methodology to the remaining developments in order to reduce uncertainty and to minimise any gap between contributions and scheme costs as far as possible.
- 4.13. The residual scheme contributions that will be necessary for collection will be calculated in accordance with the existing ASR methodology which takes into account the proportion of trip generation and proximity of the development impact on the mitigation scheme. If the proposed number of dwelling units varies from the assumptions made as part of the apportionment methodology (for example the BEW masterplan proposes 4,300 units instead of the assumed 3,000), then the cumulative impacts of the development will need to be assessed through the development management process (using evidence from transport assessments) before this can be taken into account in calculating the developer contribution.
- 4.14. Overall, based on the information in Table 1 and Appendix A, there is a sum of £84m (rounded) which remains to be secured to deliver the infrastructure package in full. If contributions from strategic developments do not achieve the levels expected in the ASR, this will represent a budget shortfall for the respective scheme that will need to be funded from other sources (e.g. Government funding programmes; the Local Enterprise Partnership; CIL etc.).

A259 Bognor Regis to Littlehampton scheme A259 ECEBR

- 4.15. Strategic Allocations impacting on the A259 corridor were shown in the ASR 2019 as only making contributions towards the specific Oyster Catcher and Comet Corner safety schemes and not the wider A259 Bognor Regis to Littlehampton Corridor Enhancement scheme. These safety schemes are needed if the A259 Bognor Regis to Littlehampton Corridor Enhancement does not proceed, but the contributions secured could also be utilised to support delivery of the overall A259 Bognor Regis to Littlehampton Corridor Enhancement scheme if this, in effect, replaces the safety schemes. The ASR 2022 therefore, apportions the cost of each of these schemes to the relevant strategic site allocations that are still to come forward. The timing and detailed arrangements for contributions, including the steps that should be taken if any of these schemes do not proceed or if planning permissions lapse, will be agreed through the development management process (using evidence from transport assessments) with reference to the ASR.
- 4.16. The legal agreement for the Fontwell Strategic Development includes a requirement for the developer to deliver an A27/A29 Fontwell (west) scheme and pay the remainder of the contribution towards A29 Realignment. Therefore,

the contribution to A29 Realignment depends on the cost of A27/A29 Fontwell (west) improvements. The latest cost estimate for the A27/A29 Fontwell (west) mitigation is £2.3m. Therefore, there is unlikely to be a contribution from the Fontwell Strategic Development to A29 Realignment. This is likely to mean that there will be a funding gap on A29 Realignment that will need to be funded from CIL and/or other sources.

- 4.17. The ASR 2019 report (Background Paper 2) which currently sits on the website alongside the ASR Excel tables, will need to be updated to the ASR 2022 (with draft supporting apportionment tables) and placed on the web site subject to Committee agreeing the costs and sum to be apportioned in this report.
- 4.18. The ASR is a live document and will be updated and reported to this committee as mitigation schemes are worked up in design and revised or amended taking into account prices, risk, optimism bias, construction costs and an allowance for inflation.

Next Steps

- 4.19. The amended scheme costs and apportionment figures be used to update and amend the Apportionment Study to be dated September 2022 and posted on the Council's web site and be used as a basis for infrastructure planning and development management negotiations.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1. Consultations have been undertaken with Transport officers of West Sussex County Council.

6. OPTIONS / ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

- 6.1. To agree the ASR update to reflect transport mitigation costs and apportionment; or not to agree the report.

7. COMMENTS BY THE GROUP HEAD OF CORPORATE SUPPORT/SECTION 151 OFFICER

- 7.1. There are no direct budget implications for Arun District Council.

8. RISK ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS

- 8.1. Implementing the recommendation will minimise the risk that the Council will fail to secure funding towards transport mitigation costs.

9. COMMENTS OF THE GROUP HEAD OF LAW AND GOVERNANCE & MONITORING OFFICER

- 9.1. There are no Governance or legal implications arising.

10. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

- 10.1. There are no implications arising.

11. HEALTH & SAFETY IMPACT

- 11.1. There are no direct implications arising although securing transport mitigation, including safety improvements, will benefit the health and safety performance of transport infrastructure delivered in Arun.

12. PROPERTY & ESTATES IMPACT

- 12.1. There may not be implications for Council property arising from highway improvements but these will be managed through normal Development Management consultation and transport legal procedures and decisions operated by both WSCC as Highway Authority, and Arun District Council.

13. EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA) / SOCIAL VALUE

- 13.1. The proposals may help to improve access to services and facilities and improve amenity, reducing pollution, having a positive impact on community health and wellbeing.

14. CLIMATE CHANGE & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT/SOCIAL VALUE

- 14.1. There proposals may help to secure transport mitigation and sustainable transport measures leading to carbon reduction and help to mitigate the extremes of for Climate Change.

15. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

- 15.1. There are no direct adverse implications for crime and disorder.

16. HUMAN RIGHTS IMPACT

- 16.1. There are no direct adverse implications for human rights.

17. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION / DATA PROTECTION CONSIDERATIONS

- 17.1. There are no implications.

CONTACT OFFICER:

Name:	Kevin Owen
Job Title:	Planning Policy & Conservation Manager
Contact Number:	01903 787853

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

Background Paper 1 (Urgent Item) A259 Bognor Regis to Littlehampton Corridor Enhancement: -

<https://democracy.arun.gov.uk/documents/s4606/Transport%20Evidence%20Update%20Report%20PPSC%2030%20June%202020v1.pdf>

Background Paper 2: Final ASR Report 2019 accessed on the Council's Web Site:

<https://www.arun.gov.uk/download.cfm?doc=docm93jjm4n15799.pdf&ver=16302>

Arun District Council

Appendix A - Contributions secured as of September 2022 (£m)

Table 1: Contributions Secured (expected*) as of end of Sept 2022													
Intervention	Pagham South	Pagham North	West of Bersted	BREZ Oldlands Farm	Barnham / Eastergate / Westergate	Fontwell	Yapton	Ford*	Climping	Littlehampton Westbank	Angmering N	Angmering S / E	BREZ Salt Box / BREZ Rowan Park
A27-B2145 Whyke Roundabout	0.395	0.493	0.051										
A27-A259 Bognor Road Roundabout			0.058	0.018									
A27-B2233 Nyton Road Junction				0.017	0.005								
A27-A29 Fontwell West Roundabout				0.004		0.758							
A27-A29 Fontwell East Roundabout					0.010								
A27-A284 Ford Road Roundabout													
A27-The Causeway Junction											0.033		
A27-A280 Northern Roundabout				0.016							0.439		
A29-A259 Rowan Way Junction			0.061	0.075									
A29-A259 Felpham Relief Road Junction			0.057										0.065
A259-Church Lane Junction									1.2				
A259-B2187 (Bridge Road L'ton) Roundabout													
Ford Road Level Crossing								0.350					
Barnham Village					0.005		0.042						
A259-Oystercatcher Junction			0.098		0.048		1.042	0.600					
A259-Comet Corner Junction							0.364	0.097					
A29 Realignment			0.157		0.272	0.000							
A259 Widening Oystercatcher to Littlehampton (now called A259 Bognor Regis to Littlehampton Corridor scheme)			0.020		0.044			0.515			0.120		
A259 East Arun Widening (Lyminster Bypass to Body Shop and Station Road to A280)								0.015			0.439	3.188	

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT TO:	Planning Policy Committee - 24 November 2022
SUBJECT:	Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS) 2021/2022
LEAD OFFICER:	Kevin Owen - Planning Policy & Conservation Manager
LEAD MEMBER:	Councillor Richard Bower
WARDS:	All
CORPORATE PRIORITY / POLICY CONTEXT / CORPORATE VISION: The recommendations supports: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the Wellbeing of Arun; • Delivering the right homes in the right places 	
DIRECTORATE POLICY CONTEXT: The proposals will help to:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with key partners to ensure that we deliver council wellbeing services that are complementary to their own, rather than duplicate effort • Support the NHS Clinical Commissioners to provide primary care medical and dental facilities to meet the growing needs of our community • Provide wider infrastructure that supports wellbeing, e.g. more opportunities for cycling and walking and easily accessible and safe greenspace • maximise the delivery of affordable housing including utilising the council's own resources and commercial expertise to ensure that our social housing is energy efficient • Use our expertise to influence the local housing market, working with the right partners from all sectors, to develop the housing and infrastructure that we need Use the planning system to create great new places and improve our existing places, where new homes meet the needs of current and future generations	
FINANCIAL SUMMARY: There are no direct financial implications arising from this Infrastructure Funding Statement.	

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1. To update Planning Policy Committee on the publication of the council's annual Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS) setting out S.106 planning obligation contributions and CIL income and spend on the council's infrastructure list from the previous financial year, in accordance with 'The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (as amended).
- 1.2. This report summarises the factual update to the Arun District IFS which is available as Background Paper 1.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Planning Policy Committee resolve that:-
- 2.1. The Arun Infrastructure Funding Statement 2021/22 be published on the Arun District Council website in accordance with Regulation 121A of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended).

3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 3.1. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (as amended) includes a requirement for all planning obligation collecting authorities to prepare an annual Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS) to be published on the council's web site by the end of each calendar year. The IFS sets out the s106 contributions together with the CIL-income and how it has been spent on the council's Infrastructure or held by the authority, for the monitoring year 2021/22.

4. DETAIL

- 4.1. The Council first published an Infrastructure Funding Statement for the year 2019/20 so this is the third publication. It is a factual update setting out the position of infrastructure funding for the year 2021-22. The IFS must be published annually, on the Council's web site i.e. by 31 December 2022. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (as amended) requires the IFS to set out:-
 - A statement of the infrastructure projects or types of infrastructure which the charging authority will be or may be or partly funded by CIL;
 - A report about CIL in relation to the previous financial year;
 - A report about planning obligations in relation to the reported year.
- 4.2. The publication of the IFS helps to ensure developer contributions are fully transparent and shows how they are to be used, and must be set out in an accessible standard digital format

INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING STATEMENT (IFS) AND HEADLINE FIGURES

- 4.3. As mentioned above, the IFS must report on the Council's infrastructure list (what it intends to spend CIL on) including reporting on CIL and S.106 income and expenditure. It is important to note that not all receipts held are spent or allocated in any given reporting year because of the status of the infrastructure project (e.g. whether a project is sufficiently funded or progressed to justify handing over funds).
- 4.4. It is also important to note that when reviewing the Arun IFS, it should be read together with the West Sussex County Council IFS to get a complete picture of infrastructure delivery in the district. The County Council IFS will be made available on this page of their website:

<https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/information-for-developers/section-106-planning-obligations/>

- 4.5. CIL receipts and S.106 and play a critical role in supporting growth in the district and delivering the aims and objectives and housing growth (20,000 dwellings), set out in the Arun Local Plan (ALP). The ALP is supported by the infrastructure mitigations set out in the supporting Infrastructure Capacity Study Delivery Plan 2017:-
- £215 million in S.106 would be required to support and mitigate the delivery of eleven strategic housing allocations in the district;
 - an estimated £30 million in CIL may be able to contribute towards meeting additional infrastructure requirements, to support the development of the area.
- 4.6. There appears to have been a modest impact on infrastructure project delivery over the period of the Covid_19 pandemic however, planning application decision making on the Strategic Allocation sites has increased significantly and resulted in 23 new S.106 agreements being entered into which contain around £2.4m (rounded) in contributions (up from £566k last year). Developments have returned slightly less S.106 receipts this year at £1.3m (£1.4m last year) and although the number of CIL Liabilities issued has remained similar to last year, the CIL receipts have increased significantly this year at £359k compared to £99k last year.
- 4.7. The Arun IFS is provided in Background Paper 1 and is supported by a number of appendices that provide all the data to support the headline figures (rounded) and summarised below:-
- **£1.7m** was received in total in Arun from S.106 and CIL developer contributions combined in the year 2021-22; of which
 - **£1.3m** was received from S.106 developer contributions and
 - **£359k** was received from CIL Demand Notices on CIL liable planning permissions.

S.106 INCOME & EXPENDITURE (Rounded)

- **£2.4m** is due to be received by the Council, once triggers are reached, following the approval of 23 planning applications in 2021/22
- **£11m** was held on deposit as at the end of March 2022 which was received prior to 1st April 2021 and was not recorded as allocated or spent (see paragraph 7.12 of the IFS document)
- **£697k** was spent or transferred for spending on infrastructure projects (further details on the year's activity will be found under sections 7 - 9 of the IFS document)
- **£354k** was allocated prior to 1st April 2020 but not spent in 2021-22 (Allocated is defined as when the funds have been received and formally committed to be spent on a project by the relevant committee or delegated authority)
- **83** new affordable housing units (in Angmering, Arundel, Barnham and Lidsey) and **2** new areas of open space or play area (in Arundel and Barnham) are due to be delivered on development sites once triggers are reached (see paragraph 8.2 of the IFS document)

- **58** new affordable homes have been completed in 2021-22 (see paragraph 8.3 of the IFS document)

4.8. Further details on non-monetary contributions are set out in section 8 of the IFS.

CIL INCOME & EXPENDITURE

- **£359k** was received in 2021-22 from CIL Demand Notices on CIL liable planning permissions this year
- **175** x CIL liability notices (approximately) have been issued since 2020 with
- **£1.3m** total CIL relief granted
- No expenditure took place in 2021/22 - CIL spend priority is set out in the Infrastructure Investment Plan covering a 3 year period (i.e. IIP 2022 - 2024) which was adopted by Full Council on 9 March 2022;
- **£49.3k** was transferred to Town or Parish Councils (paragraph 5.3 of IFS document) and details of any expenditure will be set out in the equivalent Parish/Town Council IFS

CONCLUSIONS

- 4.9. The Arun IFS provides a comprehensive overview of CIL and S.106 income and expenditure within the district and how it has or will be spent on specifically defined projects that benefit the local community through mitigating the impact of development. The appendices, which accompany the IFS provide further detail. However, for a full picture the Arun IFS, that it should be read together with the WSCC IFS and any relevant Town or Parish Council IFS.
- 4.10. It is apparent from having several years of IFS financial data that a substantial fund of £11m (rounded) has built up of S.106 money held on deposit (similar to last year) for identified specific infrastructure but which has not yet been formally allocated for spend on a project (e.g. because the project funding threshold or triggers have not been reached). The officers monitoring planning obligations reconcile data over complex phased developments, some extending back as long ago as 2011 to ensure that money is paid promptly on achieving triggers. However, the council will need to be diligent in assessing the types of project that are involved to ensure that those that the authority can facilitate are maximised, in order to benefit the communities affected and to reduce risk (e.g. return of unspent funds after 5 years). Consequently, the Director for Growth will ask officers to provide and Action Plan to undertake due diligence on deposited funds which are unallocated.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1. No consultations have been undertaken because this is a factual monitoring report.

6. OPTIONS / ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

- 6.1. The options are to agree to publish the IFS or to not publish the IFS on the Council's web site.

7. COMMENTS BY THE GROUP HEAD OF CORPORATE SUPPORT/SECTION 151 OFFICER

- 7.1. The implementation of the recommendations does not require budget or resources to be allocated.

8. RISK ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS

- 8.1. Implementing the recommendation will minimise the risk that the Council will fail to meet national policies and regulations.

9. COMMENTS OF THE GROUP HEAD OF LAW AND GOVERNANCE & MONITORING OFFICER

- 9.1. The governance and legal implications related to the IFS 2021/22 are set out within the body of the report.

10. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

- 10.1. There are no implications arising from the IFS 2021/22.

11. HEALTH & SAFETY IMPACT

- 11.1. No direct health and safety impacts have been identified as arising from the IFS 2021/22.

12. PROPERTY & ESTATES IMPACT

- 12.1. There are no direct implications for Council property.

13. EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA) / SOCIAL VALUE

- 13.1. The proposals may have a positive impact on community health and wellbeing through supporting infrastructure delivery.

14. CLIMATE CHANGE & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT/SOCIAL VALUE

- 14.1. The infrastructure proposals may have positive and negative implications for Climate Change although these should balance and mitigate supporting the Arun Local Plan 2018 being subject to Sustainability Appraisal.

15. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

- 15.1. There are no direct adverse implications for crime and disorder.

16. HUMAN RIGHTS IMPACT

16.1. There are no direct adverse implications for human rights.

17. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION / DATA PROTECTION CONSIDERATIONS

17.1. There are no implications.

CONTACT OFFICER:

Name: Kevin Owen

Job Title: Planning Policy & Conservation Manager

Contact Number: 01903 787853

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

Background Paper 1: "Arun Infrastructure Funding Statement 2021/22"

This document, and all appendices will be available on the Arun District Council's webpage: <https://www.arun.gov.uk/monitoring>

This page is intentionally left blank

Arun District Council

REPORT TO:	Planning Policy Committee - 24 November 2022
SUBJECT:	Littlehampton Economic Growth Area (LEGA)
LEAD OFFICER:	Neil Crowther, Group Head of Planning
LEAD MEMBER:	Councillor Richard Bower
WARDS:	Beach, Brookfield, Courtwick with Toddington and River
CORPORATE PRIORITY / POLICY CONTEXT / CORPORATE VISION: The recommendations supports:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving the wellbeing of Arun; Delivering the right homes in the right places. 	
DIRECTORATE POLICY CONTEXT: The proposals will help to enhance the quality of the natural and built environment, protect the district's natural and heritage assets and to promote economic growth in a sustainable manner, striking a balance between the need for development and the protection of scarce resources and to facilitate the delivery of the West Bank strategic allocation in the Local Plan.	
FINANCIAL SUMMARY: Full Council on 15th September 2021 resolved that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Should any application for funding for this project submitted to the UK Community Renewal Fund be unsuccessful, then a supplementary budget of up to £50,000 to fund the cost of recommendations (1) and (2) approved by the Planning Policy Committee on 1 June 2021, be agreed as the Council's contribution to the cost of the project. This equates to a Council Tax equivalent of £0.80 for a Band D property; and The Council accept financial contributions from third parties to support the delivery of recommendations (1) and (2) approved by the Planning Policy Committee on 1 June 2021. 	

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1. This report seeks Planning Policy Committee's agreement that the proposed Littlehampton Economic Growth Area (LEGA) Study update should exclude work on the West Bank Strategic Allocation elements of the Study and focus the study brief on the riverside opportunities and the area between Climping beach and the West Bank. The study would, therefore, aim to complement what might happen on the West Bank through the existing LEGA study and Strategic Allocation in the adopted Arun Local Plan 2018.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. Planning Policy Committee resolves:-
That the LEGA Study update brief focusses on the riverside opportunities and the area between Climping Beach and the West Bank Strategic Allocation.

3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 3.1. This report updates the Committee on the progress of the LEGA Study update following officer's scoping of the study brief. Officers' advice is that the study brief is amended to exclude the West Bank element which is an existing Strategic Allocation in the adopted Arun Local Plan supported by an existing LEGA evidence study. The purpose of undertaking the study update is to consider the West Bank's relationship to adjacent land uses outside of but adjacent to the Strategic Allocation; i.e., within the Riverside/Climping areas to see if there are potential opportunities that exist which would complement and support the delivery of the West Bank. In particular, to consider whether there are opportunities to enable the West Bank to come forward more quickly and more viably, and whether there is material evidence to suggest the configuration of the West Bank could be improved.

4. DETAIL

- 4.1. The progression of delivering the West Bank Strategic Allocation as a single development opportunity has currently stalled. Two major site promoters were invited by the landowners to bid for the opportunity to promote the site for development. These site promoters undertook detailed due diligence work, but this established that ground conditions were poor which consequently increased the likely construction costs associated with flood defence and land raising. This coupled with the extent of the infrastructure required to deliver a satisfactory scheme, impacted adversely on the overall financial viability of the proposal. The site promoters decided not to enter into any formal agreement and withdrew because the financial risks were considered substantial. It is also worth noting, that external funding has also been sought in the past to assist with the delivery of the infrastructure, but these bids were unsuccessful.
- 4.2. The current approach to delivery treats the allocation as a single development, constructed in essence, in one go. An alternative approach being explored in the proposed LEGA update study is to seek to deliver the development as a series of discrete phases which can work independently but also contribute to the delivery of a detailed integrated masterplan within the defined strategic allocation.
- 4.3. The physical extent of the Strategic Allocation is set out in the Local Plan. However, there may be good reasons why it would be appropriate to consider adjacent land opportunities that exist along the western side of the river and between the strategic allocation and the sea at Climping Beach. This work may or may not offer material circumstances to consider any potential departure from the development plan in order to unlock the delivery of the West Bank.

- 4.4. Since this would be outside the Local Plan allocation (the exact extent of the area to be agreed as part of the study) the Council would need to consider and consult upon any positive delivery narrative identified within the study as evidence, in order for these potential additional areas to complement and sit alongside the supplementary planning guidance proposed for the strategic allocation.
- 4.5. Full Council on 15th September 2021 resolved the following:
- 1) Should any application for funding for this project submitted to the UK Community Renewal Fund be unsuccessful, then a supplementary budget of up to £50,000 to fund the cost of recommendations (1) and (2) approved by the Planning Policy Committee on 1 June 2021, be agreed as the Council's contribution to the cost of the project. This equates to a Council Tax equivalent of £0.80 for a Band D property; and;
 - 2) The Council accept financial contributions from third parties to support the delivery of recommendations (1) and (2) approved by the Planning Policy Committee on 1 June 2021.
- 4.6. The principal landowners remain committed to the delivery of the LEGA strategic site. This has led to investigations into developer options which could include opportunities for parcels of the site to be developed at different rates within an agreed masterplan.
- 4.7. Whilst there are currently no agreements with developers yet, given that the rationale for undertaking the LEGA study was to explore other delivery options, in the absence of developer interest, it is proposed that the brief for the study removes any such work on the West Bank elements on the basis that it might prove unnecessary and therefore not a good use of public money.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1. The West Bank strategic allocation is part of a strategic policy in the Local Plan and as such the principle of the allocation has undertaken several public consultation processes as required.

6. OPTIONS / ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

- 6.1. The options are
1. The Council proceeds with commissioning a study with a brief which excludes the West Bank Strategic Allocation and focuses on the riverside opportunities and the area between Climping beach and the West Bank in order to complement what might happen on the West Bank. **OR**
 2. The Council commissions a detailed masterplan for the West Bank Strategic Allocation including indicative phasing and a comprehensive viability appraisal together with a complementary evidence study for areas adjoining the allocation to the south including along the riverside and towards Climping Beach.

7. COMMENTS BY THE GROUP HEAD OF CORPORATE SUPPORT/SECTION 151 OFFICER

- 7.1. The £50,000 supplementary budget approved on 15 September 2021 has been carried forward to 2022/23 in an earmarked reserve to secure it. Funding is therefore available up to £50,000, to be withdrawn from this reserve as required. Any spend about this level will have to be funded from other sources.

8. RISK ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS

- 8.1. The risk is that if this proposal is not successful then the outcome in the short term will be even further pressure to allow development on unallocated sites to deliver the proposed 1,000 homes. In the medium to long term without successful intervention, the outcome is likely to require the de-allocation of the strategic allocation in either this Plan or any updated Local Plan.

9. COMMENTS OF THE GROUP HEAD OF LAW AND GOVERNANCE & MONITORING OFFICER

- 9.1. There are Governance and legal implications. The allocation of land is legal plan making function with due process. The council will, therefore, need to ensure that it follows appropriate processes in undertaking this evidence work and how it may become material evidence to inform decision making.

10. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

- 10.1. There are no human resources implications.

11. HEALTH & SAFETY IMPACT

- 11.1. No direct health and safety impacts have been identified in relation to the proposals.

12. PROPERTY & ESTATES IMPACT

- 12.1. There are implications for Council property as the Council is one of the landowners in the West Bank consortium.

13. EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA) / SOCIAL VALUE

- 13.1. The proposals may help to improve access to housing through plan making for all sections of the community, having a positive impact on health and wellbeing.

14. CLIMATE CHANGE & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT/SOCIAL VALUE

- 14.1. There are possible implications for Climate Change and environmental impact, particularly in regards to flooding.

15. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

- 15.1. There are no direct adverse implications for crime and disorder.

16. HUMAN RIGHTS IMPACT

16.1. There are no direct adverse implications for human rights.

17. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION / DATA PROTECTION CONSIDERATIONS

17.1. There are no implications.

CONTACT OFFICER:

Name:	Donna Moles
Job Title:	Principal Planning Officer
Contact Number:	01903 737697

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT TO:	Planning Policy Committee - 24 November 2022
SUBJECT:	Arundel Town Council Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)
LEAD OFFICER:	Neil Crowther - Group Head of Planning
LEAD MEMBER:	Councillor Richard Bower
WARDS:	All
CORPORATE PRIORITY / POLICY CONTEXT / CORPORATE VISION: The recommendations supports: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the Wellbeing of Arun e.g. ensuring safe accessible and sustainable transport network serves communities. • Delivering the right homes in the right places e.g. ensuring placemaking is supported by a sustainable transport network. • Supporting our Environment to help us e.g. make low carbon transport including walking and cycling and travel by public transport etc. 	
DIRECTORATE POLICY CONTEXT: The proposals will help to support delivery of sustainable transport infrastructure e.g. more opportunities for cycling and walking and easily accessible green space.	
FINANCIAL SUMMARY: There are no financial implications arising from this Action Plan.	

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1. The report seeks the Planning Policy Committee's agreement in principle, to support the development of Arundel Town Council's Local Walking Cycling and Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) (Background Paper 1) because it is consistent with the Council's approach to delivering Active Travel opportunities, through its Active Travel study (Background Paper 2) which was approved as a material consideration and based on strong community engagement.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Planning Policy Committee resolves:-
- 2.1 That the Arundel LCWIP can be supported in principle subject to the caveats in section 4.5.

3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 3.1 Arundel Town Council are preparing their LCWIP in accordance with national guidelines and at this stage are seeking Arun District Council's support in principle for the approach being taken. This will help the Town Council in its further work, to finalise the LCWIP and engage with West Sussex County Council (WSCC) to promote the schemes identified within the LCWIP programme managed by WSCC and potential future funding bids.

4. DETAIL

- 4.1 Arundel Town Council invited Arun members to a virtual presentation on the Arundel LCWIP Member on 4 August 2022. The event was hosted by the Chair of Planning Policy Committee but open to all Members. A presentation was given by the Town Council outlining the purpose of the LCWIP, the stage it was at - going through public consultation on draft proposed active travel routes to serve the local communities in the Arundel area. This was followed by a 'Question and Answer' session.
- 4.2 Arundel Town Council explained that they were seeking support for their emerging LCWIP. The proposals were consistent with the Councils own Active Travel Study methodology and national requirements (for example looking at potential for segregation of vehicles and walkers/cyclist, value for money and accessibility to employment, services and leisure).
- 4.3 The emerging Arundel LCWIP sets out a proposed network of two walking zones, three walking routes and seven cycle routes that connect commonly used 'origins and destinations'. The initial engagement and consultation work over recent years has identified comments, concerns, and ideas about walking, cycling and general access to key locations raised by Arundel residents including intelligence from the 2019 Arundel Neighbourhood Plan Review. Key findings from LCWIP consultation Executive summary show:-
- 94% support aims of the LCWIP in principle, 7% have mobility constraints.
 - Walkers would walk more if infrastructure was improved (wider pavements.
 - dropped kerbs, continuous paths, better road surface, segregation where needed).
 - Fewer respondents were cyclists (about 10%) but a higher proportion would cycle more if safe/direct to do so than the increase in walkers.
 - Main reasons for not walking/cycling more now are safety, traffic, lack of routes & lack of crossing points (especially Ford Road & The Causeway).
 - Driving is convenient especially if luggage is needed, time is short, or weather bad.
 - Buses are seen as unreliable.
 - Draft network is supported but need to add Walberton & Burpham.
 - Arundel needs a parking strategy/shared space.
 - Rat running is a big issue as is HGV's on Ford Road.

- 4.4 Arun District Council approved its own Active Travel Study (ATS) as a material consideration (Planning Policy Committee 1 June 2021). The ATS identified a network of 15 Active Travel routes across the District (and was also based on stakeholder engagement and a methodology to meet national guidelines). The Arun ATS identified that there are 5 key priority routes, one of which is Route 8 'Arundel to Littlehampton Ford Road route'. This route is consistent with the LCWIP Arundel to Ford Road Cycle and Walking 'Route 'C6' and 'W1' (respectively), to the Rail Station. Further, Route 8 is included in Arun's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Infrastructure Investment Plan (IIP 2022/24).
- 4.5 The Arundel LCWIP proposal shows a more detailed approach to proposed active travel routes with a number of different schemes compared to Arun's ATS. For example, the Arun ATS has Route 4 Walberton to Arundel; Route 1 Littlehampton to A27; and Route 7 Arundel to Littlehampton (River route) affecting the Town Council's LCWIP area (see Background Paper 2). However, the Arundel LCWIP shows Walking routes W2, W4, and Cycling routes C5 and C7. Where these routes are common to both the Arun ATS routes and the emerging Arundel LCWIP, they can be supported as complementary with Arun District Council (ADC) priorities. Where they depart, the Arun ATS will be ADC's formal policy position in regard to any further prioritisation and funding (e.g. via the IIP). Nevertheless, the LCWIP proposals as a whole package, can be supported in principle subject to this caveat and it is possible that further funding alignment between the LCWIP and Arun ATS may be possible through the IIP prioritisation process, subject to funding and prioritisation criteria and review of the IIP. The Arundel LCWIP will also assist the Town Council in its infrastructure work and in bidding for Active Travel funding resources via the Countywide LCWIP prioritisation process managed by West Sussex County Council.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1. Arun District Council can provide support in principle to the emerging Arundel LCWIP subject to the caveats identified in section 4.5 above. A further report will be brought back once the final Arundel LCWIP is approved by the Town Council.

6. CONSULTATION

- 6.1. No consultations have been undertaken.

7. OPTIONS / ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

- 7.1. The options are:-
1. Support the Arundel LCWIP in principle.
 2. Not support the Arundel LCWIP in principle.

8. COMMENTS BY THE GROUP HEAD OF CORPORATE SUPPORT/SECTION 151 OFFICER

- 8.1. The implementation of the recommendations subject to section 4.5, has no budget or resource implications.

9. RISK ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1. Implementing the recommendation will pose no risk to the Council based on the caveats set out in this report.

10. COMMENTS OF THE GROUP HEAD OF LAW AND GOVERNANCE & MONITORING OFFICER

- 10.1. There are no Governance or legal implications arising from the emerging Arundel Town Council LCWIP.

11. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

- 11.1. There are no implications arising from the Arundel Town Council LCWIP.

12. HEALTH & SAFETY IMPACT

- 12.1. No direct health and safety impacts have been identified from the Arundel Town Council LCWIP. However, it is anticipated that there will be opportunities for segregation of vehicles and walkers/cyclists resulting in reduced health and safety risks for the community.

13. PROPERTY & ESTATES IMPACT

- 13.1. There are no direct implications for Council property arising from the Arundel Town Council LCWIP.

14. EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA) / SOCIAL VALUE

- 14.1. The proposals may help to improve safe and sustainable travel access to employment, services and leisure, having a positive impact on community health and wellbeing.

15. CLIMATE CHANGE & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT/SOCIAL VALUE

- 15.1. There are no direct adverse implications for Climate Change and indeed the proposals may have beneficial effects. These include a reduction in emissions related to car use and improvement in air quality.

16. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

- 16.1. There are no direct adverse implications for crime and disorder.

17. HUMAN RIGHTS IMPACT

- 17.1. There are no direct adverse implications for human rights.

18. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION / DATA PROTECTION CONSIDERATIONS

- 18.1. There are no implications.

CONTACT OFFICER:

Name:	Kevin Owen
Job Title: Planning	Policy & Conservation Manager
Contact Number:	01903 787853

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

Background Paper 1: Arundel Town Council LCWIP Proposals
<https://www.arundeltowncouncil.gov.uk/lcwip/>

Background Paper 2 Arun Active Travel Study
<https://www.arun.gov.uk/transport-planning-policy>

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT TO:	Planning Policy Committee – 24 November 2022
SUBJECT:	Key Performance Indicators 2022-2026 – Quarter 2 performance report for the period 1 April 2022 to 30 September 2022.
LEAD OFFICER:	Jackie Follis
LEAD MEMBER:	Councillor Richard Bower
WARDS:	N/A
CORPORATE PRIORITY / POLICY CONTEXT / CORPORATE VISION: The Key Performance Indicators support the Council's Vision and allows the Council to identify how well we are delivering across a full range of services.	
DIRECTORATE POLICY CONTEXT: This report is produced by the Group Head of Organisational Excellence to give an update on the Q2 Performance outturn of the Key Performance Indicators.	
FINANCIAL SUMMARY: Not required.	

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1. This report is to update the Committee on the Q2 Performance Outturn for the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) which make up the Corporate Plan, for the period 1 April 2022 to 30 September 2022. It will also report on any items referred by other committees to this committee. The process is described in section 4. of this report.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.2. As this report is an information paper, there are no recommendations for the Committee to consider. This report is to be taken as read only with Members having the opportunity to ask questions at the meeting on service performance. Members can also submit questions or comments on the indicators relevant to their Committee and these will be considered by the Policy and Finance Committee on 13 December 2022.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1. This report sets out the performance of the Key Performance indicators at Quarter 1 for the period 1 April 2022 to 30 September 2022.

3. DETAIL

- 3.1. The Council Vision 2022-2026 was approved at Full Council in March 2022. To support the Vision we need a comprehensive and meaningful set of performance measures which allow us to identify how well we are delivering across a full range of services. Two kinds of indicators were agreed at the Policy and

Finance Committee on 17 March 2022. The first of these are annual indicators and will primarily update the progress against strategic milestones. In addition to this 'key performance indicators' (KPIs) will be reported to committees every quarter. These KPIs are known as our Corporate Plan.

- 3.2. A short report and appendix will go to each of the other Committees in the cycle of meetings after each quarter has ended. This appendix will only contain the indicators which are relevant to each Committee.
- 3.3. A full report showing quarterly performance against all indicators (which are measured at that quarter) will go to the relevant Policy and Finance Committee meeting at the end of the cycle of the other Committee meetings. Members of the other Committees will be able to give comments or ask questions of officers about the KPI indicators that are relevant to their Committee and these can be referred to the Policy and Finance Committee for consideration if deemed necessary.
- 3.4. The Committee meetings that will receive Q2 KPI reports are as follows:

Committee meeting dates	Indicators to receive report on
Corporate Support Committee - 10 November 2022	9 (CP1, CP2, CP3, CP4, CP5, CP6, CP7, CP8, CP9)
Environment Committee - 17 November 2022	10 (CP12, CP13, CP37, CP38, CP39, CP40, CP22, CP23, CP24, CP25)
Economy Committee - 22 November 2022	2 (CP41, CP42)
Planning Policy Committee - 24 November 2022	1 (CP36)
Planning Committee – 30 November 2022	10 (CP26, CP27, CP28, CP29, CP30, CP31, CP32, CP33, CP34, CP35)
Housing & Wellbeing Committee - 6 December 2022	8 (CP11, CP15, CP16, CP17, CP18, CP19, CP20, CP21)
Licensing Committee – 9 December 2022	1 (CP14)
Policy & Finance Committee - 13 December 2022	41 indicators - not CP10 (only at Q4)

- 3.5. This is the second quarterly report covering performance from 1 April 2022 to 30 September 2022 and will cover only those indicators that are due to be measured at this point.
- 3.6. Thresholds are used to establish which category of performance each indicator is within.

	Achieved target	100% or above target figure
	Didn't achieve target but within 15% range	85%-99.9% below target figure
	Didn't achieve target by more than 15%	85% or less target figure

- 3.7. There are 42 Key Performance indicators. 1 of these indicators is reportable to the Planning Policy Committee.
- 3.8. This report gives the status this indicator at Q2. Appendix A gives full commentary. This appendix shows the figures and commentary for both Q1 and

Q2 and a column which shows the direction of travel of the status for this indicator.

Status	Number of Key Performance indicators in this category
Achieved target	0
Didn't achieve but within 15% range	0
Didn't achieve target by more than 15%	1
TOTAL	1

- 3.9. The Q4 figure for 2021/22 for this indicator has now become available. It was not available when the Q4 KPI data was submitted to Committee. **653 homes** were completed in 2021/22. The target for 2021/22 was 930 homes.
- 3.10. The table at 4.4 sets out the reporting structure for Q2 KPIs. Members will see that relevant indicators have been presented to the listed committees prior to this meeting. A separate appendix will be presented to the Policy and Finance Committee, should any items be forwarded on from the other Committees.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1. No consultation has taken place.

5. OPTIONS / ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

- 5.1. To review the report
- 5.2. To request further information and/or remedial actions be undertaken

6. COMMENTS BY THE GROUP HEAD OF CORPORATE SUPPORT/SECTION 151 OFFICER

- 6.1. None required.

7. RISK ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1. None required

8. COMMENTS OF THE GROUP HEAD OF LAW AND GOVERNANCE & MONITORING OFFICER

- 8.1. None required

9. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

- 9.1. Not applicable.

10. HEALTH & SAFETY IMPACT

- 10.1. Not applicable.

11.PROPERTY & ESTATES IMPACT

11.1. Not applicable.

12.EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA) / SOCIAL VALUE

12.1. Not applicable.

13.CLIMATE CHANGE & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT/SOCIAL VALUE

13.1. Not applicable.

14.CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

14.1. Not applicable.

15.HUMAN RIGHTS IMPACT

15.1. Not applicable.

16.FREEDOM OF INFORMATION / DATA PROTECTION CONSIDERATIONS

16.1. Not applicable.


CONTACT OFFICER:

Name: Jackie Follis

Job Title: Group Head of Organisational Excellence

Contact Number: 01903 737580

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS: *None*

No.	Indicator	Council Vision Theme	Service Committee	CMT Member	Frequency data collected	Assess by	Target 2022-2026	June 22 Outturn - Q1 (April-June)	Q1 Status	September 22 Outturn - Q2 (April-Sept)	Q2 Commentary	Q2 status	Improved or not since Q1 figure (Q2 compared to Q1)
CP36	Number of new homes completed	Fulfilling Arun's economic potential	Planning Policy	Karl Roberts	Monthly	Higher is better	1288 (22/23) 1247 (23/24) 1059 (24/25)	115	Not achieving	290	<p>The last two months have shown an upturn in the number of homes being delivered which is a positive sign, however, national issues around mortgage availability and other financial concerns may have a dampening effect on the continued improvement of the number of homes being delivered.</p> <p>The 2021/22 Q4 figure has now been obtained as this was not available when the Q4 report was given to various Committee meetings. The figure for 2021/22 was 653 homes completed against a target in 2021/22 of 930 homes.</p>	Not achieving	<p>Up by 175 homes</p> 

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Policy Committee	Report Author	Date of Meeting	Full Council Meeting Date
Karl Roberts, Neil Crowther			
Local Plan Evidence Update - Tourism & Visitor Accommodation Study	K Owen	7 June 22	13 July 22
Housing Delivery Test Update	K Owen		
Arun Local Plan Update – 6 month review	K Owen		
Arun Infrastructure Topic Papers - A27 junction Improvements; Wastewater Capacity; Water Neutrality; Housing Market Absorption	K Owen K Owen		
Transport for the Southeast Strategic Investment Plan Consultation	K Owen	27 July 22	14 Sep 22
Gypsy & Traveller Development Plan Document Update	K Owen		
The provision of resources to assist the Council on matters relating to the A27 Arundel Improvements	R Spencer		
Response to Southern Water's Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP) consultation	K Owen		
Arun Transport Model Update	K Owen		
Planning Policy Work following Full Council on 13 July 2022	K Roberts/ N Crowther		
The Provision of Resources to assist the Council on matters relating to the A27 Arundel Improvements – Financial Implications	K Roberts	21 Sept 22	9 Nov 22
Q1 KPI Reporting			
Q2 KPI Reporting		24 Nov 22	18 Jan 23
Local Plan Evidence Update - Biodiversity Net Gain Study	K Owen		
Arun Transport Apportionment Methodology Update	K Owen		
Arun Infrastructure Funding Statement	K Owen		
Littlehampton Economic Growth Area (LEGA)	D Moles		
Arundel Town Council Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)	K Owen		

Planning Policy Committee Karl Roberts, Neil Crowther	Report Author	Date of Meeting	Full Council Meeting Date
Q3 KPI Reporting		26 Jan 23	15 Mar 23
Committee Revenue & Capital Budgets 2023/2024	C Martlew		
Local Development Scheme Update	K Owen		
Arun Housing Market Absorption Study	K Owen		
Infrastructure Investment Plan (IIP)	K Owen		
A response to the National Highways A27 Arundel further consultation	K Roberts		
Housing Delivery Test Action Plan	K Owen		