

**MINUTES  
OF A  
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL  
HELD IN THE ARUN CIVIC CENTRE  
ON 10 OCTOBER 2019 AT 5.45 PM**

Present: Councillors Mrs Warr (Chairman), Mrs Worne (Vice-Chair), Bennett, Bicknell, B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Brooks, Mrs Caffyn, Mrs Catterson, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Mrs Daniells, Dixon, Edwards, Elkins, English, Goodheart, Mrs Gregory, Gunner, Mrs Hamilton, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Huntley, Kelly, Lury, Mrs Madeley, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton, Miss Rhodes, Miss Seex, Mrs Stainton, Mrs Staniforth, Tilbrook, Ms Thurston, Dr Walsh and Mrs Yeates.

[Note: The following Councillors were absent from the meeting during consideration of the matters detailed in the Minutes indicated:- Councillors Elkins and Mrs Hamilton – Minute 257 to Minute 260 (Part); Councillor English – Minute 257 to Minute 264 (Part – during the debate on Recommendation 1); Councillors Brooks and Goodheart – Minute 264 (Part – they left during the debate on Recommendation (1) and did not take part in any of the voting); Councillor Mrs Madeley – Minute 264 (Part – she left after the recorded vote had been taken on the Magenta Route Option); Councillors Mrs Worne and Mrs Staniforth – Minute 264 (Part – they left during the Recorded Vote on Recommendation (4) (a) to (f)].

**257. WELCOME**

The Chairman welcomed Councillors, representatives of the public, press and officers to the Council Meeting.

**258. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Batley, C Blanchard-Cooper, Buckland, Miss Needs, Purchase, Roberts, Smith and Stanley and from all of the Council's Honorary Aldermen.

**259. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

A Declaration of Interest Sheet had been circulated to the meeting setting out those Members who had made a declaration of their personal interest as a Member of a Town or Parish Councillor or a West Sussex County Councillor, as confirmed in their Register of Interest as these declarations could apply to Agenda Item 8 – A27 Trunk Road – Improvements at Arundel. This table is set out below:

Full Council - 10.10.19

<b>Name</b>	<b>Town or Parish Council or West Sussex County Council [WSCC]</b>
Councillor Jamie Bennett	Rustington
Councillor Paul Bicknell	Angmering
Councillor Billy Blanchard-Cooper	Littlehampton
Councillor Jim Brooks	Bognor Regis
Councillor Mike Clayden	Rustington
Councillor Alison Cooper	Rustington
Councillor Sandra Daniells	Bognor Regis
Councillor David Edwards	WSCC
Councillor Roger Elkins	Ferring and WSCC
Councillor Paul English	Felpham
Councillor Steve Goodheart	Bognor Regis
Councillor Pauline Gregory	Rustington
Councillor June Hamilton	Pagham
Councillor Shirley Haywood	Middleton-on-Sea
Councillor David Huntley	Pagham
Councillor Martin Lury	Bersted
Councillor Francis Oppler	WSCC
Councillor Jacky Pendleton	Middleton-on-Sea and WSCC
Councillor Vicky Rhodes	Littlehampton
Councillor Emily Seex	Littlehampton
Councillor Samantha Staniforth	Bognor Regis
Councillor Isabel Thurston	Barnham & Eastergate
Councillor James Walsh	Littlehampton and WSCC
Councillor Jeanette Warr	Bognor Regis
Councillor Amanda Worne	Yapton
Councillor Gillian Yeates	Bersted

## 260. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Chairman invited questions from members of the public who had submitted their questions in advance of the meeting in accordance with the rules of the Council's Constitution.

The Chairman announced that six questions had been received and that all questions were for the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh to respond to. All of these questions related to Agenda Item 8 – A27 Trunk Road – Improvements at Arundel.

Question One outlined concern about the viability of the route options throughout the consultation and referred to an email that Highways England (HE) had sent to a Member of Arun District Council confirming that it had “not yet formulated any conclusions on the planning likelihood of any route” and that “it was too early and

inappropriate for HE to conclude the ‘consentability’ of any route”. The questioner asked if the Council had been made aware of this guidance and if it would be taken into account when the route options were ranked against the Council’s stated objective of improving the social and environmental wellbeing of Arundel and Walberton, Storrington and surrounding communities.

Councillor Dr Walsh responded confirming that he was not aware of the email referred to. However, he stated that there was a subtle difference between viability and consentability. The Council’s Officers had worked on the basis that the six options were viable and would not have been put forward by HE if this was not the case.

Members of the Council tonight would debate the issues and would be invited to vote for or against or abstain on each of the six options. The options would not be ranked, however, a ranking could be discernable once the votes had been cast for all six of the options.

Question Two outlined that the Magenta option would result in Walberton and Slindon Parishioners facing the sum of all fears with the monstrous multi-directional motorway interchange that would cover at least the size of the Crossbush junction. Great concern was expressed over the increase in traffic for surrounding areas and the threat that ‘rat runs’ would be created too. The Magenta route would sever two parts of the area permanently and so the Council was asked it could please oppose options that achieved one Arundel by creating two Walbertons.

Councillor Dr Walsh responded stating that the reason why this Special Council meeting had been called was to debate the very important issue of a proposed by-pass of Arundel and so to provide a basis upon which HE could be provided with the Council’s corporate response to its consultation. As part of the debate, Councillors would have regard for the likely effects on local routes and for junction arrangements. Councillor Dr Walsh confirmed that he was confident that severance would be in Members’ mind when casting their votes for/against each of the options.

Question Three outlined that the Crimson route was now said to be ‘viable’ by HE and would cause the least damage to any residential properties by taking a route through the South Downs National Park (SDNP) which was only slightly longer than the online options. In light of environmental concerns surrounding Crimson and the fact that it had the second-best benefit to cost ratio and was the cheapest of all routes, the Council was asked why it could not consider Crimson instead of Magenta?

Councillor Dr Walsh outlined that all six route options were viable. A substantial portion of the Crimson route was within an area classified as “replanted ancient woodland”. He re-emphasised that Councillors would consider all of the six options and that each option would be voted on.

Question Four remarked upon the fact that local residents had initially been persuaded by HE not to support the Crimson route as this would pass through ancient soil and so there would be associated environmental offsetting costs. HE had since confirmed that all routes were viable and had admitted that Crimson was the shortest,

Full Council - 10.10.19

cheapest offline route. As halfway between Arundel and Walberton a covered Crimson would be the ideal solution and would unite all communities. Taking this into account the questioner asked the Council to please support Crimson.

Councillor Dr Walsh stated that he could not comment on the assertion of HE persuading local residents towards or away from any particular route option. He reconfirmed that Members would consider all of the six options and that they would be voting for or against or abstaining on all of the six options.

Question Five focused on the cost of all of the route options and the questioner asked that in light of the Climate Emergency, could these vast sums of money be spent on public transport in the Arun District instead which would achieve reduced congestion; less air pollution and reduced CO2 emissions.

Councillor Dr Walsh stated that he understood the questioner's concerns in terms of the environment and that the Council was addressing the matter of climate change in a number of ways. He reminded those present that the reason why this Special Council meeting had been convened was to debate the very important issue of a proposed bypass for Arundel and to be able to provide HE with the Council's corporate response to its consultation.

Question Six outlined the questioner's viewpoint that all six route options had their advantages and disadvantages but that the Magenta option was the least worst option due to varying points of view, it would effectively deal with traffic problems on the A27 and would create the significant benefit of reducing the amount of east-west traffic using the current A27 through the SDNP. The downside of this option was that it, along with four of the other options, would have a negative impact on both local people and their houses. The questioner outlined why he felt that the Crimson route was not a practical runner and he set out the reasons for this. He urged the Council to make a decision to support one of the six HE options and preferably that this be the Magenta option which was the best route for this essential and long-awaited A27 bypass of Arundel.

Councillor Dr Walsh in responding stated that the format of the officer recommendations had been changed to enable Councillors to cast a vote for or against (or to abstain from voting) on each of the six route options. It was felt that this presented the most transparent way of reaching a position that could be relayed to HE as the Council's corporate response to its consultation.

As no supplementary questions were asked, the Chairman then drew Public Question Time to a close.

*[To view the full detail of the questions submitted and the answers provided in writing – please refer to the Council's Public Question Time page on its web site - <https://www.arun.gov.uk/public-question-time>]*

261. MINUTES

The Minutes of the last Full Council Meeting held on 18 September 2019 were approved by the Council as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

262. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman alerted Members to the list of engagements and events that had been attended since the last Full Council meeting held on 18 September 2019 – these had been emailed to Councillors recently.

The Chairman then invited Councillor Dixon to make a statement.

Councillor Dixon outlined that it had recently been brought to his attention that at the last Full Council meeting he had failed to sit when the Chairman of the Council had stood to regain order within the Council Chamber. Councillor Dixon confirmed that he had been unaware, at that time, of his actions and that he had not, at any time, intended to show any form of disrespect to the Chairman. Councillor Dixon gave his unreserved and sincere apologies to the Chairman in this respect and confirmed that his actions had not in any way been intentional.

The Chairman confirmed that she accepted Councillor Dixon's apology.

263. URGENT MATTERS

There were no items for this meeting.

264. A27 TRUNK ROAD - IMPROVEMENTS AT ARUNDEL

The Chairman invited the Chief Executive to make a statement.

The Chief Executive outlined that all Members of the Council were sent an email on 8 October 2019 advising them that the recommendations in the Officer's report issued with the agenda were being withdrawn and were being replaced with revised recommendations which had been provided and published to the Council's website that same day.

The decision had been made to take this action based on concerns raised with him by the Council's Group Leaders about the wording of the recommendations in the Officer's report. The Chief Executive believed that the revised recommendations allowed greater transparency and would allow for a more democratic debate to take place on all the options put forward by Highways England (HE) for the A27 improvements at Arundel. A copy of the Chief Executive's statement issued including the revised recommendations had been circulated to the meeting.

The Chief Executive then explained the process that would be followed for the meeting. He confirmed that:

Full Council - 10.10.19

- It was in order for an Officer recommendation to be revised and withdrawn right up to the time it was due to be considered by Members. This was because at a Council meeting, an officer recommendation only became the subject of debate once it had been proposed and seconded by two separate Members.
- In terms of the officer recommendations now before Members, if proposed and seconded, the Chairman intended to request that each recommendation be debate and voted on individually. This meant that:
  - If the Council supported Recommendations (1) and (2) then there would be no further discussion on the options put forward by HE.
  - If recommendation (1) was not supported, then the Council would debate all the options in the consultation document as set out in Recommendation (3) then allowing all Members to have the opportunity to vote on each option. The vote on each option would be recorded.
  - If there was support by a majority for one of the options, then Recommendation (4) sought approval to this option being presented as the Council's response to HE. It was explained that if there was not an overall majority for one option, then the Council would be able to consider ranking the options.
  - Members would then consider Recommendation (5).
- Throughout the debate, Members would have the opportunity to propose further amendments in line with Council Procedure Rule 16.7.

The Chief Executive confirmed that to support and inform debate, all Councillors had been provided with the Officer report setting out the technical assessment of the options; the opportunity to participate in a briefing provided by HE on 24 September 2019 or to attend one of the community-based exhibitions; and a copy of the full consultation documents from HE.

Finally, the Chief Executive alerted Councillors to an error on Page 29 of the Officer report at Paragraph 1.1.4 in which the option 4/5AV2 (Magenta) should read (Amber) and the 'emerging Local Plan' had been referred to in the Officer's report, as the Local Plan was now adopted the word 'emerging' should be deleted from each occurrence.

The Chairman then invited the Leader of the Council to present the item.

Councillor Dr Walsh outlined that this was a 'once in a lifetime' opportunity for the Council to make and that it could not afford to not arrive at a corporate preference or opinion to be related to HE as part of the current consultation, especially in light of the fact that enhancements to the A27 at Chichester and Worthing had not come to fruition. For over 27 years Arun's residents had been crying out for the right improvements to be made as well as commuters; businesses and tourists. This was because this was not just a local road but because it was the strength of the south coast. The A27 was vital to the economy for this part of the country. Its lack of improvement had led to less inward investment into the Arun District over many years. Completing much needed

enhancements would unlock this potential allowing employment and businesses to thrive. Councillor Dr Walsh urged Councillors to unite and support one option which could be confirmed as this Council's solid recommended route option to HE.

Councillor Dr Walsh outlined that there were six options to consider and that there were many factors to think about in assessing each of these including environmental; financial; deliverability and effects on communities as a starting point. Firstly, he stated that as a Council, Councillors were being asked to vote to support the principle of a bypass for Arundel and then if this succeeded Members would then have opportunity to drill down further looking into the merits surrounding each option that was available to the Council.

Councillor Dr Walsh highlighted some background to previous studies and proposals around improvements to the A27 at Arundel. Following a consultation in 2017, the Council revised its preferred solution to Option 5A with a suggestion for a slight amendment – this was the equivalent of the current Amber option. Councillor Dr Walsh's view was that this was the Option that should be supported. There had recently been a lot of emphasis made on social media in terms of the Crimson route as this ran through an area of designated ancient woodland. If chosen as an option, the South Downs National Park would strongly reject it. The Magenta route provided greater flexibility and would have a less direct impact on the South Downs National Park area, minimising the environmental impact. Local feedback had shown massive support for a road junction at Ford, to avoid 'rat running' south of the River Arun. Due to expanding housing and industrial parks this was seen to be a vital need. Although this was not promised by HE, it had been included in its consultation document and would be looked at once a route had been chosen. Turning to other details, the Magenta route would mean that only 29 properties within 50 metres of the scheme footprint would be affected. In terms of the SDNP only 0.75 km of land would be taken from the National Park. Government was offering £300 m of investment into the District via this bypass, as a Council could we afford to reject this opportunity?

Councillor Oppler then seconded the revised recommendations circulated.

The Chairman firstly invited debate on Recommendation (1) which was whether the Council agreed that it should make a response to HE to not support any of the options put forward in their latest consultation on the A27 Arundel Bypass.

This commenced with two Councillors speaking in support of the Council to vote for not supporting any of the six options presented. This was because they felt that many residents could see the damaging effect all the six options would have on the local community and on the environment. It was quoted that 'nobody wanted a 70 mile per hour road near to their home'. The Magenta option threatened to be the most devastating for Arundel residents as well as those residing in the villages of Binsted and Walberton. The Six Villages area had also expressed its dismay at the idea of 3 offline routes passing nearby. A Walberton Village campaign group had compiled a leaflet that stated that a bypass would be catastrophic for the village and that residents in Arundel would also be divided as many recognised the environmental damage that would be inflicted onto their neighbouring countryside, spoiling panoramic views and walks for

Full Council - 10.10.19

ever. It was felt that the Council had a duty to support and protect all residents and their surrounding environment.

The Council was reminded that its adopted Local Plan promised to protect the unique qualities of the District and look after its beautiful landscape and special habitats. The well-rehearsed arguments for Arundel needing a bypass were well known, however, it was felt that it was more important to bring to the attention of Councillors the sound environmental reasons why a bypass should not happen. It was accepted that there was congestion at Arundel as there was on many other roads, but there were important reasons that the Council could not afford to ignore. There were many rare and protected species of birds and bats that would become endangered. Destroying them would be too high a price to pay in order to save drivers eleven minutes travelling time during rush hour. There was concern that the proposals would only shift traffic from Arundel to Fontwell and then Chichester and would create 'rat running' on other more minor roads resulting in higher emissions and pollution. It was suggested that instead the funds available should be invested in public transport to free up roads and to develop new transport plans with WSCC whilst at the same time providing a more reliable and affordable public transport infrastructure.

Varying Councillors then spoke against supporting Recommendation (1). This was because they very strongly believed that the time had come to make a decision that would provide an improved A27 at Arundel. The congestion issues on the A27 affected the economy in the Arun District as well as areas further afield. To support one of the six options put forward by HE would mean that something would be done about the situation in Arundel and areas to the east and west. Arundel was a bottleneck that held up traffic costing commuters, businesses, communities and visitors valuable time and money.

This viewpoint was widely supported by other Members who referred to the fact that the Council had a corporate responsibility for the entire District of Arun, not just the villages that would be affected by any A27 improvements. Examples were cited. The A27 at Arundel was recognised as one of the worst traffic hold up spots in the whole of South East England and this would only get worse, unless action was taken now. The need to consider alternative forms of transport were accepted as important but it had to be recognised that the A27 was the only major east-west trunk road south of the M25 linking many of the towns and cities along the south coast, this made it a national situation. The smooth running of the road played a key part in the region's success. Congestion in Arundel resulted in drivers seeking alternative routes which were not suited to higher traffic volumes. This was why National Government had come forward with the funding to deal with this situation. The whole of the Arun District was reliant on the provision of this bypass. Its importance could not be underestimated in view of other A27 schemes that had either been paused or were no longer part of HE's schemes.



Other Councillors referred to previous debates where it had been stated that the housing crisis in Arun could not be improved without the essential infrastructure in place. The opportunity for a bypass was that essential infrastructure and all residents, businesses and tourists knew that a bypass was needed. It was argued that there was nothing 'green' about hundreds of people sitting in traffic jams and polluting the environment.

During this part of the debate, Councillor Elkins outlined that West Sussex County Council's Select Committee had not yet debated this topic. He therefore felt that in his position as West Sussex County Council's Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport he did not wish to prejudice his position and so asked for advice on whether he should declare an interest and remain in the meeting and vote on the item or whether he should leave the meeting at this point. Having received advice, Councillor Elkins decided that he would leave the meeting and not participate any further in the debate and votes.

As proposer to the recommendation, Councillor Dr Walsh urged Councillors to vote in support of making a response to HE. In responding to biodiversity and environmental concerns raised from those not wishing to submit an option response, he outlined that any option put forward would aim to minimise environmental impacts and would seek to protect and enhance the quality of the surrounding areas through high quality design. He referred to the consultation document that confirmed that green bridges could be implemented to protect wildlife by constructing culverts to facilitate safer animal crossings of the A27. He outlined the real problem of 'rat running' as drivers were often left with no alternative other than to use less suitable routes [notably Storrington] to avoid severe congestion around Arundel. Finally, Councillor Dr Walsh referred to poor transport connectivity, it was hoped that the Arundel Chord linking the south coast mainline to the Arun Valley train route could be explored as part of this process.

The Chairman announced that a recorded vote would now take place on Recommendation (1).

Those voting for Recommendation (1) were Councillors Mrs Catterson and Ms Thurston (2). Those voting against were Councillors Bennett, Bicknell, B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Mrs Caffyn, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Mrs Daniells, Dixon, Edwards, English, Mrs Gregory, Gunner, Mrs Hamilton, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Huntley, Kelly, Lury, Mrs Madeley, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton, Miss Rhodes, Miss Seex, Mrs Stainton, Tilbrook, Dr Walsh and Mrs Yeates (34). Councillors Mrs Staniforth, Mrs Warr and Mrs Worne abstained from voting.

Recommendation (1) was therefore LOST.

As Recommendation (1) had not been supported, Recommendation (2) was withdrawn and so the Chairman invited debate on Recommendation (3) which was for the Council to agree which option it would support to be submitted as its response to Highways England. There were six options, these being:

Full Council - 10.10.19

- Cyan (Option 1V5)
- Beige (Option 1V9)
- Crimson (Option 3V1)
- Magenta (Option 4/5AV1)
- Amber (Option 4/5AV2)
- Grey (Option 5BV1)

Councillors were reminded that they now had the opportunity to debate each of the six options listed above before a recorded vote would be taken on each option.

The following arguments were put forward in respect of the following route options:

### **Cyan, Beige and Amber**

Would divide Arundel and not solve congestion issues and would have the worst impact on the villages of Binsted and Walberton. Amber could be the safest route.

### **Crimson**

There were many arguments put forward to support this route as it would improve the safety of travellers; would reduce congestion; and would provide a substantial carbon footprint saving. It would reduce the impact of noise and would reduce the impact on the villages of Binsted and Walberton. The woodland to be lost was a conifer plantation which happened to be located on ancient woodland. Conifer plantations could contaminate soil and would need to be harvested at some point in the future. This route provided the best available balance between providing the much-needed bypass with the least impact on the local community. The Council had a duty to protect resident's homes.

Crimson was not a bad route, just not the best route. It would destroy 21 hectares of ancient woodland. There were concerns expressed that this would not be the safest option for travellers.

### **Magenta**

This route provided the most pragmatic balance by having the least impact on residents and the least loss of land. The following points were made:

- Magenta might look like the least damaging option, but it did cut through land that was the home for many rare species such as bats and owls – there were environmental issues to consider.
- Traffic in the area had increased and would continue to do so. A new bypass would take the pressure off the A259.
- This was the best option to deliver and improve inward investment
- Had the smallest impact on the South Downs National Park.

- A Ford Junction should be included as part of this option
- This is the most environmentally friendly route and least detrimental on homes

Councillor Dr Walsh, as proposer of the recommendations, highlighted his observations from the debate that had taken place. Firstly, he congratulated Councillors for executing a well conducted discussion on this vital issue. He stated that all arguments had been well presented and he thanked everyone for their contribution. The discussion held so far had highlighted the impact congestion was having with travellers taking alternative routes from the A27 to other minor roads not suitable for such volumes of traffic. Responding to concerns about environmental impact, the Magenta route had less of an environmental impact than the Crimson route. Back in 2017, the Council had shown general support for Option 5A but there had been caveats attached to this. HE has listened and had now moved one of the option routes westwards and this was the Magenta route. For that reason, the Council should support Magenta. All of the arguments for not supporting the Crimson route had been well itemised in Question Six asked at Public Question Time. Whatever option chosen, Councillor Dr Walsh stated that it was important for the Council to also put across points of vital importance. These were to ensure that the impact on residents and the environment be reduced as far as possible; that viaducts and bridges be built to the highest architectural standard; to encourage a Ford Junction; to consider using the port of Littlehampton and the River Arun to barge materials to the construction site; and to encourage the creation of a cycleway between the South Downs to the coast alongside the River Arun, forming an alternative form of local transport.

The Chief Executive confirmed that a recorded vote would now take place on each of the six options.

**For Option (1V5) Cyan**, no Councillors voted for this Option. Those who voted against it were Councillors Bennett, Bicknell, B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Mrs Caffyn, Mrs Catterson, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Mrs Daniells, Dixon, Edwards, English, Mrs Gregory, Gunner, Mrs Hamilton, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Huntley, Kelly, Lury, Mrs Madeley, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton, Miss Rhodes, Miss Seex, Mrs Staniforth, Mrs Stainton, Tilbrook, Ms Thurston, Dr Walsh and Mrs Yeates (37). Councillors Mrs Warr and Mrs Worne abstained from voting.

The Chairman then announced the outcome of this recorded vote which confirmed that Option (1V5) Cyan HAD NOT BEEN SUPPORTED.

A recorded vote then took place on **Option (1V9) Beige**. No Councillors voted for this Option. Those who voted against it were Councillors Bennett, Bicknell, B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Mrs Caffyn, Mrs Catterson, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Mrs Daniells, Dixon, Edwards, English, Mrs Gregory, Gunner, Mrs Hamilton, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Huntley, Kelly, Lury, Mrs Madeley, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton, Miss Rhodes, Miss Seex, Mrs Staniforth, Mrs Stainton, Tilbrook, Ms Thurston, Dr Walsh and Mrs Yeates (37). Councillors Mrs Warr and Mrs Worne abstained from voting.

Full Council - 10.10.19

The Chairman then announced the outcome of this recorded vote which confirmed that Option (1V9) Beige HAD NOT BEEN SUPPORTED.

A recorded vote then took place on **Option (3V1) Crimson**. Those voting for this Option were Councillors Coster, Dixon, Mrs Hamilton, Huntley, Northeast (5). Those voting against were Councillors Bennett, Bicknell, B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Mrs Caffyn, Mrs Catterson, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Edwards, English, Mrs Gregory, Gunner, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Kelly, Lury, Mrs Madeley, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton, Miss Rhodes, Miss Seex, Mrs Staniforth, Mrs Stainton, Tilbrook, Ms Thurston, Dr Walsh and Mrs Yeates (31). Councillors Mrs Daniells, Mrs Warr and Mrs Worne abstained from voting.

The Chairman then announced the outcome of this recorded vote which confirmed that Option (3V1) Crimson HAD NOT BEEN SUPPORTED.

A recorded vote took place on **Option (4/5AV1) Magenta**. Those voting for it were Councillors Bennett, Bicknell, B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Mrs Caffyn, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Mrs Daniells, Edwards, English, Mrs Gregory, Gunner, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Huntley, Kelly, Lury, Mrs Madeley, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton, Miss Rhodes, Miss Seex, Mrs Stainton, Tilbrook, Dr Walsh and Mrs Yeates (31). Those voting against were Councillor Mrs Catterson, Coster, Dixon, Mrs Hamilton and Ms Thurston (5). Councillors Mrs Staniforth, Mrs Warr and Mrs Worne abstained from voting.

The Chairman then announced the outcome of this recorded vote which confirmed that Option (4/5AV1) Magenta WAS SUPPORTED.

A recorded vote took place on **Option (4/5AV2) Amber**. No Councillors voted for this Option. Those voting against it were Councillors Bennett, Bicknell, B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Mrs Caffyn, Mrs Catterson, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Mrs Daniells, Dixon, Edwards, English, Mrs Gregory, Gunner, Mrs Hamilton, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Huntley, Kelly, Lury, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton, Miss Rhodes, Miss Seex, Mrs Staniforth, Mrs Stainton, Tilbrook, Ms Thurston, Dr Walsh and Mrs Yeates (36). Councillors Mrs Warr and Mrs Worne abstained from voting.

The Chairman then announced the outcome of this recorded vote which confirmed that Option (4/5AV2) Amber WAS NOT SUPPORTED.

A recorded vote then took place on **Option (5BV1) Grey**. No Councillors voted for this Option. Those voting against it were Councillors Bennett, Bicknell, B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Mrs Caffyn, Mrs Catterson, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Mrs Daniells, Dixon, Edwards, English, Mrs Gregory, Gunner, Mrs Hamilton, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Huntley, Kelly, Lury, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton, Miss Rhodes, Miss Seex, Mrs Staniforth, Mrs Stainton, Tilbrook, Ms Thurston, Dr Walsh and Mrs Yeates (36). Councillors Mrs Warr and Mrs Worne abstained from voting.

The Chairman then announced the outcome of this recorded vote which confirmed that Option (5BV1) Grey WAS NOT SUPPORTED.

The Chairman confirmed that Option (4/5AV1) Magenta had received the majority of the Council's votes.

The Council

**RESOLVED**

That Option (4/5AV1) Magenta be submitted to Highways England as this Council's supported option for the A27 Trunk Road, Improvements at Arundel.

The Chief Executive advised Members that now it had resolved that Option (4/5AV1) Magenta was this Council's supported option, it now had to agree the comments set out in Recommendation (4) (a) to (f). A request was made that the voting on these elements of Recommendation (4) be taken on block and without a recorded vote. This was agreed by the Council.

Having undertaken the voting on Recommendation (4) (a) to (f) via a show of hands the Chairman announced that 32 Councillors had voted for the recommendations and three had abstained from voting. There were no votes against.

The Council

**RESOLVED – That**

As Option (4/5AV1) Magenta had been confirmed as the Council's supported Option the following comments be made to Highways England:

- (a) The Council urges Highways England to consider all potential opportunities on any preferred route corridor, which would further reduce the impact on residents and the environment;
- (b) The Council encourages Highways England to construct any bypass and consequential embankment, viaducts and bridges to the highest possible architectural standards and to take appropriate account of any potential flooding issues;
- (c) The Council would encourage Highways England to consider amending any 'off-line' preferred route to provide a junction between the proposed A27 Bypass and Ford Road to improve accessibility to and from communities (existing and proposed) south of the South Coast Mainline Railway and the residential amenity of residents in Ford Road, Arundel;
- (d) The Council would welcome further investigation into the routing of Footpath 2207 at Crossbush, with the potential for an on-line footbridge rather than a diversion that is routed close to the Arun Valley Railway;

Full Council - 10.10.19

- (e) The Council would encourage Highways England to consider using the port of Littlehampton and the River Arun to barge aggregate and other construction materials to the construction site; and
- (f) The Council would encourage Highways England to support, through their 'Designated Funds', the creation of a cycleway between the South Downs National Park via Arundel to the coast, along the River Arun and improved parking for commuters, tourists and residents at Ford Railway Station.

Councillor Dr Walsh then formally proposed Recommendation (5) which sought the Council's approval to delegate authority to the Director of Place to commission and submit any Local Impact Statement required as part of a formal Development Consent Order process working collaboratively with West Sussex County Council, Arundel Town Council, Walberton Parish Council and the South Downs National Park Authority. This recommendation was then seconded by Councillor Oppler.

The Chairman invited Councillor Mrs Catterson to speak as she had confirmed that she wished to propose an amendment to this recommendation. She proposed adding the words "**Lyminster and Crossbush Parish Council**" after the words Walberton Parish Council in view of the impact of the proposals on this Parish area. Councillor Ms Thurston seconded this amendment.

As there was no debate on this amendment, Councillors Oppler, as seconder to the recommendation, and Dr Walsh, as proposer to the recommendation were asked if they were willing to accept this amendment. They both confirmed that they were happy for this amendment to be incorporated into what they had originally proposed at Recommendation (5).

The voting on this amendment declared it as being CARRIED.

The Council

RESOLVED

Delegated authority be granted to the Director of Place to commission and submit any Local Impact Statement required as part of a formal Development Consent Order process working collaboratively with West Sussex County Council, Arundel Town Council, Walberton Parish Council, Lyminster and Crossbush Parish Council and the South Downs National Park Authority.

(The meeting concluded at 8.00 pm)