

Public Document Pack

Subject to approval at the next Full Council meeting

475

MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE ARUN CIVIC CENTRE ON 3 MARCH 2022 at 6.00 PM

Present: Councillors Brooks (Chair), Staniforth (Vice-Chair), Bicknell, Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Buckland, Caffyn, Catterson, Chace, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Dendle, Dixon, Edwards, Elkins, Mrs English, English, Gregory, Gunner, Hamilton, Haywood, Hughes, Jones, Lury, Madeley, Needs, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Pendleton, Rhodes, Roberts, Stainton, Stanley, Thurston, Walsh, Worne and Yeates.

The following Members were absent from the meeting during consideration of the matters referred to in the Minutes indicated:-
Councillors Jones and Needs - Minute 692 (Part). Councillor Needs – voting on the amendment and Councillor Jones – voting on the substantive recommendations.

685. WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed Councillors, representatives of the public, press and Officers to this Special Meeting of the Council.

686. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Baker, Batley, Bennett, Charles, Chapman, Goodheart, Huntley, Kelly, Purchase, Seex, Tilbrook and Warr and from Honorary Aldermen Mrs Stinchcombe and Mr Dingemans.

687. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Roberts declared a Personal Interest in Agenda Item 7 [National Highways Proposals for the A27 Arundel Improvements – response to Statutory Consultation (Grey route)]. This was because of where he lived, and he confirmed that the Bypass would be of benefit to him and his family. This was a personal benefit that would not influence his decision making. Councillor Roberts confirmed that he would be taking part in the debate and the vote on this item.

The Declaration of Interest Sheet set out below confirms 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 any of the issues to be discussed at the meeting.

Full Council - 3.03.22

| Name | Town or Parish Council or West Sussex County Council [WSSC] |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Councillor Tracy Baker | Littlehampton |
| Councillor Kenton Batley | Bognor Regis |
| Councillor Jamie Bennett | Rustington |
| Councillor Paul Bicknell | Angmering |
| Councillor Billy Blanchard-Cooper | Littlehampton |
| Councillor Jim Brooks | Bognor Regis |
| Councillor Ian Buckland | Littlehampton and WSSC |
| Councillor David Chace | Littlehampton |
| Councillor Mike Clayden | Rustington |
| Councillor Andy Cooper | Rustington |
| Councillor Alison Cooper | Rustington and WSSC |
| Councillor Sandra Daniells | Bognor Regis |
| Councillor Roger Elkins | Ferring and WSSC |
| 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 Henry Jones | Bognor Regis |
| Councillor Martin Lury | Bersted |
| Councillor Claire Needs | Bognor Regis |
| Councillor Mike Northeast | Littlehampton |
| Councillor Francis Oppler | WSSC |
| Councillor Jacky Pendleton | Middleton-on-Sea and WSSC |
| Councillor Vicky Rhodes | Littlehampton |
| Councillor Emily Seex | Littlehampton |
| Councillor Martin Smith | Aldwick |
| Councillor Samantha Staniforth | Bognor Regis |
| Councillor Matt Stanley | Bognor Regis |
| Councillor Isabel Thurston | Barnham & Eastergate |
| Councillor Will Tilbrook | Littlehampton |
| Councillor James Walsh | Littlehampton and WSSC |
| Councillor Jeanette Warr | Bognor Regis |
| Councillor Amanda Worne | Yapton |
| Councillor Gillian Yeates | Bersted |

688. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Chair confirmed that this Council had been invited to respond to the Statutory Consultation put forward by National Highways. Until Councillors had considered the Officer report and taken part in a debate, it was not possible to anticipate if the recommendations would be adopted, rejected or amended.

Based on this, the Chair confirmed that he would be responding to the two questions put before the Council this evening as the meeting was meant to be deciding its response to the consultation of which the Officer report was merely a suggested response.

The Chair confirmed that two questions had been submitted – these have been very briefly summarised below:

1. From Councillor Vawer from Walberton Parish Council
2. From Mr Waller – Chair of OneArundel A27 ByPass Group

A supplementary question was asked by Councillor Vawer.

(A schedule of the full questions asked, and the responses provided can be found on the Public Question Web page at: <https://www.arun.gov.uk/public-question-time>)

The Chairman then drew Public Question Time to a close.

689. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS WITH PECUNIARY/PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS

There were no Questions from Members with prejudicial/pecuniary interests.

690. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair confirmed that he felt that it was important this evening to mention the current situation in Ukraine. He stated that the thoughts and prayers were with all of those where their lives have been turned upside down and who had gone from living their normal daily lives to now living in fear and fleeing their homes. Many residents in Arun would be from Ukraine or Russia and would have loved ones there that they were concerned about and so the council's thoughts were with these community members.

The Chair confirmed that the council was flying the flag of Ukraine here at the Civic Centre and at the Bognor Regis Town Hall, and that it had lit these buildings in blue and yellow as a sign of support.

691. URGENT MATTERS

The Chair confirmed that there were no items for this meeting.

692. NATIONAL HIGHWAYS' PROPOSALS FOR THE A27 ARUNDEL IMPROVEMENTS - RESPONSE TO STATUTORY CONSULTATION (GREY ROUTE)

The Chair confirmed that this Special Meeting of the Council had been called to allow the Council to consider and respond to National Highways with a corporate response to the Statutory Consultation regarding the preferred route for the Arundel section of the A27 Trunk Road Improvements.

Full Council - 3.03.22

The Interim Group Head of Law & Governance and Monitoring Officer reminded Members that the purpose of this meeting was to provide a response to National Highways as part of its statutory consultation. It was not for the Council to consider a case for choosing a route, but to make comment upon the National Highways' (NH) preferred route. It was important for Members to take this point into account.

The Chair then invited Councillor Gunner to propose the recommendations as set out in the Officer report.

Before proposing these recommendations, Councillor Gunner made a statement about the situation in Ukraine.

Turning to the Arundel Bypass he outlined how vital the improvements were to the Town of Arundel and to the district's overall economy including West Sussex and the South of England. The economic benefits were clear; the bypass was needed; this was millions of pounds of investment for the area; the population of Arun had grown significantly over time and so road infrastructure was essential. The grey route proposed was the infrastructure that was required. It was highlighted that the residents of Littlehampton and Bognor Regis would not appreciate the Council turning down a brand new road in the district. Economic growth in Arun was essential along with more car movement, more visitors and tourists to assist regeneration and in bringing more investment into the district's economy, stimulating growth, jobs and prosperity.

The Grey route had been chosen by (NH) to work around the National Park as the South Downs National Park had opposed the previously favoured Magenta route. The Grey route had been chosen to reduce impact on woodland and the South Downs National Park. Councillor Gunner reminded Members that tonight the purpose of the meeting was not to debate what Councillors saw as their favourite route, it was an opportunity to pass comment on the route selected by NH, the Grey route.

Councillor Gunner stated that he supported the need for an Arundel bypass, to not have a bypass was not a viable option. He supported the need to have a Ford Road junction and maintained that the Council had to continue to work with WSCC and NH to ensure this would happen. Councillor Gunner supported all works to reduce congestion at the Fontwell roundabouts; he shared the concerns of residents of some of the villages and supported all work to reduce rat-running through Walberton; a Ford Road Junction would help but other access points had to be considered. He supported all and any work to mitigate and challenge flooding on the flood plain at Arun and he expressed his deep frustration over NH's inability to produce and provide up to date data and information to local communities.

He urged NH to urgently embrace greater transparency so that the most accurate information be made available. He had difficulty in understanding that the Grey route was the option for consideration in terms of the many problems that would not be faced had the Magenta route been selected. He did not understand why NH had ignored the information contained within the Local Plan and the projected housing growth which was substantially less than what the Council would be facing. Amongst all of this, there were strong messages being expressed by residents. Arundel wanted the bypass and this message needed to be made clear to NH whilst at the same time firmly expressing the concerns and views of residents in Walberton and other nearby villages.

Councillor Gunner therefore confirmed that he was happy to propose the recommendations but with slight amendments. He looked forward to NH's response to the consultation and the council's comments hoping that these would be taken on board.

The Interim Group Head of Law & Governance and Monitoring Officer confirmed that the amendments to the recommendations in the report were largely technical additions which would allow Officers to respond to the planning inspectorate and to take part in the examination as required and to submit additional documents in relation to the adequacy of consultation and the local impact report. These were normal stages in such a process which had not yet been reached. These additional actions would only be required if NH decided to submit the application. If this did not occur, the Council would not be required to submit an adequacy of consultation response or a local impact report. The amendments gave authority and provided the appropriate delegations to allow officers to do that following tonight's meeting.

Councillor Pendleton then seconded the recommendations.

In line with the Council's Constitution [Council Procedure Rule 4.3 – Procedure for Debates at Special Meeting] the Chair confirmed that before moving to a debate, where amendments could be made, he would be inviting Councillors to ask technical questions and to make statements first.

The Chair then invited technical questions from Members and statements and these were made.

The Interim Group Head of Law & Governance provided advice reminding Councillors that the pre-application consultation had been conducted by NH and not by the council. Councillors had to respond to the consultation based on the information provided by NH. If NH had provided figures on the economic benefits that was the figure that Members needed to be addressing, it was not a council decision on whether to build the A27 bypass or not it was for the Council to confirm to NH its response to the preferred route option announced by NH.

The Chair then returned to the recommendations in the report. An adjournment was called to allow amendments to be prepared to share to the meeting.

Full Council - 3.03.22

Councillor Gunner then proposed the following amendments – as shown below – additions have been shown in **bold**.

- (1) To authorise the Chief Executive to respond specifically in respect of the Grey Route proposal Statutory Consultation as follows:
 - (a) Welcome the opportunity to comment upon the proposals for the off-line ‘Grey Route’ bypass proposals.
 - (b) Notwithstanding the Council’s preferred option: the Magenta route, not being taken forward, support is given to the Grey route subject to the following (c) & (d)
 - (c) The current discussions regarding inclusion of a south facing Ford Road Junction with the new A27 road continue between all relevant partners.
 - (d) National Highways strive to further mitigate to reduce rat-running and increased traffic in local villages, especially Walberton
 - (e) Suggest that a high-level deck is the most appropriate form for the viaduct across the River Arun valley and flood plain providing there is no compromise in respect of a Ford Road Junction**
 - (f) In regard to the Yapton Lane options, to take forward the option that has the less risk and greater constructability but suggest that this should be balanced by the views of the immediately affected residents and businesses
 - (g) Encourage National Highways to continue dialogue with the Littlehampton Harbour Board in respect of utilising the port of Littlehampton in the construction phase of the project
 - (h) Reiterate the Council’s comments made in respect of the previous consultation (October 2019), to consider all potential opportunities, which would further reduce the impact on residents and the environment.**

2 That Full Council

- (a) authorises the Director of Place, where the Director considers it necessary, to respond to any further stages of pre-submission consultation, in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee in support of the formal response approved under Recommendation 1.**
- (c) if an application for a Development Consent Order is submitted, authorises the Director of Place where the Director considers necessary, to:**
 - (i) approve the Council’s ‘adequacy of consultation’ response;**
 - (ii) prepare and submit the Council’s written representation and Local Impact Report; to negotiate with the applicant on the DCO requirements, any S106 Agreement, and the preparation of a Statement of Common Ground; and to comment on the written representations of third parties – all in support of the formal response approved under Recommendation 1;**

(iii) attend the examination hearings and answer the Examining Authority's questions in support of the Council's position; and

3. That representation be made to Government (Department for Transport (DfT) and Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC), to urge a resolution to the mis-match in guidance and methodologies for traffic modelling thus cost benefit analysis, for new road schemes and development projections.
and
- 4 Note that a business case is being developed in partnership with West Sussex County Council and encourage the continuation of partnership working with National Highways in addressing the Council's concerns over the Ford Road Junction

Councillor Pendleton then seconded these amendments.

The Chair then invited debate on this amendment.

Councillor Dixon confirmed that he wished to make an amendment. This is shown below with additions shown in **bold** and deletions shown using ~~strikethrough~~:

(1) To authorise the Chief Executive to respond specifically in respect of the Grey Route proposal Statutory Consultation as follows:

- (a) Welcome the opportunity to comment upon the proposals for the off-line 'Grey Route' bypass proposals;
- ~~(b) Notwithstanding the Council's preferred option: the Magenta route, not being taken forward, support is given to the Grey route subject to the following (c) & (d);~~

Notes that none of the Council's Members supported the Grey Route and regrets that the National Highways decision to proceed with the Grey Route has, in essence, usurped local democracy;

- ~~(e) Notwithstanding the Council's~~ **The current discussions regarding inclusion of a south facing Ford Road Junction with the new A27 road continue between all relevant partners; support for an offline A27 Arundel bypass the Council believes that the very considerable damage that will be caused to the local environment and biodiversity and in particular to the communities of Binsted, Fontwell and Walberton by the Grey Route renders it unacceptable**

Full Council - 3.03.22

- ~~(d) National Highways strive to further mitigate to reduce rat-running and increased traffic in local villages, especially Walberton; **are required to constructively reconsider in detail all remaining alternatives**~~
- ~~(e) Suggest that a high-level deck is the most appropriate form for the viaduct across the River Arun valley and flood plain; **the current discussions regarding inclusion of south facing Ford Road junction with the new A27 road continue between all relevant partners**~~
- ~~(f) In regard to the Yapton Lane options, to take forward the option that has the less risk and greater constructability but suggest that this should be balanced by the views of the immediately affected residents and businesses; **If National Highways persists with pursuing the Grey Route there must be an undertaking not to proceed until the problems of rat running and increased traffic in local villages, especially Walberton, have been fully discussed and agreed with representatives of those villages and this Council. Also a scheme acceptable to local villages and this Council to solve the bottlenecks at the East and West Fontwell roundabouts is in hand for prompt completion.**~~
- ~~(g) Encourage National Highways to continue dialogue with the Littlehampton Harbour Board in respect of utilising the port of Littlehampton in the construction phase of the project **Suggest that a high level deck is the most appropriate form for the viaduct across the River Arun Valley and flood plain.**~~
- ~~(h) **If National Highways persists with pursuing the Grey Route and in regard to the Yapton Lane options, to take forward the option that has the less risk and greater constructability but suggest that this should be balanced by the views of the immediately affected residents and businesses.**~~
- ~~(i) **Encourage National Highways to continue dialogue with the Littlehampton Harbour Board in respect of utilising the port of Littlehampton in the construction phase of the project.**~~

2. That representation be made to Government (Department for Transport (DfT) and Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC), to urge a resolution to the mis-match in guidance and methodologies for traffic modelling thus cost benefit analysis, for new road schemes and development projections; and

3 Note that a business case is being developed in partnership with West Sussex County Council and encourage the continuation of partnership working with National Highways in addressing the Council's concerns over the Ford Road Junction

Councillor Coster seconded this amendment.

Councillor Dixon then explained his amendment and his concerns over the intolerable pressure this route would inflict onto other village areas. Binsted would be destroyed and the village of Walberton would become an unbearable rat-run. The Council also needed to receive assurances about the impacts for the Fontwell roundabouts before the project should proceed. The main argument for not accepting his amendment seemed to be a fear over what NH or the Government might do next. It was vital for the council to make decisions for the right reasons not over concerns that the funding for the bypass might be withdrawn, as had been the case for Chichester. Councillor Dixon was sure that this would not be repeated in this situation and so the council needed to fight for what was right and needed to ensure that it would make the right decision for the district. There was a complete lack of transparency in terms of the consultation conducted by NH and the message to NH was that it should rethink its proposals.

The Chair then invited debate on this amendment.

Although there were Councillors that agreed with much of what Councillor Dixon had said in proposing his amendment, they questioned the statements made and the evidence that went with it. The key thread in speeches made opposing the amendment was that the district needed a bypass. The whole of the economy of the district relied upon its provision to support employment, regeneration and tourism. The risk of what happened at Chichester could not happen here.

There were Councillors who stated that they could not support the amendment as the purpose of this meeting was not to redesign a preferred route, that proposal had been made by NH.

Others thought that the amendment was negating the original motion because it was confirming that although the council wanted a bypass, it wanted one on different terms. This was not possible as there were no other route options. It was necessary for the council to make the right decision for the whole of the district and the fact was that this was about accepting the overwhelming need for the bypass.

Other Councillors pointed out that the matters of concern expressed did need to be addressed and that this would be covered by the Planning Inspector, this was still a very early stage of the process. There was no alternative proposal. Councillors understood the passions in presenting alternative proposals; and the implications for all residents in Arun and businesses in the South East were not fully understood, however, the risk of the scheme not being delivered had far greater implications.

Some Councillors confirmed that they were sympathetic to some elements of the amendment such as addressing rat-running in nearby villages. The biggest risk was the fear of NH withdrawing from this scheme. The proposals were better than no options and Councillors needed to be mindful of what had happened at Chichester. Other Councillors were of the view that this decision should not be made based on fear, this would not happen. This decision was not about saying that a bypass was not wanted or needed but about the need to better the whole economy, ensuring that the right mitigation was undertaken and the need for a Ford Road junction accepted. The council

Full Council - 3.03.22

had to stand hard and had to ensure that the proposals were right for the district. The environmental damage and biodiversity impact also had to be considered and it was strongly felt that the council had to express support to the residents that would be affected and should have the courage to say what it was not prepared to tolerate. An argument was made for the provision of a Fontwell flyover.

Councillor Coster, as seconder to the amendment, urged Councillors to support it as it represented supporting residents that would be adversely affected. The council could not accept the damage the bypass would do by destroying residents' homes and communities and to the environment and biodiversity. Severe unreversible damage would be done to the western villages due to rat-running which could not be accepted to just save 6 minutes of journey time. This did not justify the damage that would be made. The congestion that would occur at the Fontwell roundabouts could not be accepted, there were many disbenefits that the Grey route would bring to the district. There were alternatives and the amendment proposed called for closer consideration of these alternatives.

Councillor Dixon, as proposer of the amendment, confirmed that the Grey route was the most damaging environmentally. It was longer than the other route options and would destroy more habitat. The priority was protecting local communities not conifer plantations. Ancient woodland was being destroyed to make way for other forms of infrastructure around the country and so why was this plantation so sacrosanct? There was no answer to this question. The council was being asked to give its retrospective approval to the Grey route. Councillor Dixon felt that this should not happen and that the council should standby residents and seek a route that did not damage communities. He felt that NH and SDNP were not acting on behalf of their communities and so the council needed to stand up and support its residents. Councillor Dixon was keen to see an offline bypass but was not prepared to see a bad option.

A recorded vote had been requested on this amendment.

Those voting for it were Councillors Buckland, Coster, Dixon, Hamilton, Haywood, Northeast, Thurston and Worne (8). Those voting against were Councillors Bicknell, Bower, Caffyn, Chace, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Dendle, Edwards, Elkins, Mrs English, English, Gunner, Hughes, Madeley, Oliver-Redgate, Pendleton, Rhodes, Roberts, Staniforth (20). Councillors Blanchard-Cooper, Brooks, Gregory, Jones, Lury, Oppler, Stainton, Stanley, Walsh and Yeates abstained from voting (10).

The amendment was therefore declared LOST.

Councillor Walsh confirmed that he wished to make an amendment. He confirmed his wish and support for the Magenta route to be reconsidered and confirmed his reluctance in supporting the Grey route, but this was the only remaining option. It was his view that for Recommendation (1) Parts, (b), (c) and (d) these needed amending because many Councillors believed strongly and had spoken to support the inclusion of a junction at Ford Road. This needed to be stated more forcibly, the recommendations should leave the option open to impress upon NH for a junction with Ford Road was essential for local residents and by the business community. Looking at (d), he supported the concerns of residents at Walberton along The Street which would be met by huge congestion along a narrow road with no proper pavements. Councillor Walsh also referred to the roundabout capacity at the top of Fontwell Avenue and eastern junction coming down from Slindon, they were crucial to the A27 delivering its benefits. Balancing this, there was threat that NH might walk away and take its funding elsewhere. The council therefore needed to reflect the mood of this meeting in that it was not entirely happy but subject to the rest of the amendment and the other conditions proposed it could support it which would enable the motion to give qualified support.

The wording of this amendment is set out below – with additions shown using **bold** and deletions shown using ~~strikethrough~~:

- (1) To authorise the Chief Executive to respond specifically in respect of the Grey Route proposal Statutory Consultation as follows:
 - (a) Welcome the opportunity to comment upon the proposals for the off-line 'Grey Route' bypass proposals;
 - (b) **The Council re-states is previously expressed overwhelming support for** ~~Notwithstanding the Council's preferred option:~~ the Magenta route. **It reluctantly gives qualified support for the less satisfactory** ~~, not being taken forward, support is given to the Grey route,~~ subject to **much more detailed information from National Highways on environmental considerations for local residents and natural habitat and to** the following (c) & (d);
 - ~~(c) The current discussions regarding inclusion of a south facing Ford Road Junction with the new A27 road continue between all relevant partners;~~ **inclusion of a junction with Ford Road and the new A27**
 - (d) **Further mitigation** ~~National Highways strive to further mitigate~~ to reduce rat-running and increased traffic in local villages, especially Walberton; **and also traffic management, including roundabout capacity, at the Fontwell A29 junctions.**
 - (e) Suggest that a high-level deck is the most appropriate form for the viaduct across the River Arun valley and flood plain;
 - (f) In regard to the Yapton Lane options, to take forward the option that has the less risk and greater constructability but suggest that this should be balanced by the views of the immediately affected residents and businesses;

Full Council - 3.03.22

- (g) Encourage National Highways to continue dialogue with the Littlehampton Harbour Board in respect of utilising the port of Littlehampton in the construction phase of the project

Councillor Jones seconded this amendment confirming that he did not support any route that did not have a Ford Road Junction. He strongly believed that the Council needed to be steadfast stipulating certain assurances otherwise the strength of support and need for a junction and proper mitigation for Walberton would be lost.

Councillor Gunner, as proposer to the substantive recommendations, confirmed that he would be prepared to accept this amendment subject to some minor tweaking. The Chair allowed a few minutes for rapid consultation within the Chamber amongst Councillors. The finalised wording to the suggested amendments to Recommendation 1 (b) was then agreed.

- (b) The Council re-states its previously expressed overwhelming support for Notwithstanding the Council's preferred option: the Magenta route. It reluctantly gives in principle conditional qualified support in principle for the less satisfactory , not being taken forward, support is given to the Grey route subject to much more detailed information from National Highways on environmental considerations for local residents and natural habitat and to the following (c) & (d);**

This further amendment was seconded by Councillor Pendleton as the seconder to the substantive recommendations. Councillors Walsh and Jones confirmed that they supported these further changes.

The Chair then invited debate on the amendment. This achieved support from most Members as it provided a stronger request to resolve the environmental concerns and seek detailed mitigation.

Following further debate, Councillor Gunner proposed that "the question be now put" and this was seconded by Councillor Edwards. The Chair confirmed that he felt that the matter had been adequately discussed and put this Motion without Notice to the vote. This was declared CARRIED.

The Chair then invited Councillor Pendleton, as seconder to the substantive recommendations, to speak. She confirmed that she very much welcomed the cross party debate and support showing that Councillors were working together for the benefit of the district's residents. She believed that the proposed new road was essential to support the district's economy, even though Grey was not this council's preferred option. It was the only option and so Councillors now had to work hard to resolve all of the issues raised. She therefore urged Councillors to support the substantive recommendations.

The Chair invited Councillor Gunner, as proposer of the substantive recommendations, to speak. He thanked Members for the debate and for their full and detailed reviews and urged Councillors to support the recommendations.

A recorded vote had been requested on the substantive recommendations. Those voting for were Councillors Bicknell, Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Caffyn, Chace, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Dendle, Edwards, Elkins, Mrs English, English, Gregory, Gunner, Hughes, Lury, Madeley, Northeast, Pendleton, Stainton, Staniforth, Stanley, Walsh and Yeates (25). Those voting against were Councillors Coster, Dixon, Hamilton, Haywood, Thurston and Worne (6). Councillors Brooks, Buckland, Oliver-Redgate and Roberts abstained from voting.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

- (1) The Chief Executive be authorised to respond specifically in respect of the Grey Route proposed Statutory Consultation as follows:
 - (a) Welcomes the opportunity to comment upon the proposals for the off-line 'Grey Route' bypass proposals;
 - (b) The Council re-states its previously expressed overwhelming support for the Magenta route. It gives in principle support for the less satisfactory Grey route subject to much more detailed information from National Highways on environmental considerations for local residents and natural habitat and to the following (c) & (d);
 - (c) Inclusion of a junction with Ford Road and the new A27;
 - (d) Further mitigation to reduce rat-running and increased traffic in local villages, especially Walberton and also traffic management, including roundabout capacity, at the Fontwell A29 junctions;
 - (e) Suggest that a high-level deck is the most appropriate form for the viaduct across the River Arun valley and flood plain providing there is no compromise in respect of a Ford Road Junction;
 - (f) In regard to the Yapton Lane options, to take forward the option that has the less risk and greater constructability but suggest that this should be balanced by the views of the immediately affected residents and businesses;
 - (g) Encourage National Highways to continue dialogue with the Littlehampton Harbour Board in respect of utilising the port of Littlehampton in the construction phase of the project;
 - (h) Reiterate the Council's comments made in respect of the previous consultation (October 2019), to consider all potential opportunities, which would further reduce the impact on residents and the environment.

Full Council - 3.03.22

(2) That Full Council

- (a) authorises the Director of Place, where the Director considers it necessary, to respond to any further stages of pre-submission consultation, in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee in support of the formal response approved under Recommendation 1.
- (b) if an application for a Development Consent Order is submitted, authorises the Director of Place where the Director considers necessary, to:
 - (i) approve the Council's 'adequacy of consultation' response;
 - (ii) prepare and submit the Council's written representation and Local Impact Report; to negotiate with the applicant on the DCO requirements, any S106 Agreement, and the preparation of a Statement of Common Ground; and to comment on the written representations of third parties – all in support of the formal response approved under Recommendation 1;
 - (iii) attend the examination hearings and answer the Examining Authority's questions in support of the Council's position; and

3) That representation be made to Government (Department for Transport (DfT) and Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC), to urge a resolution to the mis-match in guidance and methodologies for traffic modelling thus cost benefit analysis, for new road schemes and development projections; and

4 Note that a business case is being developed in partnership with West Sussex County Council and encourage the continuation of partnership working with National Highways in addressing the Council's concerns over the Ford Road Junction.

693. MOTIONS

The Chair confirmed that no Motions had been submitted for this meeting.

(The meeting concluded at 10.06 pm)