

**SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 1 MARCH 2023**

**AGENDA ITEM 3 – PUBLIC QUESTION TIME – ORDER IN WHICH THE CHAIR OF THE COUNCIL WILL INVITE QUESTIONS BELOW RECEIVED IN WRITING IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING**

1. From Mr Hamilton to the Chair of the Planning Committee, Councillor Chapman
- 2.

**FULL DETAIL OF THE QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED IS DETAILED BELOW**

Note, the Chair will:

- invite questions from members of the public who have submitted in writing their questions in line with the Council's Constitution.
- confirm that Public Question Time allows Members of the public to ask one question at a time and that a maximum of one minute is allowed for each question;
- state that questions will be invited in the order in which they have been received and that if there is time remaining from the 15 minutes allowed for Public Question Time, questioners will be allowed to ask a supplementary question.
- Outline that if in the opinion of the Monitoring Officer the question relates to the terms of reference of a Council committee, the question is to be accepted by Full Council and be automatically referred by Full Council without discussion or debate to the relevant committee and that the questioner would have been advised of this at the time they submitted their question

**QUESTION ONE**

**From Mr Hamilton to the Chair of the Planning Committee, Councillor Chapman**

**Question**

In the highly contentious application P/188/22/DOC, in which the applicant sought to have Condition 30 (in essence the provision of alternative feeding grounds for Brent Geese) discharged, a commercial company situated in Essex and employed and funded by Arun district council tax payers to advise on Ecological aspects of planning applications, submitted a report in which it repeated the conditions imposed by ADC, followed by four lines of text as follows:

*We are satisfied that the submitted Brent Goose Mitigation Plan (Ecology Solutions, December 2022) includes the details required by Condition 30. The document includes all of the detail outlined within the condition wording. As stated within the document the responsible party for carrying out this mitigation plan are (sic) responsible for ensuring it is adhered to in perpetuity.*

Followed by:

**Recommendation** : Condition 30

*Subject to implementation in full of the submitted details, we recommend discharge of Condition 30.*

In other words, the consultant is recommending discharge as long as the developer does as required by ADC which a plethora of evidence shows they have not. It is patently obvious they have not visited the site.

I would therefore like to know what mechanism is in place to ensure that taxpayers money is being spent appropriately and not squandered on sub-standard products, and who is responsible for this quality control.

### **Question**

Thank you for your question. I am aware that you have made written representations on the application and Karl Roberts, Director of Growth, has confirmed how the Council obtained Ecological advice and who that is from. You are also aware that the planning application you refer to is currently undetermined.

You have communicated with the Council's Ecological Advisors directly (on 30 January 2023) and Planning Officers are currently discussing these matters before the application is determined. We are awaiting a response from Natural England on the matter. As Natural England required the said condition through the Appropriate Assessment process, their response is essential.

If the condition is discharged, it will be so on the basis that the measures in the ecological proposals are implemented. If they are not, then the developer will be in breach of this condition. This is entirely normal way to determine a discharge of condition application.