

Questions , Answers and Actions - Arun County Local Forum 20 June 2022

County Councillors in attendance:

Trevor Bence, Alison Cooper, Keir Greenway(Chairman), Dawn Hall, Gary Markwell, Francis Oppler, Ashvin Patel, Jacky Pendleton, Deborah Urquhart.

Apologies: David Britton, Roger Elkins, John Charles, James Walsh

Question 1 from Liz Mac:

Given the proposed new housing developments in Felpham where services already are unable to deal with a number of stresses on local communities - vehicles speeding along narrow roads that have a 20 mph limit with no consequences for those breaking speed restrictions; Southern Water already unable, or perhaps unwilling, to cope with wastewater issues in the area-hence dumping of raw sewage; growing noise and air pollution from traffic and low flying light aircraft-e.g. LEC airstrip; and biodiversity loss due to, amongst other things, unnecessary mowing and spraying of vergers, what measures are being taken to mitigate the consequences of even more people coming into the area through new building developments?

Response to Question 1 (local member is Jacky Pendleton covering for John Charles):

The County Council is not responsible for planning for new homes in West Sussex; that is the responsibility of the local planning authorities (LPA), i.e. the district and borough councils, and the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA). Those authorities are required to plan for the needs of their area, including housing, through a document called the Local Plan. In the preparation of their Local Plans, the LPA and SDNPA must objectively assess the housing needs of their area and allocate land to meet those needs. They must also consider the need for supporting facilities and services (including water supply and wastewater) by engaging with the relevant service providers, including the County Council, through the plan-making process.

The County Council is only a statutory consultee in the plan-making process and it does not have any control over the decisions made by other authorities. The Authority is consulted by the LPAs and SDNPA at various stages in the plan-making process; this involves commenting on draft policies and proposals (including the allocation of land for new homes and other uses) with regard to their impact on the delivery of the County Council's duties, responsibilities and services; this includes highways, education, libraries, fire and rescue, flood risk management, and waste management.

Similarly, planning applications for housing are determined by the LPAs and the SDNPA. As a statutory consultee in the process, the County Council comments on relevant highways, transport and flood risk matters. However, it is up to the LPA/SDNPA to decide how much weight (if any) should be attached to those comments and the County Council has no control over the decisions that are made.

In summary, questions about the amount and location of new housing (and supporting infrastructure) and decisions about specific planning applications for housing should be directed to the relevant planning authority, which is Arun District Council with regard to Felpham.

In response to this answer the resident expressed disappointment about the lack of joined up working on issues such as this. The resident suggested Citizens Assemblies could be an answer. It was agreed she would speak to Cllr Jacky Pendleton about this after the meeting.

Question 2 from Ann Sheppard:

When will the train crossing in Toddington Lane , Littlehampton be closed as agreed in planning?

Response to Question 2 (local member Gary Markwell):

The current obligation upon the developer, through their planning permission, is to use best endeavours to try to close the level crossing at Toddington Lane. In the event an objection is upheld to its closure, the developer is then required to provide improvements to the existing arrangement.

At the present time there are a number of technical matters still under consideration by the developer's transport consultants and as such, we do not have a date for a resolution either-way.

For your information, the County Council has been consulted by the National Casework Team at the Department for Transport in relation to this proposed stopping up of the highway associated with the potential closure of the level crossing. The County Council is only a consultee in the process. The County Council as local highway authority is keeping them informed as the aforementioned discussions continue. However, should you wish to make any representations directly to the Department, the contact there is Mr. Paul Harrison, Casework Manager, National Casework Team, Newcastle-Upon-Tyne.

Cllr Gary Markwell agreed to take forward the residents' concerns. Cllr Deborah Urquhart added that the process can take some time due to the legal process if objections are received and the stopping up process.

Questions 3 - 9 are all related to the Rampion project:

Question 3 from Jon Bell:

Is WSCC aware that a number of estate agents are predicting an inevitable drop in coastal property values should Rampion 2 get approval, particularly those with a direct view of the turbines? Surely this must be included in the economic impact when WSCC compile their LIR? Aside from the houses along the coast, there are hundreds of sea-facing flats in Bognor, Littlehampton, Rustington and Worthing that will be effected both by the visual degrading as well as the property values. These days, many property owners depend on equity release to support themselves in later life, or to help their children get a start on the property ladder, so any reduction in value will have a direct impact

Is WSCC aware of the low efficiency of Rampion 2 predicted by RWE compared to other sites around the UK ? Will this factor be taken into account when

compiling the LIR? RWE are claiming that Rampion 2 will be able to power 1 million homes and save 600,000 tonnes of Carbon Dioxide each year. When this claim is worked back from the Power Output of 1200MW, it produces a load factor of 35%. There are windfarms in the North Sea and Dogger Bank that have load factors of 56-69%, meaning that up to twice the number of homes could be supplied for the same power output. Surely this has to be part of the decision process. The more efficient the windfarm is, the less gas energy is needed to back up generation when the wind stops blowing.

Response to Question 3 (local member Dawn Hall):

No, the County Council is not aware that a number of estate agents are predicting a drop in coastal property values if a future application for Rampion 2 receives consent. In due course, the County Council will take account of all relevant socio-economic information in preparing its Local Impact Report. Rampion will have to include the need case as part of the application for development consent, which will include the capacity of the proposed extension and how it will help meet renewables targets. This is a matter to be addressed by the Planning Inspectorate, as the examining authority, not by the County Council (because the efficiency of Rampion 2 does not have any relevance to the impact of the proposed development on the environment, communities, and economy of West Sussex).

Cllr Deborah Urquhart strongly advised that all community groups register as interested parties and formally put in their objections.

Question 4 from Christopher Lee (local member Ashvin Patel):

Is WSCC aware that talks on compensation for Selsey Fishermen have already been taking place in anticipation of the harm that the Rampion 2 project will have on breeding grounds for crab & lobster? This is a clear indication that RWE know there will be damage to the breeding grounds if not acknowledging it publicly. It must feature in the WSCC LIR as an ecological consequence of Rampion 2 being given planning permission. In essence, the crab and lobster industry in Selsey which is decades old will never recover. It has been reported that the crab & lobster population that used to exist off the Worthing coast has never recovered from Rampion 1 either.

The construction phase for Rampion 2 is expected to take 3-4 years. What mitigation does WSCC suggest they will press for to restrict the hours of piledriving should Rampion 2 get planning permission? It is well documented that noise and duration of such was a cause of many complaints around Worthing when Rampion 1 was under construction. The foundations required for turbines for the Rampion 2 project, will need to be much deeper than those for Rampion 1 so noise levels and duration can be expected to be proportionally greater.

Response to Question 4:

No, the County Council is not aware of any talks about compensation for Selsey fishermen. In due course, the County Council will take account of all relevant ecological information in preparing its Local Impact Report.

Discussions with Rampion are on-going about the location of the turbines within the area of search. At this stage, no decisions have been made by Rampion and, therefore, it is not possible to identify the likely impacts of the development, including offshore construction, and any required mitigation. As and when the impacts have been identified, the County Council will draw on its involvement with Rampion 1 (including the impact of piling on local communities at that time) when discussions with Rampion take place about hours of construction and other mitigation measures.

Question 5 from Dennis Buckingham:

WSCC reported that Amy Harrower, a well-qualified environmental consultant will lead the LIR preparation., calling on internal technical specialists (within WSCC?) as needed.

Have the terms of reference already been given to her and if so may I have sight of these ? If the terms of reference are still in preparation, can WSCC advise if these will include an evaluation of the economic impact of Rampion 2 on tourism, job creation or loss, and its expected effect on coastal property valuation ? What outside resources or organisations will be consulted to assist in the economic assessment?

Response to Question 5 (local member unknown):

Technical discussions with Rampion are on-going and key elements of the proposed development have yet to be determined. Therefore, the preparation of the Local Impact Report (LIR) has not yet commenced. The LIR will reflect the County Council's formal consultation response, taking account of any changes to the project since the response was approved in September 2021. The consultation response identifies a number of concerns about socio-economic issues, including the benefits of the scheme to West Sussex (including employment opportunities and supply chain expenditure, and the creation of an additional Community Benefit Fund) and the impact on tourism. Accordingly, the LIR will set out the County Council's views on the likely impact of the proposed development on West Sussex, including on the economy. No decision has been made about the involvement of outside resources or organisations in the preparation of the LIR.

Question 6 from Larry Haas:

The Minutes of the 8 March 2022 Local Forum meeting say in the Question 6 response, "Cllr James Walsh added that as soon as the LIR was available he would ask the Cabinet Member to share this". We understood that Dr Walsh actually said as soon as the Terms of Reference (TOR) for contracting consultants to prepare the Council's Local Impact Report (LIR) on the Rampion 2 wind farm proposal was available, not the LIR itself. The LIR will likely only be due Q1 next year.

Therefore, we now ask if Cllrs can please clarify the situation for us? Can Cllrs more generally update us on the current status and timing of WSCC LIR preparation. And specifically, whether the Consultant's draft LIR will be openly discussed by the Full Council and whether WSCC will entertain local

representations on the LIR preparation - as provided in the Planning Inspectorate Advice Note One on LIRs (para 4.10).

Response to Question 6 (local member James Walsh):

If an application for development consent is submitted by the developer (and accepted by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS)), the County Council will be invited to submit a Local Impact Report (LIR). A LIR is a technical document defined as "a report in writing giving details of the likely impact of the proposed development on the authority's area (or any part of that area)". Provided that it fits within this definition, the structure and content of the LIR is a matter for the relevant authority.

The County Council has yet to commence preparation of the LIR, which is not required until the start of the examination stage (currently assumed to be in spring 2023). Work on the LIR will start later this year following further engagement with the developer on technical matters. The LIR will reflect the County Council's formal consultation response, taking account of any changes to the project since the response was approved in September 2021.

With regard to the 'terms of reference' (a term used in PINS Advice Note 1), all this means in practice is a statement at the start of the LIR identifying the local authority, the role and remit of that authority, and the topics covered by the LIR. It should be noted that the term 'terms of reference' used by PINS is a misnomer because the terms are not set out and agreed prior to the commencement of the work (on the LIR).

The LIR will be approved by the Assistant Director of Highways, Transport and Planning under delegated authority following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change.

There is no requirement for the County Council's LIR to be prepared jointly or collaboratively with any other authority. PINS Advice Note 1 states the following: "Parish councils, organisations and members of the public may have made representations to the local authority or directly to the applicant about the scheme (prompted, for example, by the applicant's consultation). The LIR could include reference to these representations [in their LIR], but only where they are relevant to a particular local impact which the local authority itself wants to highlight. Local authorities should therefore encourage such respondents to register with the Planning Inspectorate as 'interested parties' at the appropriate time so that their representations about the scheme will be considered by the Examining Authority."

To be clear, the LIR will only set out the views of the County Council and it will not capture the various (and potentially conflicting) views of local residents and community groups except where "they are relevant to a particular local impact which the local authority itself wants to highlight" (as per PINS Advice Note 1). Therefore, as advised in Advice Note 1, local residents and community groups should register as 'interested parties' so that they can make their views known direct to PINS, as the examining authority.

Following this response Mr Christopher Lee expressed disappointment that the officer response seemed to be dismissive of the relevance of the terms of reference. He stated that he regarded the TOR as a key starting point to any LIR. Cllr Deborah Urquhart agreed to follow up with officers if any more information on the ToR could be shared.

Question 7 from Melanie Jones:

Does WSCC recognise that any major infrastructure such as Rampion 2 must also meet the criteria for sustainable development, this being the overarching principle to be adhered to, and how will this be assessed.

Response to Question 7 (local member Alison Cooper):

Compliance of the scheme with national and other policy is a matter for the Planning Inspectorate, as the examining authority. The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) sets out national policy for large-scale energy infrastructure. The National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) specifically addresses electricity generation from renewable sources of energy as an important element in the development of a low-carbon economy and the role of large-scale renewable energy infrastructure in meeting national targets. The need for sustainable development is addressed in the National Policy Statements (NPS). In due course, the Secretary of State will use the NPS as the primary basis for decision-making in relation to Rampion 2.

As a supplementary question the resident raised concern that the LIR was not being worked on yet.

Cllr Alison Cooper added that all members understood the strength of opinion. Members had had the opportunity to question Rampion and had put forward concerns themselves.

Question 8 from Elizabeth Morogna:

May I respectfully ask why there is such little interest by Councillors towards the Socio, Economic and Environmental effects of the proposed Rampion 2 windfarm? The WSCC comments on the PEIR were largely of a technical nature and while these are welcomed, there was no real effort put into addressing Socio, economic and environmental issues. Rampion 2 is a far different project than Rampion 1. It is too close to extremely sensitive visual receptors such as the South Downs National Park, will decimate fishing and marine life habitats for years to come, damage tourism and is actually directly in the middle of the largest bird, bat and insect migration routes in the UK. It is not the developer, but WSCC that has a Duty of Care to look out for our best interests. We have seen no evidence of a Local Impact Report, Terms of Reference and there has been such little engagement with the community that it seems as if West Sussex County Council does not care at all about the effects and impacts of an industrial power plant, the disruption, and it is not doing the due diligence to find out what the impacts would be. The Unitary Council Awel Y Mor in Wales objected to a similar RWE windfarm proposal "*...planning officers advised councillors to oppose the plans, citing damage to the visual landscape, seascape and harm to tourism.*" After RWE's pre-application consultation in Wales ended in Nov 2021,

RWE withdrew its Awel Y Mor proposal and worked on a scaled back version with fewer, smaller turbines placed further out occupying less of the seascape thereby having less adverse local socio-economic impacts and ecological impacts (Awel Y Mor offshore wind farm plans scaled back [\[1\]](#)). Similarly, Councils objected to the Navitus Bay Wind Park proposed on the other side of the Isle of Wight, which forced the applicant EDF to revise its submitted Application which was then refused consent in 2015. To conclude: Why is there such little apparent interest by WSCC in the Socio, Economic and Environmental effects of the proposed Rampion 2 windfarm given the sheer scale of this £3 bn development? Why the apparent complacency? What assurances can be given that WSCC will ensure there will be genuine open debate among WSCC Councillors on the local impact assessment and reasonable alternatives to Rampion 2 and to adequately reflect community input on the draft WSCC Local Impact Report that we understand is, or will be, prepared by external consultants. The Planning Inspectorate Advice Notes on LIRs is clear, the Council can do what it wishes to gather evidence and opinion but the statement 'Councils are only Consultees' does not apply to the LIR.

Response to Question 8 (local member Alison Cooper)

In responding to the statutory consultation on Rampion 2 last year, the County Council undertook a detailed analysis of the Preliminary Environmental Informal Report, considering the likely significant social, economic and environmental impacts (both direct and indirect) and whether those impacts were considered to be positive, negative, or neutral (taking into account any proposed mitigation measures). Consideration was also given to whether further work could be undertaken by Rampion, including mitigation measures, to address issues identified as being significantly negative.

Although the County Council is supportive of the principle of offshore wind development, acknowledging the target set by the UK Government of delivering over a third of electricity from offshore wind by 2030, the consultation response was clear that the target needs to be achieved without significant adverse effects on the environment, local communities, and economy of West Sussex. The response goes on to note that Rampion 2 could have potentially significant adverse impacts on the seascape, coastal landscapes, and people who live, work and visit West Sussex. The onshore infrastructure at the substation site also has the potential to negatively impact on a number of environmentally sensitive areas and features and on residential amenity during the lifetime of the project.

Therefore, although Rampion 2 is supported in principle by the County Council, the Authority's formal position is that there are a number of matters of significant concern that need to be satisfactorily addressed by Rampion; these include:

- the methodology for the Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA), specifically viewpoint locations;
- the size and layout of the offshore wind turbines, in order to reduce impacts on views out to sea;
- final selection of the location of the project substation near Bolney;
- final selection for the cable route and the micro-siting of the cable route within the 100m PEIR boundary;

- further understanding of the impacts of crossings along the cable corridor and reinstatement proposals;
- the impacts on onshore and offshore ecological receptors, including key species and habitats, and the need for ecological enhancement (including Biodiversity Net Gain);
- the socioeconomic benefits to West Sussex (including employment opportunities and supply chain expenditure, and the creation of an additional Community Benefit Fund) and the impact on tourism; and
- responses to 30+ pages of detailed technical queries.

County Council officers are engaging with Rampion in the post-consultation/pre-submission period to seek to influence the remaining design elements to achieve the best possible outcomes for the local communities and other sensitive receptors that would be most affected by the construction and long-term operational impacts of Rampion 2.

The Local Impact Report (LIR) is one of a number of documents that will be prepared by the County Council. The LIR is a technical document defined as “a report in writing giving details of the likely impact of the proposed development on the authority’s area (or any part of that area)”. Provided that it fits within this definition, the structure and content of the LIR is a matter for the relevant authority.

The LIR will only set out the views of the County Council, a statutory consultee, and it will not capture the various (and potentially conflicting) views of local residents and community groups except where “*they are relevant to a particular local impact which the local authority itself wants to highlight*” (Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 1). Therefore, as advised in the Advice Note, rather than expecting the County Council to be represent their views in the LIR, local residents and community groups should register as ‘interested parties’ so that they can make representations direct to the Planning Inspectorate, as the examining authority.

The County Council has yet to commence preparation of the LIR, which is not required until the start of the examination stage (currently assumed to be in spring 2023). Work on the LIR will start later this year following further engagement with Rampion on technical matters. The LIR will reflect the County Council’s formal consultation response, taking account of any changes to the project since the response was approved in September 2021.

Question 9 from Carlo Marogna

As a professional sound reinforcement engineer, I am very concerned about the extremely high sound pressure levels that will be generated during the construction phase of Rampion 2, as well as the constant sonics generated above and below the waterline during operation. Previous studies of other windfarms have measured decibel levels in excess of 200db during construction, which is a fatal level of induced noise for any living creature not suitably protected. Are the councils going to instruct a Local Impact Report so that the communities affected can be made more aware of the issues that we face due to

this proposal? We are very grateful for your help with this. According to the application timeline, there is very little time left to discuss the windfarm proposal before it goes to examination. We appreciate this opportunity to put questions to our representatives and to have conversation on the subject.

Response to Question 9 (local member Alison Cooper)

The issue of noise and vibration is addressed by Rampion in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), which was published in July 2021. Chapter 22 generally addresses the noise and vibration, and other chapters address potential impacts on specific receptors, for example, Chapter 8: Fish and Shellfish Ecology, Chapter 11: Marine Mammals, Chapter 14: Nature Conservation (Offshore), and Chapter 23: Terrestrial Ecology and Nature Conservation.

Technical work on noise and vibration is being taken forward by Rampion through engagement with the statutory regulators and other bodies with relevant knowledge and experience, including the Marine Management Organisation (MMO), the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (Cefas, which is an executive agency of Defra), Natural England, the District and Borough Councils (given their responsibility for environmental health), the Sussex Wildlife Trust, and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds.

Therefore, concerns about potential offshore and onshore noise and vibration impacts from construction and operation (and the need for mitigation) should be directed to the responsible bodies, i.e. the MMO, Natural England, and the Districts and Borough Councils.

As necessary, the County Council will continue to liaise with other organisations about Rampion 2, including where concerns are raised with it about noise and vibration. However, it is the responsibility of the statutory regulators (referred to above) to ensure that potential adverse impacts are identified and satisfactorily addressed (i.e. avoided, minimised, mitigated, and (lastly) compensated for) through the Development Consent Order process.

The following questions were raised as part of the open session

Question 10 from Jane Chew:

Given the steep increase in the cost of living, the national and local debts from and the ongoing costs of the pandemic, how can we better spend half a billion pounds that is planned for the A27 Arundel Bypass? Cllr Trevor Bence and Gary Markwell are aware of my concerns, but I would like all other Councillors to understand the devastation that the current route will cause.

Response to Question 10 (local Member Trevor Bence)

Cllr Trevor Bence responded stating he fully understood and shared the residents' concerns. He confirmed that all tiers of Councillors attend Elected Representative Forums (ERF) and they have all challenged the proposals. West Sussex County Council officers have submitted 85 questions that have not yet been fully responded to by National Highways. Cllr Bence encouraged the resident to continue to stay in touch with the Parish Council representatives.

Cllr Gary Markwell added that a lot of his residents support the proposals and that West Sussex County Council support the need for a bypass, but it was important to ensure that what is proposed is right for the residents.

Question 11 from Danny Dawes:

As a small business and community interest company we are struggling with storage whilst Bartons (school) has been sat empty. Would West Sussex County Council consider giving rolling short term contracts to use for the benefit of the community for any of its empty properties.

Response to Question 11 (local member Francis Oppler):

Cllr Francis Oppler asked Monique Smart to contact the Estates Team for a response to see if this was feasible. Cllr Deborah Urquhart did add that she was aware that Bartons was a potential site for the Coroner to use as a venue for the Shoreham Air Crash inquest but that another venue had been found for that now.

Response from Estates Team: The former Barton's Infant school is not available to rent or hire. A planning application has been submitted to Arun District Council for demolition of the former school building and erection of 21 No. new dwellings and associated car parking, cycle parking and landscaping. Properties are generally only held vacant while future options are explored and progressed. Once formally declared surplus, opportunities arising to buy or rent vacant properties are advertised through local estate agents.

Question 12 from Dermot Rice:

Why is there no money/care spent in the Barnham areas but ridiculous spent on Bognor and Littlehampton? There is overgrown vegetation on paths and bridleways and potholes that don't get repaired well. Also, litter is a problem.

Response to Question 12 (local member Trevor Bence):

Cllr Trevor Bence asked the resident to ensure that they report any faults directly via [Love West Sussex](#) / Love Clean Streets. This can be done online or via an app you download on your smartphone. If issues are not resolved to your satisfaction please [contact your local County Councillor](#) directly by email and they will take it up on your behalf.

Cllr Bence also assured the resident that Barham Parish Council are also spending money locally to improve facilities.

Question 13 from Paul Wells:

Expressed disappointment about the lack of joined up thinking and working between agencies such as Stagecoach and the County Council. He stated there seems to be no plans to deal with the growth in the area and used the A29 as an example.

Response to Question 13:

Cllr Trevor Bence confirmed that an alternative route for the A29 was planned but it was all reliant on S106 contributions that are not released until all the houses are built which will be in 8 years. He stated that he and others are

lobbying Government to allow this funding to be released upfront but at present that does not happen.

Cllr Kier Greenway added that we need to incentivise people to use other forms of transport to the car. West Sussex County Council is currently looking to receive a £17million grant to improve bus travel across the County. Cllr Francis Oppler added that money should be spent on subsidising bus travel, so it is affordable for residents.

Question 14 from Terry Ellis:

Mr Ellis provided photos of damaged road signs in Littlehampton that have been reported but not fixed.

Response to Question 14:

Cllr Jacky Pendleton stated that she had contacted WS Highways about these signs only last week and was told they are on the list to be repaired. She undertook to follow up if this was not resolved in the next week or so.

Question 15 from George Grundy:

Expressed disappointment about the lack of Police support and presence locally.

Response to Question 15:

Cllr Trevor Bence stated that some Town or Parish Councils have street wardens, but it is really an issue to raise with the Police and Crime Commissioner.

The following questions were submitted by residents unable to attend the Forum. Officer responses are included below:

Question 16 from Steve Goodheart:

A) What is the WSCC position on providing Youth facilities around local areas within WSCC, in the aftermath of all the closures of the Youth & community centres.

B) Will it continue to support the youth & community groups that are bidding for the leases of the properties that were used for youth & community activities?

C) When will the notification of the outcome be announced to all the applications who have applied for the leases of the Phoenix Centre & the 39 club-centre ?

Response to Question 16 (local members Francis Oppler and Keir Greenway):

A) We have the following in place for young people in Arun:

- 2 Family Hubs based in Bognor and Littlehampton both providing a Find It Out offer for young people.
- Enabling Young People offer providing short term one to one support for young people experiencing a level 2 concern.
- Young people can be supported on an Early Help Plan as part of the Early Help whole family support offer for those children requiring a targeted response.
- Dedicated Schools Team offer which provide a flexible response to schools to help guide or provide hands on support as identified.

The Young Carers offer is still in place and offers a program of events as well as targeted support, Youth Emotional Support remains in place as is the Mental Health in Schools team.

B) WSCC Assets Management and Estates Team are currently undertaking a Community Asset Transfer process with suitable community organisations that have expressed an interest to take on, manage and maintain the two assets listed through a Full Repairing and Insuring Lease, with terms to be agreed, subject to contract.

- Find it Out Centre, Glamis Street, Bognor Regis
- Phoenix Youth Centre, Westloats Lane, Bersted

Community Asset Transfer focus is to facilitate the transfer of an asset to a community organisation or Town/Parish Council to be run by and on behalf of the local community in response to local community identified priorities. Bidders through the Business Plans show how they will work with networks locally including the Town Council, voluntary sector, community volunteers and education establishments etc to provide activities that communities have identified.

This is different to a commissioned WSCC service that is locally delivered through voluntary or community sector.

End of May was the deadline for the two stage submissions, and we are now undertaking evaluation of the bids from those organisations invited through to the second stage.

Once a preferred bidder has been selected, subject to contract, they will be offered a full repairing and insuring lease, for a term to be agreed, but likely to be 25 years.

Through the Community Asset Transfer process, the rent will be nil, but the bidder will be responsible for all costs associated with managing and maintaining the premises. The relationship will be contractual between landlord and tenant. The County Council is ensuring through the bidding process that the bidders have the capacity and capability to take on a lease by demonstrating their competence and by presenting a robust business plan which includes consideration around how they will raise income and manage expenditure and that they have sufficient funding, in place or planned, to meet their obligations in the lease.

C) The Full Business Plan stage deadline was extended by 4 weeks to end of May 2022, on the request from the interested organisations as they identified they needed further time to complete their submissions.

The bids are currently being evaluated and it is hoped to have reached a position of having a preferred bidder in July.

Question 17 from Steve Goodheart:

A) What is WSCC highways position on the returning the High Street in Bognor Regis a 2-way traffic flow?

B) Does WSCC highways agree that the Esplanade in Bognor Regis should be part pedestrianised?

C) Does WSCC highways agree that Harrington angle parking should be introduced to the Esplanade in Bognor Regis?

D) Can WSCC improve the promenade/street lighting on the west of the Bognor pier?

E) Can WSCC highways introduce a public zebra-crossing on the southern part of the Steyne Gardens area from the drop-kerb to the promenade ramp

Response to Question 17 (local Members Ashvin Patel & Francis Oppler):

Firstly, to say that any significant change to the highway request a community highway scheme request. This can be made by [applying for a community highways scheme](#).

A) We have no issue with this being proposed. We do believe the current system works reasonably well, so we would need compelling evidence that changing this area back would be a betterment for the local communities. The requestor would also need to engage with all key local stakeholders to see if they share their opinion.

B) We have no issue with this being proposed. We do believe the current system works reasonably well, so we would need compelling evidence that changing this area would be a betterment for the local communities. The requestor would also need to engage with all key local stakeholders to see if they share their opinion. It should be noted that our growth team are working on proposals in this area that may support enhanced pedestrian movements along the esplanade.

C) We have no issue with this being proposed. We do believe the current system works reasonably well, so we would need compelling evidence that changing this area would be a betterment for the local communities. The requestor would also need to engage with all key local stakeholders to see if they share their opinion. It is noted that echelon parking does modestly increase parking capacity, however this can lead to a rise in shunt accidents, and we would need to be certain that the carriageway is suitably wide to make this manoeuvre with reasonable safety.

D) WSCC has no plans to change the street lighting in this area. The request is not specific, however it is possible that this location is lighting on the promenade that is provided by Bognor Town Council. If it is public highway a Community Highway Scheme request would be required, however it is unlikely that this will score well as there is no safety issue at this location on the highway.

E) We have no issue with this being proposed, however we do not believe a request for a zebra crossing would be successful as there is no clear signal to motorists to stop (red light), so it is reliant on the motorist to see the pedestrian crossing and motorists near seaside destinations may not be focusing on the road in front of them. So we believe a signalised crossing similar to the other locations on the sea front would be more appropriate.

Question 18 from Paul Dukes:

In Fitzalan Road, Littlehampton, Practical Van Hire park vans instead of having a yard. Over the weekend they had 14 marked vehicles in the two parts of this road. As they are there days on end it reduces parking for people visiting houses/vets/library

As a commercial company this is not good for people visiting Littlehampton as this will be the main route when all the roads are completed. I understand that they are taxed and insured . So what is the answer?

1. Restricted parking on this road for commercial marked vehicles ie 2/4 hours. I know that they will then park in other places so this may not be the complete answer and restrictions may be needed in "other places" until they find a yard.

2. Total ban (except for delivery) in certain areas. This is more difficult, and I hope that the meeting will come up with a better solution.

I look forward to your comments made at the meeting as I am sure I am not the only one who has stated the above over the past five years.

Response to Question 18 (local member James Walsh):

Ultimately an operator's licence would be required to operate vehicles above 3.5 tonnes gross vehicle weight (gvw) that are used to carry goods on public roads for trade or business purposes. This includes short-term rental vehicles hired for as little as one day. The terms of the licence will state where the vehicle has to be kept, so, if any of the hire vehicles are over 3.5 tonnes gvw and are being kept on the highway overnight, this can be reported to the Traffic Commissioners.

There is also specific legislation within the highway code which is covered under rule 248 which states, 'You MUST NOT park on a road at night facing against the direction of the traffic flow unless in a recognised parking space.' This applies to all motor vehicles. There is also a requirement (rule 250) that states all vehicles exceeding 2500kg laden weight may only be parked at night with lights, and this may cover some of the larger vans. If any of the hire company's vehicles are found parked in contravention of these rules, then they can be reported to the police.

However, I would suggest that you may wish to check with your local planning department (Arun District Council) to determine whether there are any planning conditions which apply to the hire company's office relating to the parking of their vehicles to see if there are any planning breaches, if you have not already done so.

If the commercial vehicles are taxed and insured, and parked in accordance with the aforementioned regulations, then there is no obvious legislation which would prohibit them from being parked there, as long as they are not contravening an existing Traffic Regulation Order e.g. left on yellow lines or for longer than allowed in the limited waiting bays.

The only way you can change an existing restriction or prohibit a certain classification of vehicle would be to apply for a Traffic Regulation

Order, however, any restrictions would have a caveat for access and would also equally apply to other road users, and that any restrictions could merely serve to move the problem elsewhere.

In response to the specific questions raised:

1. We are restricted by the Department for Transport on what Traffic Regulation Orders we can raise with regards to restricting vehicle movements. It is not possible to specifically restrict parking of commercial vehicles, however it would be possible to restrict spaces for cars only, however this may not be popular with residents who own larger vehicles who would no longer be able to park.

2. An access restriction would be on weight alone (so normally HGVs) and would does not consider if a vehicle is commercial or not. A ban may have unintended consequences that residents would not be able to get deliveries from larger vehicles, or may have problems when moving house and require larger vehicles access.

If you would like to request a restriction you would need to make apply for a [Traffic Regulation Order](#). There is a rigorous test that any request must pass to proceed to being processed. Requests that have compelling, evidence-based reasoning and a good demonstration of public support stand the best chance of success.

Question 19 from M Schofield:

I have lived here in Aldwick since 1961, and have seen massive housing development on greenfield sites eg Westmeads, Aldwick Fields, Gleason Estate etc. All this without any infrastructure changes, especially sewage overload. With all the extra revenue coming in from the increased council tax Bognor should be a better place to live. Sadly, this is not the case; we cannot get a doctor's appointment, dentist etc. The town is run down & dirty, cracked paths, redevelopment plans don't come to fruition, despite private investment. I am sure my sentiments will be echoed by a lot of people at the meeting. We think it is time the people of Bognor had more of a say and not the councillors.

Response to Question 19 (local member Ashvin Patel):

The County Council is not responsible for planning for new homes in West Sussex; that is the responsibility of the local planning authorities (LPA), i.e. the district and borough councils, and the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA). Those authorities are required to plan for the needs of their area, including housing, through a document called the Local Plan. In the preparation of their Local Plans, the LPA and SDNPA must objectively assess the housing needs of their area and allocate land to meet those needs. They must also consider the need for supporting facilities and services (including health care and wastewater) by engaging with the relevant service providers, including the County Council, through the plan-making process.

The County Council is only a statutory consultee in the plan-making process and it does not have any control over the decisions made by other authorities. The Authority is consulted by the LPAs and SDNPA at various stages in the plan-making process; this involves commenting on draft policies and proposals

(including the allocation of land for new homes and other uses) with regard to their impact on the delivery of the County Council's duties, responsibilities and services; this includes highways, education, libraries, fire and rescue, flood risk management, and waste management.

Similarly, planning applications for housing are determined by the LPAs and the SDNPA. As a statutory consultee in the process, the County Council comments on relevant highways, transport and flood risk matters. However, it is up to the LPA/SDNPA to decide how much weight (if any) should be attached to those comments and the County Council has no control over the decisions that are made.

In summary, questions about the amount and location of new housing (and supporting infrastructure) and decisions about specific planning applications for housing should be directed to the relevant planning authority, which is Arun District Council with regard to Aldwick.

Question 20 from Tony Cross:

I am unable to attend the event, but my questions are on the topic of encouraging a more green and sustainable life without always relying on the motor car and the provision of public toilets:

1. Is there a strategy to increase the number of bus shelters in and around Angmering?
2. What is being done to join up the currently disconnected cycle path network, particularly in the North of Angmering where there is large scale development.
3. Is there a strategy to provide a public toilet in Angmering?

Response to Question 20 (local member Deborah Urquhart):

1. We have been developing the West Sussex Bus Improvement Plan which has been submitted to government. We will know more in the next few months but assuming we are awarded funding we shall be carrying out a complete audit of all bus stops county wide and developing a programme of improvements over the next 2 to 3 years. This work will include reviewing the existing infrastructure including the bus poles, flag, bus service information, provision of real time information screens, hardstanding and accessibility. Bus shelters may form part of these works but are installed with the agreement of district/borough, city, town and parish councils who normally take on the maintenance responsibilities thereafter. Where requests for new shelters are made, they should be directed to those councils first.

2. The Public Rights of Way Team is working with the Parish Council to upgrade Footpath2127 to allow cycling. This would facilitate connection with the cycleway footway in Rowan Way. There are a couple of matters which need to be addressed, namely the available width in one section to safely accommodate cyclist and pedestrians but it is hoped that these can be overcome and a permissive agreement put in place.



3. Provision of public toilets is the responsibility of Arun District Council or Angmering Parish Council, so we suggest you contact them directly about this.

Question 21 from Mary Kool:

Just before Covid appeared and stopped everyone in their tracks, I had contacted all West Sussex, Arun and Local councillors about the state of the road and pavements in Barnham. I sent photos too. When the verges are cut, your workmen just cut leave all the cuttings all over the place, hence the growth of vegetation on the inside of the railings towards the bridge and Lake lane in Barnham on both sides of the road, and the raised part of the middle of the road. The pavement down from Dial Close to the Trading Post is a disgrace. There was a 4ft Buddleia growing out of the pavement, this is now approx 8ft. Leaves accumulate in the corner by the entrance to the Trading Post and weeds grow in them. The Ivy gallops across the pavement and trees overhang the pavement. It is an obstacle course, which needs a lot of attention. The roads are never swept. Barnham seems to have drawn the short straw as nothing gets done here. I also would like to know what Barnham Parish Council does with the fees that get paid to it. We don't see any improvements to the area. They seem to just do up the Village hall in one way or another. Nothing of any consequence to the residents.

A house Fairholme on the Barnham Road needs to have its hedging reduced as its so wide it encroaches over the pavement so its difficult to walk past, especially if a car is parked alongside. Perhaps something could be done, or said to the residents of that house.

Response to Question 21 (local member Trevor Bence):

Thank you for your recent enquiry with regards to Barnham paving. We do inspect this area at least once per year. A highway steward has been instructed to review this area with regards to safety. Please note the most efficient and effective way of reporting issues is by Love West Sussex, which is a handy smart phone app or via the following link:

<https://love.westsussex.gov.uk/reports/home>

It should be noted that we have not attended vegetation for amenity for quite some time, and we currently do leave any cuttings on site as we are not currently resourced to remove this.

Arun District Council is responsible for street sweeping so residents will need to contact them directly.

West Sussex County Council do not get involved with how the Parish Council allocated any fund so residents would need to contact them directly.