

West Sussex County Council – Ordinary Meeting

19 January 2015

At an Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held at 10.30 a.m. on Friday, 19 January 2015, at County Hall North, Horsham, the members present being:

Mrs A J Jupp (Chairman)

Mr W E Acraman	Mr R A Lanzer
Mrs P A C Arculus	Mr G V McAra
Mr D H Barling	Mr P G Metcalfe
Mr L H Barnard	Mrs M E Millson
Mr A J Barrett-Miles	Mrs J S Mockridge
Mrs E A Bennett	Mr J A P Montyn
Mr M J Brown	Mrs S R Mullins
Mrs H A Brunson	Mr R J Oakley
Mr I R J Buckland	Mr S J Oakley
Mr R D Burrett	Mr J J O'Brien
Mr P C Catchpole	Mr C G Oxlade
Mr P J Circus	Mr L W Parsons
Mr M R Clark	Mr A Patel
Mr M A Cloake	Mr A P Petch
Mr D G Crow	Mr N F Peters
Mrs J E Dunton	Mrs J E Phillips
Mrs E M Evans	Mr B J Quinn
Mr P C Evans	Mr J G Rae
Mrs C M Field	Mrs A M Rapnik
Mr M J Glennon	Mr R Rogers
Ms M L Goldsmith	Mr D P Sheldon
Mr P A D Griffiths	Mr B A Smith
Mrs P A Hall	Mrs B A Smith
Mr P D High	Mr R J Smytherman
Mr S R Hillier	Mr A C Sutcliffe
Mr J C Hunt	Mr B W Turner
Ms S James	Mr G M Tyler
Mrs A F Jones, MBE	Mrs D L Urquhart
Mr G L Jones	Mr S G Waight
Mr M G Jones	Dr J M M Walsh, KStJ, RD
Ms D M K Kennard	Mr B R A D Watson, OBE
Mrs L Kitchen	Mr D R Whittington
Mr P K Lamb	Mr L S Wickremaratchi

Apologies and attendance

155 Apologies were received from Mr Bradbury, Dr Dennis, Mr Oppler and Mr J L Rogers. Mrs Smith arrived at 10.40 a.m. Ms James arrived for the afternoon session at 1.55 p.m. and Mr Cloake at 3.25 p.m.

Executive Director Care, Wellbeing and Education

156 The Chairman reported that Avril Wilson, the new Executive Director Care, Wellbeing and Education, who would start formally with the County Council

Minutes

on 2 February 2015, would be attending the meeting and would be available to meet members.

Interests

157 Members declared interests as set out at Appendix 1.

Minutes

158 It was agreed that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held on 12 December 2014 (pages 341 to 369) be approved as a correct record, subject to the correction of Mr Circus' name in the recorded vote on page 349.

County Council response to the Airports Commission's consultation on shortlisted options for Future Airport Capacity before submission for Government decision

159 The Council considered the proposed response by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport to the Airport Commission's consultation on shortlisted options for greater airport capacity in the south east and in particular the option of a second runway at Gatwick Airport (pages 370 to 405). The Council was reminded that the final decision would be for the Government to take and the County Council's comments reflected its role in planning for the consequences of that decision and on how the Gatwick option could better address the needs of the area, its residents and the local economy.

160 The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport expressed his thanks to the officers who had prepared the response and also to the members of the Task and Finish Group on Gatwick Airport and the Environmental and Community Services Select Committee for their contributions. The recommendations from that Committee's recent meeting (circulated with the papers for the meeting) would, the Cabinet Member explained, be incorporated into the Council's response. He also explained that the further comments from members would be taken into account in the preparation of the final text of the response to the consultation and which would form an attachment to a decision he is to make this week.

161 The following amendment to the recommendation to the report on page 373 was proposed by Mrs Arculus and seconded by Mr Barling:

'The County Council expresses serious concerns about the implications for West Sussex and its communities and that these have not been satisfactorily answered.'

The County Council is invited to support a response to the Airports Commission's consultation which:

- ~~neither support for nor opposition to expansion of Gatwick Airport;~~

- describes the improvements that should be made to the Gatwick option before the Airports Commission makes any recommendation; **and**
- identifies the changes needed to the evidence base and plans for consequential impacts if the final proposal is to have the trust and confidence of the communities affected; ~~and~~
- ~~recognises the need to plan with partners for the impact of any decision on future airport capacity so as to optimise the economic opportunities and address the social and environmental effects for the County and its residents.~~

The County Council, in discharging its strategic role, shall continue to maintain a constructive relationship with all partners, including Gatwick Airport, to ensure that the economic effects of any decision about airport expansion are optimised and that all of the potential adverse effects for our communities are fully addressed.'

162 The amendment was agreed.

163 Resolved –

'The County Council expresses serious concerns about the implications for West Sussex and its communities and that these have not been satisfactorily answered.

The County Council supports a response to the Airports Commission's consultation which:

- describes the improvements that should be made to the Gatwick option before the Airports Commission makes any recommendation; and
- identifies the changes needed to the evidence base and plans for consequential impacts if the final proposal is to have the trust and confidence of the communities affected.

The County Council, in discharging its strategic role, shall continue to maintain a constructive relationship with all partners, including Gatwick Airport, to ensure that the economic effects of any decision about airport expansion are optimised and that all of the potential adverse effects for our communities are fully addressed.'

Notice of Motion by Mr Acraman

164 At the County Council meeting on 12 December 2014 the following motion had been moved by Mr Acraman, seconded by Mr Griffiths, and referred to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport for consideration. A report by the Cabinet Member for was included with the agenda (page 406).

'Gatwick was last debated by this Council 15 months ago in July 2013. Events since that time have clarified a number of things and make clear that net economic growth would at best be marginal whilst the environmental and infrastructure damage would be considerable.

In the last year the following have become clear:

- GAL has issued a second set of figures on the numerical consequences of a second runway. GAL state that 122,000 new jobs would be created, meaning immigration into the SE of 100,000 + people.
- 100,000 immigrants, 3 times the size of the proposed Mayfield new town, would put intolerable pressure on roads housing schools and hospitals with GAL's contribution to those costs would appear to be between zero and minima, with council tax payers left to fund the sizeable residue. GAL's estimate of 40,000 new homes is clearly a gross underestimate.
- 250,000 extra road journeys per day would result. Again GAL will only fund road IMPROVEMENTS CLOSE TO THE TERMINAL. Improvements to M23/A23, M25, A264, A272 and A27 would need to be county-funded as the only provider, since there will be no government financial support.
- The brief of Davies Airport Commission leaves a lot to be desired. His emphasis, like that of GAL, has been on the problems within the airport perimeter, taking no cognisance of problems such as hospital provision beyond the perimeter.
- Davis regards it as a given that runway capacity in the SE is a necessity and it is, to him, just a question of where. His short list of 3 does not include Stansted, which is excluded on flimsy grounds and thus the consideration is not being done on a level playing field.
- GAL has nonsensically stated that they can engineer a great increase in the train capacity on the London Brighton line. How can they do that with an immovable line capacity pinch point at East Croydon and limited train lengths on a network run by somebody else?
- At least 6 other MPs in the Surrey/Sussex area, including the Rt Hon Sir Nicholas Soames, Rt Hon Francis Maude and Rt Hon Nick Herbert, are opposed to a second runway.
- Any new runway anywhere cannot be reconciled with the UK's obligations under the Climate Change Act.
- A new runway will increase the county's Gross Economic Value. However there will be more people wanting that benefit and it will be a bigger cake but with more people wanting a slice so each person's slice (Gross Economic Value per person) will be much the same. The same arithmetic applies to the county's tax revenue. It will be greater but there will be much more required expenditure on dealing with an ageing demographic and potential increase in problems like dementia.
- It is no longer realistic to imagine that Gatwick is just a north of the county problem which will have no effect in the coastal area. The pressure on housing roads and infrastructure will be county wide – from Shoreham to the Manhood peninsular as well as from East Grinstead to Horsham.

The environmental damage is without question, whereas the economic benefit is unproven and may well be negative. Therefore this Council should reserve its position on environmental grounds until such time as the definitive costs and possible benefits are much clearer than they are today.'

- 165** The following amendment to the last paragraph of the motion was proposed by Mr Griffiths and seconded by Mr Petch:

'The environmental damage is without question, whereas the economic benefit is unproven and may well be negative. Therefore this Council **expresses its opposition to a new runway to expand Gatwick Airport** ~~should reserve its position on environmental grounds until such time as the definitive costs and possible benefits are much clearer than they are today.~~'

- 166** The motion with the amendment was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 36(1).

(a) For the proposition – 37

Mr Acraman, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mrs Bennett, Mrs Brunsdon, Mr Buckland, Mr Burrett, Mr Catchpole, Mr Circus, Mr Clark, Mr Crow, Mrs Duncton, Mr Glennon, Mr Griffiths, Mrs Hall, Mr Hillier, Ms James, Mrs Jones, Mr G L Jones, Mr M G Jones, Mrs Jupp, Mrs Kitchen, Mr McAra, Mr Metcalfe, Mrs Mullins, Mr S J Oakley, Mr Parsons, Mr Petch, Mrs Phillips, Mr Quinn, Mr Rae, Mrs Rapnik, Mr Sheldon, Mr Smith, Mrs Smith, Mr Sutcliffe, Mr Whittington and Mr Wickremaratchi.

(b) Against the proposition – 26

Mr Barnard, Mr Brown, Mr Cloake, Mrs Evans, Mr Evans, Ms Goldsmith, Mr High, Mr Hunt, Ms Kennard, Mr Lamb, Mrs Millson, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr O'Brien, Mr Oxlade, Mr Patel, Mr Peters, Mr R Rogers, Mr Smytherman, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mrs Urquhart, Mr Waight, Dr Walsh and Mr Watson.

(c) Abstentions – 4

Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mrs Field and Mr Lanzer.

- 167** The motion, as amended, and set out below, was agreed.

'Gatwick was last debated by this Council 15 months ago in July 2013. Events since that time have clarified a number of things and make clear that net economic growth would at best be marginal whilst the environmental and infrastructure damage would be considerable.

In the last year the following have become clear:

- GAL has issued a second set of figures on the numerical consequences of a second runway. GAL state that 122,000 new jobs would be created, meaning immigration into the SE of 100,000 + people.
- 100,000 immigrants, 3 times the size of the proposed Mayfield new town, would put intolerable pressure on roads housing schools and hospitals with GAL's contribution to those costs would appear to be between zero and minima, with council tax payers left to fund the

Minutes

sizeable residue. GAL's estimate of 40,000 new homes is clearly a gross underestimate.

- 250,000 extra road journeys per day would result. Again GAL will only fund road IMPROVEMENTS CLOSE TO THE TERMINAL. Improvements to M23/A23, M25, A264, A272 and A27 would need to be county-funded as the only provider, since there will be no government financial support.
- The brief of Davies Airport Commission leaves a lot to be desired. His emphasis, like that of GAL, has been on the problems within the airport perimeter, taking no cognisance of problems such as hospital provision beyond the perimeter.
- Davis regards it as a given that runway capacity in the SE is a necessity and it is, to him, just a question of where. His short list of 3 does not include Stansted, which is excluded on flimsy grounds and thus the consideration is not being done on a level playing field.
- GAL has nonsensically stated that they can engineer a great increase in the train capacity on the London Brighton line. How can they do that with an immovable line capacity pinch point at East Croydon and limited train lengths on a network run by somebody else?
- At least 6 other MPs in the Surrey/Sussex area, including the Rt Hon Sir Nicholas Soames, Rt Hon Francis Maude and Rt Hon Nick Herbert, are opposed to a second runway.
- Any new runway anywhere cannot be reconciled with the UK's obligations under the Climate Change Act.
- A new runway will increase the county's Gross Economic Value. However there will be more people wanting that benefit and it will be a bigger cake but with more people wanting a slice so each person's slice (Gross Economic Value per person) will be much the same. The same arithmetic applies to the county's tax revenue. It will be greater but there will be much more required expenditure on dealing with an ageing demographic and potential increase in problems like dementia.
- It is no longer realistic to imagine that Gatwick is just a north of the county problem which will have no effect in the coastal area. The pressure on housing roads and infrastructure will be county wide – from Shoreham to the Manhood peninsular as well as from East Grinstead to Horsham.

The environmental damage is without question, whereas the economic benefit is unproven and may well be negative. Therefore this Council expresses its opposition to a new runway to expand Gatwick Airport.'

Chairman

The Council rose at 4.07 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 1 - Interests

Members declared interests as set out below. All the interests listed below were personal but not pecuniary or prejudicial unless indicated.

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
Item 4, County Council response to the Airports Commission's consultation on shortlisted options for Future Airport Capacity before submission for Government decision and Item 5, Notice of Motion on Gatwick Airport	Mr Acraman	Supporter of Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign
	Mr Barrett-Miles	Member of Mid Sussex District Council and Burgess Hill Town Council
	Mrs Bennett	Member of Mid Sussex District Council and East Grinstead Town Council
	Mrs Brunsdon	Member of Mid Sussex District Council and East Grinstead Town Council
	Mr Burrett	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Circus	Member of Horsham District Council
	Mr Crow	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mrs Duncton	Member of Chichester District Council
	Ms Goldsmith	Member of the Gatwick Diamond Overview Steering Group
	Mrs Jones	Member of Mid Sussex District Council and Burgess Hill Town Council
	Mr Jones	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mrs Kitchen	Member of Horsham District Council and member of Gatwick Airport Consultative Committee

Minutes - Appendix 1

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
<p>Item 4, County Council response to the Airports Commission's consultation on shortlisted options for Future Airport Capacity before submission for Government decision</p> <p>and</p> <p>Item 5, Notice of Motion on Gatwick Airport (cont)</p>	Mr Lamb	Member of Crawley Borough Council and local authority representative on Gatwick Airport Consultative Committee
	Mr Lanzer	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Montyn	Member of Gatwick Airport Consultative Committee
	Mr S J Oakley	Member of Chichester District Council
	Mr O'Brien	Member of Mid Sussex District Council and East Grinstead Town Council
	Mr Oxlade	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Quinn	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Rae	Member of Horsham District Council
	Mrs Smith	Member of Crawley Borough Council and 'One's Enough' group
	Mr Smytherman	Member of Worthing Borough Council and Worthing Town Crier