

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD

Director of Corporate Services

Contact: Graham Thrussell on 01243 534653

Email: gthrussell@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House

1 East Pallant

Chichester

West Sussex

PO19 1TY

Tel: 01243 785166

www.chichester.gov.uk



A meeting of the **Cabinet** will be held in Committee Room 2 at East Pallant House East Pallant House Chichester on **Tuesday 2 October 2018 at 09:30**

MEMBERS: Mr A Dignum (Chairman), Mrs E Lintill (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Barrow, Mr J Connor, Mrs J Kilby, Mrs S Taylor and Mr P Wilding

AGENDA SUPPLEMENT

The first agenda supplement contains the appendices to the reports for the stated items.

7 **Tower Street Chichester Public Conveniences Refurbishment** (pages 1 to 7)

Appendix: Project Initiation Document.

8 **Approval of the Draft Infrastructure Business Plan 2019-2024 for Consultation with the City, Town and Parish Councils and Key Infrastructure Delivery Commissioners** (pages 9 to 20)

Appendix 2: Education money collected through section 106

Appendix 3: Draft CIL Spending Plan

Appendix 4: Executive summary extracted from Chichester Roadspace Audit

[**Note** Appendix 1 is available to view online only in the second agenda supplement]

11 **Housing Benefit and Council Tax Reduction Risk Based Verification Policy 2019-2020** (pages 21 to 32)

Appendix: RBV policy document

12 **Southern Gateway Regeneration** (pages 33 to 62)

Appendix 1: Draft Development Brief

Appendix 2: Revised Project Initiation Document

14 **Reducing Single Use Plastics** (pages 63 to 70)

Appendix: Single Use Plastics Action Plan – September 2018

18 **Southern Gateway Regeneration** (pages 71 to 120)

Appendix 1: Draft Collaboration Agreement

Appendix 2: Risk Register

Appendix 3: Drawing no 5586, Plots 15 and 16 Terminus Road Chichester

Appendix 4: Heads of Terms for purchase of Plots 15 and 16 Terminus Road Chichester

Project Documentation

PROJECT INITIATION DOCUMENT (PID)

Tower Street, Chichester Public Conveniences refurbishment

Release:	Draft
Date:	11/09/18
Author:	Tania Murphy, Divisional Manager – Place
Approved by:	Jane Hotchkiss, Director – Growth and Place

Document History

Revision Date	Version	Summary of Changes	Reviewer(s)
11/09/2018	1		

Consideration by the Corporate Improvement Team

Date	Reviewing Officer	Comments for Consideration
11 th September 2018	Jenny Westbrook	Comments provided to Service for consideration

Approvals

This document requires the following approvals:

Name of person, group or committee
CDC Cabinet

Distribution

A final copy of the approved document will be distributed to:

Name	Job Title
Tania Murphy	Divisional Manager - Place
Jane Hotchkiss	Director, Growth and Place
Vicki McKay	Divisional Manager - Growth
John Bacon	Building Services Manager
Kevin Carter	Divisional Manager – CCS
Amie Huggett	Business Manager – CCS
Christopher Dean	Facilities Officer - CCS

1. PURPOSE OF DOCUMENT

This Project Initiation Document (PID) defines the Tower Street Public Conveniences Refurbishment project. It sets out the aims of the project, why the project should go ahead, who is involved and their responsibilities. This PID will provide the baseline for the project's management and for an assessment of its overall success.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

To undertake refurbishment, reconfiguration and drainage works at the Tower Street Public Conveniences.

3. BACKGROUND

Tower Street Public Conveniences are a well-used facility located close to the bus and coach stops in Chichester. These facilities were last refurbished in the late 1980's. The site was considered for refurbishment in June 2017. Tender returns based on a simple refurbishment did not proceed due to further additional costs associated with drainage and substructure concerns. In addition, there have been some anti-social activities around this site and a re-design of the footprint will assist with removing this element.

The site currently does not meet the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 as the current disabled facility is too small. The proposal is to re-locate the facilities to the front of the building which would allow access from Tower Street. This approach is supported by the Access Group for Chichester District

The existing drainage connection to the Tower Street public sewer which services the site is original, and, whilst having had some update since then, the drainage is showing signs of need for replacement and upgrade. The site is increasingly experiencing issues with the drains, resulting in closures. A CCTV survey will be undertaken to determine the condition of the drains and action required to update and improve.

4. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND SUCCESS CRITERIA

4.1. Outputs

- Improved satisfaction levels from users of the facilities;
- Reduced revenue costs;
- Better quality facilities;
- Improved drainage facilities.

4.2. Outcomes

Refurbished Public Conveniences which are modern, resolve the drainage issues, provide less opportunity for anti-social behaviour, meet the requirements of the Equality Act and enable better longevity for the facilities.

4.3. Outcome Measures

- Reduction in maintenance costs;
- Facilities which meet the requirements of existing and future needs. Confirmation of compliance with the Equalities Act.
- Reduction in anti-social behaviour.

4.4. Dis-benefits

- The Council's funds are limited and an allocation to this project may prevent another from proceeding.
- There will be some disruption to the provision of facilities during the course of the works.

4.5. Out of Scope

The project will not include the consideration of refurbishment of other Public Conveniences in the district at this stage and will be focussed on purely updating those at Tower Street. However, lessons learned from the project can be applied to other refurbishment schemes when they arise.

5. PROJECT CONSTRAINTS

The refurbishment of this site requires careful and sympathetic consideration given its location in the city. Budget allocation may be a constraint to the final scheme should issues arise which are not planned for.

6. PROJECT ASSUMPTIONS

That Cabinet approval is given for the additional sum required of £65,000 to support the existing £80,000 in the Asset Renewal Programme to refurbish the male and female toilets and create a new disabled facility using the existing footprint and to renew and upgrade drainage works servicing the facilities – subject to the outcome of the CCTV report.

That Planning approval and other statutory consents are given, where required, so the project can be delivered.

7. PROJECT COSTS

The main project costs associated with this proposal are professional fees, demolition and the costs of refurbishment and upgrade of the site facilities and drainage.

7.1. Project Delivery Costs

The cost is estimated at £145,000 which includes work to undertake the drainage investigations and upgrade, refurbishment of the facilities and the provision of a site which is DDA compliant. Full costs will be collated once the market is tested.

Costs (£)		Source
Capital	Estimated £145,000	ARP (£80,000) CDC Reserves (£65,000)
Revenue	None	
Savings	Not known at present, although anticipated to be savings as a result of the upgraded facilities not requiring maintenance to the level seen at present.	
Services to be involved in the project delivery	Property and Growth Place Finance CCS	

The required project management and staff time will be allowed for in work plans.

7.2. On-going Costs Following Project Completion

Once completed, the facilities will require ongoing maintenance and staff time but this is anticipated to be a reduction from the existing arrangements and will be covered in work plans.

8. OPTIONS SUMMARY

Not to undertake the refurbishment as described or to undertake a revised reduced level of refurbishment. However, this would not meet the requirements of the Equalities Act and the drainage issues would continue.

9. PROJECT APPROACH

The initial CCTV work to consider drainage requirements will be used to inform the subsequent activities required to ensure that the site is fit for purpose. The scheme for the site will be subject to a tender process compliant with CDC contract standing orders.

10. PROJECT PLAN

Task No.	Task / milestone	Completion Date	Responsible Owner	Dependency
1.1	Cabinet meeting to consider recommended approval for project funds.	October 2018	TM	Completion and approval of PID and provision of all relevant information for Cabinet report.
1.2	Prepare a brief for drainage consultants to investigate the issues on site.	November 2018	TM/JB	Securing funding to proceed
1.3	Consider any planning requirements and submit application if required.	December 2018	TM	Design work is developed to a level sufficient to support a planning application.
1.4	Prepare a brief for the works to include drainage. Tender and appoint.	February 2019	TM/JB	Securing funding to proceed
1.5	Completion of the works.	Timescale dependant on tender returns	TM/ JB to monitor	Contractor to ensure that the programme keeps to schedule.
1.6	Post Project Evaluation	Six months after the completion of the project	TM / JB	Practical completion date

11. PROJECT TEAM

Tania Murphy: Divisional Manager – Place	Project overview – Responsible Officer
John Bacon:	To provide project technical support and guidance

Building Services Manager	
Christopher Dean: Facilities Officer. CCS	Project operational input and liaison with Council's Cleaning contractor.
Accountancy Services	To provide budget assistance and monitoring.

12. COMMUNICATION

Regular meetings of the project group to consider progress, with all members of the group to be kept informed at all times of developments in the project. The Council's Public Conveniences contractor to be informed of key dates and milestones in order that the cleaning programme can be considered accordingly.

13. RISK LOG

The following risks have been identified together with an assessment of their severity and actions that can be taken to mitigate/reduce the risk. Details of all project risks will be recorded as and when they are identified.

Risk No	Risk Description	Likelihood Unlikely Possible Probable Certain	Impact Minor Significant Serious Major	Planned Actions to Reduce Risk	Responsible Officer
1	Cabinet do not approve the funding	Possible	Serious	Cabinet to be made aware of the issues at site which gives rise to the need for the project to proceed.	Tania Murphy
2	Project costs overrun	Possible	Serious	Frequent project meetings and budget monitoring. Contingency budget.	Tania Murphy / Building Services
3	Missed deadlines	Possible	Serious	Project monitoring at frequent intervals	Tania Murphy / Building Services
4	Lack of staff resources	Possible	Serious	Inclusion within work plans.	All project team members
5	Required drainage works exceeds that which is anticipated.	Possible	Serious	Budget includes contingency. Additional budget requirements to be reported before appointment of contractor.	Tania Murphy / Building Services

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 2

Education money collected from S106 with monies still to be spent

Parish	Planning Application	Site Address	Amount Paid but Unspent	Amount Allocated to Projects	Available Funds
Birdham	BI/4147/12	Land at, Tawny Nurseries, Bell Lane, Birdham	53,981	0	53,981
Birdham totals			53,981		53,981
Chichester	CC/106/12	The Regnum Club, 45A, South Street, Chichester	8,004	0	8,004
	CC/3113/13	Land North Of 20, Otway Road, Chichester	42,141	0	42,141
	CC/3490/10	Roussillon Barracks, Broyle Road, Chichester	703,436	108,579	594,857
	CC/3533/08	Graylingwell Hospital, College Lane, Chichester	59,018	0	59,018
	CC/743/15	Land South Of, Graylingwell Drive, Chichester	365,456	0	365,456
Chichester totals			1,178,055	108,579	1,069,476
Chidham & Hambrook	CH/1013/10	Land At, 30, The Avenue, Hambrook	1,000	0	1,000
	CH/1354/14	Chidham Garage & Service Station, Main Road, Chidham,	23,421	0	23,421
	CH/4314/09	Marshalls Mono Limited, Broad Road, Hambrook, Chidham,	141,689	0	141,689
	CH/4778/12	Land West Of, Broad Road, Hambrook, Chidham	35,262	0	35,262
Chidham & Hambrook totals			201,372		201,372
Donnington	D/4410/12	Land At Southfields Close, Stockbridge	599,715	0	599,715
	D/4732/07	Stockbridge Garage, 1, Birdham Road, Donnington,	22,859	0	22,859
Donnington totals			622,574		622,574
East Wittering & Bracklesham	EWB/2461/12	Land northeast of, Beech Avenue, Bracklesham Bay,	45,966	0	45,966
East Wittering & Bracklesham totals			45,966		45,966
Fishbourne	FB/2278/13	Land East & South-East of, Follis Gardens, Fishbourne,	40,954	0	40,954
	FB/2331/15	Land To Rear Of Romans Mead Estate, Mosse Gardens, Fishbourne	59,650	0	59,650
	FB/2431/09	Land At, Salthill Road, Fishbourne	42,849	0	42,849
Fishbourne totals			143,453		143,453
Hunston	HN/2692/12	Northmark, Foxbridge Drive, Hunston	66,751	0	66,751
Hunston totals			66,751		66,751
Lavant	LV/3912/11	Hunters Rest, Lavant Road, Chichester	60,136	0	60,136
Lavant totals			60,136		60,136
Southbourne	SB/2120/15	Land East of, 181, Main Road, Southbourne	89,162	0	89,162
Southbourne totals			89,162		89,162
Selsey	SY/490/15	Land North West Of, Park Road, Selsey	13,000	0	13,000
Selsey totals			13,000		13,000
Tangmere	TG/1739/12	Land On The East Side Of, Meadow Way, Tangmere	130,818	0	130,818
	TG/4058/11	RAF Tangmere, City Fields Way, Tangmere	5,995	0	5,995
Tangmere totals			136,813		136,813
Westbourne	WE/911/14	Land On The North Side Of, Long Copse Lane, Westbourne,	71,961	0	71,961
Westbourne totals			71,961		71,961
Westhampnett	WH/2360/12	Maudlin Nursery Hanging Basket Centre, Stane Street, Westhampnett	118,429	0	118,429
Westhampnett totals			118,429		118,429
West Wittering	WW/3286/13	Land North Of, Chaucer Drive, West Wittering	98,626	0	98,626
West Wittering totals			98,626		98,626
		Total Education	2,900,279	108,579	2,791,700

This page is intentionally left blank

Draft CIL Spending Plan

	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
1st April b/fwd	-	598,294.27	2,819,151.00	2,780,575.00	1,927,875.00	1,441,007.00	191,379.00	1,579,039.00
INCOME								
Gross Income	775,847.84	2,852,376.37	166,320.00	2,439,000.00	2,048,760.00	1,821,960.00	2,053,800.00	3,849,120.00
Parish Share	120,392.28	312,796.37	41,580.00	609,750.00	512,190.00	455,490.00	513,450.00	962,280.00
Admin	38,792.39	76,473.04	8,316.00	121,950.00	102,438.00	91,098.00	102,690.00	192,456.00
CDC Net Income	616,663.17	2,225,856.73	116,424.00	1,707,300.00	1,434,132.00	1,275,372.00	1,437,660.00	2,694,384.00
Funds Available	616,663.17	2,824,151.00	2,935,575.00	4,487,875.00	3,362,007.00	2,716,379.00	1,629,039.00	4,273,423.00
EXPENDITURE	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Ambulance response Post Chichester South Project 533	18,368.90							
Enhancements to the Lavant Biodiversity Opportunity Area -the stretch of the Lavant north of the Westhampnett SDL. Project 194		5,000.00	45,000.00					
Brandy Hole Copse Project 196			10,000.00					
Local land drainage East Beach Sea Outfall. Project			100,000.00					

293								
Primary School places E-W project 330 Chichester (subject to further detail and evaluation)						1,200,000.00		
School access improvements at expanded primary school(s) Chichester. Project 657						50,000.00		
Sustainable transport corridor – City Centre to Portfield part of project 656						25,000.00	50,000.00	425,000.00
RTPI screens at Chichester City Project 355				60,000.00	60,000.00			
Sustainable transport corridor – City Centre to Westhampnett. Project 353				500,000.00				
Medical Centre W of Chichester. Project 398 (Subject to further detail and evaluation)					1,750,000.00			
Primary School places Bournes. Project 331 (subject to further detail & evaluation)						1,200,000.00		

School access improvements at expanded primary school(s) Bournes. Project 660						50,000.00		
Primary School places Manhood Peninsula. Project 332 (subject to further detail & evaluation)				1,200,000.00				
School access improvements at expanded primary school(s) Manhood. Project 659				50,000.00				
A286 Birdham Rd/B2201 (Selsey Rd Roundabout) Junction Improvement Project 349					111,000.00			
Area-wide parking management North East Chichester. Project 654				250,000.00				
Area -wide parking management West Chichester. Project 655				250,000.00				
Area-wide parking management Chichester City.				250,000.00				

Project 665								
Total expenditure	18,368.90	5,000.00	155,000.00	2,560,000.00	1,921,000.00	2,525,000.00	50,000.00	425,000.00
31st March c/fwd	598,294.27	2,819,151.00	2,780,575.00	1,927,875.00	1,441,007.00	191,379.00	1,579,039.00	3,848,423.00

Executive Summary from Chichester Roadspace Audit

1.1.1 As with many towns and cities across the UK Chichester faces a number of challenges, it must accommodate significant new development, both residential and commercial, whilst preserving its historic character. Parking is particularly problematic, with high demand and constraints in meeting supply in the areas of greatest demand. West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) and Chichester District Council (CDC) have sought to embark on a progressive approach to meeting these challenges, which looks beyond parking measures alone in order to meet current and future demands on the road network, the outcome being a strategic blueprint for the city of Chichester that defines how parking, sustainable transport infrastructure and future development can be integrated.

1.1.2 Roadspace reallocation is one of the great challenges of our time for contemporary transport planning. The role of high street is changing rapidly; people no longer have to make as many trips into the city centre for essential items or services with the growth of home delivery, internet and out-of town shopping centres, supermarkets and click and collect. So it is becoming increasingly important for towns and cities to be places people want to visit for their quality and character.

1.1.3 Our transport inheritance is typically highway dominated, built for and around car use. But it is increasingly recognised that this is not always the optimal approach: neither in transport terms, where in more urban areas public transport, walking and cycling are becoming increasingly critical for a place to thrive.

1.1.4 Significant growth is planned in Chichester District, much of which is focused in and around the City itself - 32% increase to City households and 31% increase in population. The Chichester Transport Study 2013 indicated that even without additional new development, there is likely to be just over 20% growth in trips by 2031 compared to the 2009 base. Proposed improvements to transport infrastructure, coupled with the measures to control travel demand and promote sustainable modes of travel, are considered sufficient to accommodate the levels of development proposed in the Local Plan.

1.1.5 However it is evident from the model findings that the smarter choices package plays a significant part in mitigating the effects of the new development. These changes in mode share are achievable, but this kind of step change requires a bold new approach to transport provision within the city. There is always the possibility that measures which reduce traffic congestion have the potential to enable traffic to move faster, and therefore can induce more traffic, which will reduce the benefits. As such it is generally accepted that complementary measures designed to 'lock in' the benefits, such as a reallocation and reduction of road capacity, must be implemented in concert with those measures that reduce traffic.

OPTIONS DEVELOPMENT

1.1.6 Based on the findings of the roadspace audit and desktop research of planned future development, a range of conceptual tools were firstly identified to take to stakeholders for their consideration. The conceptual tools for reallocating roadspace can be broadly grouped under the following core themes:

1. Tackling parking issues (on-street)
2. Parking supply and traffic management
3. Reallocating roadspace: improved places and sustainable transport corridors
4. Reallocating roadspace: “to, not through”

TACKLING PARKING ISSUES (ON-STREET)

1.1.7 The city of Chichester relies on a significant in-commute from other towns to provide the labour and expertise for many of its services; the hospital is a regional employer sourcing staff from across the wider hinterland, and so is reliant on car-borne staff commuting from neighbouring lower cost towns. Thus the strategy for on-street parking treats commuter parking as something that is not only necessary, but should be welcomed. Where commuter parking is seen as a problem is where it is un-managed; policy responses are typically reactive and thus compound this impression of action being a response to a problem. For this reason we propose that a Residential Parking Scheme covering the city Chichester, equivalent to the study area delimited by the red boundary shown in Figure 4, is defined and prepared for implementation.

1.1.8 The evidence has indicated that many residential streets carry surplus capacity at all times. Sections of kerb that are not relied on by residents may offer a number of parking spots suitable to be allocated for daytime use by commuters. This approach establishes a city-wide solution.

1.1.9 On-street parking is valued, and should typically be priced higher than off street parking. A desirable occupancy rate is typically around 85-90% for on-street parking. Performance Pricing is based on adjusting the tariff paid to park based on demand to achieve the 85-90% occupancy at all times. At times and locations that demand is high, the price to park is increased and where there is high availability the price is reduced. With performance pricing established, the need to control duration of stay using time limits should diminish.

PARKING SUPPLY AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

1.1.10 Parking demand forecasts have included population and socio-demographic trends to car use and parking demand, and the assessment of off street parking within Chichester indicates that there is limited scope for growth to accommodate parking demand based on existing city capacity. Occupancy was 78% overall. This includes significant spare capacity in the Avenue de Chartres and Leisure Centre car parks. This level of occupancy is high for a city average and this view is

supported by the city centre car parks showing levels at or close to 100%.

1.1.11 The closure and redevelopment of surface car parks at the heart of the city centre would remove around 2,000 vehicle trips per day in and out of the city. The strategic approach suggested is for further short stay capacity to be provided in the current cornerstone car parks of Northgate, Cattle Market and Avenue de Chartres by reducing the space given over in these locations to long stay permit use.

1.1.12 Additional parking long stay capacity should be sought, over time and based on opportunity, either through the proposals to accommodate commuter and visitor parking within an extended RPS and/or in off street locations further out from the city centre but still within reasonable walking distance. Long stay parking displaced from the cornerstone car parks would allow those to accommodate and become the principal short stay locations serving the city.

ROADSPACE REALLOCATION

1.1.13 The third core concept builds on the previous two, and reallocates some of the roadspace, promoting improvements to the urban realm and greater travel by sustainable modes. The approach to roadspace allocation promoted within this study is underpinned by an improved understanding of the competing needs of street users, based on the principles of “Link” and “Place”. Each part the cities network of streets has a different role to play, including a differing balance between its Link and Place status functions.

1.1.14 As well as improving the urban realm, roadspace reallocation can serve as a crucial tool in providing a more conducive and appealing environment for walking, cycling and travelling by public transport. In combination with the parking measures and smarter choices package proposed as part of the Local Plan transport strategy, it is essential to ‘lock in’ the benefits of car based trip reductions.

1.1.15 In our view Chichester is potentially ideally configured towards promoting sustainable transport. Ultimately reallocating roadspace to create better walk, cycle, urban realm and public transport, whilst simultaneously removing or relocating provision for car based travel can create a virtuous circle, where more people chose to walk and cycle because there is less traffic on a particular route, which justifies further measures, further reducing demand for travel by car. A step change from seeking to continually invite more vehicle traffic into the city centre and cater for it by increasing highway capacities at the expense of the other roles streets play and the contrary to the overarching vision and objectives for the city.

TO, NOT THROUGH

1.1.16 The fourth concept builds on the previous ones and looks to then go a step further, by thinking about how in the longer term traffic might be progressively and proactively managed away from the city centres core areas to enable a greater

emphasis on key place functions (visitor attractions, shopping, restaurants, bars etc.). The strategy is therefore to reduce the attraction of using the inner ring road as a way to pass through the city. This is a bold proposal but what is becoming increasingly accepted within the transport planning fraternity, is that in combination with measures to make travel by sustainable modes more appealing, it is necessary to introduce some restraints to vehicular access.

1.1.17 For those within the urban form the reduced access and volume of vehicular traffic creates greater permeability for cycling and walking, making walking and cycling the natural choice for residents travelling within Chichester. This culture and choice need not be borne of significant cycle infrastructure engineering, but by a progressive and clear reduction in vehicular traffic on the roads within the city core and the provision of obvious routes in those areas away from the core.

1.1.18 For motor vehicles, the strategy is based on creating clarity that any trip into the core must return by the same route that it entered, and Chichester is not a through route for motor traffic. This, along with a progressive reduction in more central parking destinations will significantly reduce the traffic demand and open up clear opportunities beyond the initial years to reallocate roadspace used for wider highways just outside the city walls.

STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK

1.1.19 The overall results of feedback were encouraging, with stakeholders confirming that they feel the vision and objectives for the City would be more achievable in the longer term by following the approaches explored within this study.

1.1.20 57% of technical stakeholders and 82% of community stakeholders supported the concept of introducing a city wide Residents Parking Scheme (RPS) with managed visitor parking provision. 64% of technical stakeholders and 57% of community stakeholders supported the concept of reducing very central city centre parking and promoting the use of Northgate, Cattlemarket and Avenue De Chartres for short-stay car parking. 78% of technical stakeholders and 65% of community stakeholders supported the concept of reallocating roadspace to promote improved urban realm and sustainable transport. 72% of technical stakeholders and 50% of community stakeholders supported the concept of introducing a city wide RPS with managed visitor parking provision.

1.1.21 Reallocating roadspace was the preferred concept, both amongst the technical and stakeholder groups. The concept of relocating off-street parking supply was the 2nd priority amongst technical stakeholders, whilst community stakeholders were evenly split between several options for both their second and third priorities.

OUTLINE RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1.22 These recommendations were distilled into a package of specific solutions that make up an outline programme of short, medium and long term actions.

1.1.23 Demand for city centre parking is close to capacity. There is some capacity in car parks outside and on the periphery of the city centre. It is likely that with further growth in demand a strategy and plan to implement changes to improve parking availability will be required. A number of off street car parks are within the core historical area of the city. These locations have high turnover generating a large number of vehicular trips into the city throughout the day. Many of the larger car parks on the edge of the city centre accommodate a significant number of long stay parking. There is scope for these users to be displaced in order to generate sufficient capacity for short stay car parks in the central area to have a reduced role and allow for demand growth and urban improvements.

1.1.24 A number of areas where place function should take priority over traffic access/parking were identified, which in our view give undue priority to traffic over their importance as places. High traffic volumes, highway dominated environments and vehicle speeds create visual intrusion, noise, emissions and severance, impacting on place quality. Elsewhere streets are underselling the local attractions through poor urban realm or narrow footways.

1.1.25 We recommend that a policy of delivering improved urban realm in areas with high place functions, with the emphasis on improving the quality of the street as a destination in own right, prioritising pedestrians. The degree to which these priorities should be compromised by the streets role as a link should be governed by its Link status. In some places it may be that a link status can or should be downgraded from a primary traffic route.

1.1.26 We would suggest that Chichester can afford to be bold. It is ideally configured for sustainable transport; by virtue of its compact scale walk/cycle times cover most of the urban area. It has the makings of a good cycle network, and proposals for significant number of additional routes. Equally the constrained historic city streets in many places are more suited to the human scale. Importantly it is sufficiently attractive appealing destination that in our view it can and should strive to be a quality destination, with an emphasis on the experience rather than competing on how close to the shops visitors can park – this will never be Chichester's competitive edge, its unique character and charm is. The feedback from stakeholders largely echoed these sentiments.

1.1.27 Following on from the recommendations for parking supply, we propose a bold approach be considered whereby the longer term objective is for traffic to be intercepted at the proposed principle car parks (Northgate, Avenue De Chartres, Cattle Market), which may then enable part of the ring road to be downgraded. The strategy being to reduce the attraction of using the inner ring road as a route through

the city, whilst still providing access to trips that are destined for the city centre. This would require extensive optioneering, conceptual design, feasibility assessments and traffic modelling to determine its viability, and how best it might be implemented. But we would advocate that the concept be explored further, as it could contribute significantly towards realising the vision and objectives for the city.

EVALUATION OF APPROACH

1.1.28 Throughout the duration of the study we have maintained a log to inform how the approach might be adapted and refined for future application.



Chichester District Council

Risk Based Verification Policy 2019



Risk Based Verification Policy 2019

1. Introduction

Risk Based Verification (RBV) is already used on aspects of claims administered by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP). It is the intention that RBV will be applied to all Universal Credit (UC) claims.

From April 2012 Local Authorities (LA) have been able to adopt RBV for the processing of Housing Benefit and Council Tax Benefit (now Council Tax Reduction) claims. Adopting RBV will provide the following benefits:

- Improved claim processing times, especially for those assessed as “low risk”
- Improved efficiency in administrative functions
- Improved opportunity to identify fraud and error on claims and better allocation of resources to target these claims.

Chichester District Council introduced its RBV Policy on 1st December 2017. This Policy document updates the Policy, informed by data collected since the introduction of RBV.

2. Risk Based Verification

Risk Based Verification is a method of applying different levels of checks according to the risk associated with those claims. This determines the level of verification that is required in order to process the claim. The Council will use software provided by Xantura which will create a measured risk score, this score indicates the level of verification that needs to be applied to that case. The Xantura risk model utilises around 50 variables to predict the likelihood of Fraud and error at the gateway and is reviewed and updated in order to reflect both legislative and claimant behavioral change.

Change in circumstances can capture changes from a variety of sources such as the claimant, landlords, HMRC and the DWP. A risk score will only be requested where

the claimant, or someone acting on their behalf notifies the Council of a change in their circumstances. This means that changes received from the DWP and HMRC through the systems provided by them will not need further verification.

Claims will be divided into 3 categories:

- Low risk
- Medium risk
- High risk

Low risks claims will be streamlined and additional verification applied to high risk claims.

Risk scores have been requested on all new claims and change of circumstances received since 1st December 2017. The tables below show the breakdown of risk scores for our case load.

New Claims				
	Low Risk	Medium Risk	High Risk	Total
2017/18	207	189	141	537
	39%	35%	26%	
2018/19	241	178	80	499
	48%	35%	16%	
Total	448	367	221	1036
	43%	35%	21%	

Change of Circumstances				
	Low Risk	Medium Risk	High Risk	Total
2017/18	228	260	156	644
	35%	40%	24%	
2018/19	403	217	139	759
	53%	29%	18%	
Total	631	477	295	1403
	45%	34%	21%	

Depending on the risk grouping of the claim the level of evidence required to process the claim will change. The table at Appendix 1 shows the evidence requirement

dependent on the risk grouping. Evidence of a National Insurance Number and identity are required in all cases irrelevant of the risk grouping as per the legislation as seen in Appendix 2.

- **Low Risk**

Evidence required will be proof of ID and National Insurance Number (NINO). For passported cases this can usually be confirmed by accessing CIS (the LA gateway to DWP systems) as the DWP will have conducted identity checks. Non passported claimants and their partners (where applicable) will be required to provide original evidence to confirm their identity and NINO.

- **Medium Risk**

Evidence of ID and NINO are required as per low risk cases. Plus evidence of income, capital, expenses and rent are required. This can be photocopies or scanned documents.

- **High Risk**

Will be required to provide the same level of evidence as a medium risk case but will be required to provide original documentation. These claims may also be subject to further additional checks, such as a visit to confirm residency, a telephone interview to check entitlement or a credit check carried out by a credit reference agency. A review period may also be set up to check circumstances in the near future, this will particularly help with verifying earnings or capital used on a claim.

3. Recording and monitoring

Each claim passed through RBV process will be allocated a risk score by the software that will be recorded on the claim. Accuracy checks will be incorporated to ensure that the claim has been processed in accordance with this policy.

Cases can be upgraded to higher categories, officers would need to seek approval from a Team Leader to upgrade a case. The cases and reasons are recorded so that information can be fed through to the parameters if errors are found. Risk scores cannot be downgraded.

The risk scores will be monitored on a monthly basis using the software. The reporting will also detail the level of fraud and error within each risk score. The Single

Housing Benefit Extract (SHBE) will also identify errors from the original claim and this will be reported monthly. This monitoring will be measured against our local baseline taken from cells 222 and 231 of SHBE.

Where the appropriate levels of fraud and error are not being identified the RBV policy will be reviewed, any appropriate changes will be made annually to ensure that the Policy remains relevant to the caseload distribution.

Claimants will claim and report changes online through Citizen Access Benefits (CA-B), RBV will score the claim or change of circumstances at the time of submission and notify the claimant immediately of what evidence is required in order for the claim or change to be processed.

Since implementing risk based verification we have seen that low risk claims are processed in less days than high risk claims.

4. Implementation

The policy will commence on the 1st December 2017. New claims and changes of circumstances received after this date will be risk scored by the RBV software as described by this policy. The claim will then be subject to the verification standards applied to the risk group to which they have been assigned.

Claims and changes reported prior to this date will be subject to full verification. Claims will be checked to ensure that verification is being applied correctly.

5. Subsidy & Audit requirements

The Housing Benefit subsidy claim is audited annually. Part of this audit focuses on RBV and whether the Council has acted within its Policy. In order to satisfy the annual subsidy and audit requirement the policy will be reviewed annually and signed off by the Section 151 Officer and any changes to the policy will be reported and agreed by Members.

Appendix 1 – Evidence Required

Type of Evidence	Sub-category of evidence	Low Risk	Medium Risk	High Risk
Identity and NINO	Identity	Originals or photocopies	Originals or photocopies	Originals Required
	NINO	Originals or photocopies	Originals or photocopies	Originals Required
Residency/Rent	Private Tenants	Not Required	Originals or photocopies	Originals Required
	Social Landlords	Not Required	Originals or photocopies	Originals Required
Household Composition	Partner ID, NINO, Income, Capital		Originals or photocopies	Originals Required
	Dependants under 18	Not Required	Originals or photocopies	Originals Required
	Non-dependants – working	Not Required	Originals or photocopies	Originals Required
	Non-dependants – passported benefit	Not Required	Not Required	Originals Required
	Non-dependant – student	Not Required	Originals or photocopies	Originals Required
	Non-dependant – not in remunerative work/other	Not Required	Originals or photocopies	Originals Required
Income	State Benefits	Not Required	Originals or photocopies	Originals Required
	Earnings/SMP/SSP	Not Required	Originals or photocopies	Originals Required
	Self-employed	Not	Originals or	Originals

	income	Required	photocopies along with fully completed SE1 form	Required along with fully completed SE1 form
Child Care Costs		Not Required	Originals or photocopies	Originals Required
Student Status	Student certificate	Originals or photocopies	Originals or photocopies	Originals Required
	Student Income	Originals or photocopies	Originals or photocopies	Originals Required
Capital	Under lower capital limit	Not Required	Originals or photocopies required if over £5,500 for working age or £9,500 for Pensionable Age claims. Not required if capital is below these amounts.	Originals required if over £5,500 for working age or £9,500 for Pensionable Age claims. Not required if capital is below these amounts.
	Above lower capital limit	Not Required	Originals or photocopies	Originals Required
	Above upper capital limit (£16,000)	Not Required	Not Required	Not Required
	Property	Not Required	Originals or photocopies along with completed second property form	Originals required along with completed second property form

Appendix 2 – DWP Housing Benefit & Council Tax Benefit Circular S11/2011

Risk-Based Verification of HB/CTB Claims Guidance

Introduction

1. This guidance outlines the Department's policy on Risk-Based Verification (RBV) of Housing Benefit and Council Tax Benefit (HB/CTB) claims.

Background

2. RBV allows more intense verification activity to be focused on claims more prone to fraud and error. It is practiced on aspects of claims in Jobcentre Plus (JCP) and the Pension Disability and Carers Service (PDCS). Local authorities (LAs) have long argued that they should operate a similar system. It is the intention that RBV will be applied to all Universal Credit claims.

3. Given that RBV is practised in JCP and PDCS, the majority (up to 80%) of HB/CTB claims received in an LA may have been subject to some form of RBV. Already 16 LAs operate RBV. Results from these LAs have been impressive. In each case the % of fraud and error identified has increased against local baselines taken from cells 222 and 231 of the Single Housing Benefit Extract (SHBE), monthly data collection regime to DWP. In addition, in common with the experience of JCP and PDCS there have been efficiencies in areas such as postage and storage and processing times have improved.

4. We therefore wish to extend RBV on a **voluntary basis** to all LAs from April 2012. This guidance explains the following;

What is RBV?

How does RBV work?

The requirements for LAs that adopt RBV.

How RBV claims will be certified.

What are the subsidy implications?

What is RBV?

5. RBV is a method of applying different levels of checks to benefit claims according to the risk associated with those claims. LAs will still be required to comply with relevant legislation (Social Security Administration Act 1992, section 1 relating to production of National Insurance numbers to provide evidence of identity) while making maximum use of intelligence to target more extensive verification activity on those claims shown to be at greater risk of fraud or error.

6. LAs have to take into account HB Regulation 86 and Council Tax Benefit Regulation 72 when verifying claims. The former states:

“a person who makes a claim, or a person to whom housing benefit has been awarded, shall furnish such certificates, documents, information and evidence in connection with the claim or the award, or any question arising out of the claim or the award, as may reasonably be required by the relevant authority in order to determine that person’s entitlement to, or continuing entitlement to housing benefit and shall do so within one month of being required to do so or such longer period as the relevant authority may consider reasonable.”

Council Tax Benefit Regulation 72 is similar.

7. These Regulations do not impose a requirement on authorities in relation to what **specific** information and evidence they should obtain from a claimant. However, it does require an authority to have information which allows an **accurate assessment** of a claimant’s entitlement, both when a claim is first made and when the claim is reviewed. A test of reasonableness should be applied.

How does RBV work?

8. RBV assigns a risk rating to each HB/CTB claim. This determines the level of verification required. Greater activity is therefore targeted toward checking those

cases deemed to be at highest risk of involving fraud and/or error.

9. The classification of risk groups will be a matter for LAs to decide. For example, claims might be divided into 3 categories:

Low Risk Claims: Only essential checks are made, such as evidence of identity. Consequently these claims are processed much faster than before and with significantly reduced effort from Benefit Officers without increasing the risk of fraud or error.

Medium Risk Claims: These are verified in the same way as all claims currently, with evidence of original documents required. As now, current arrangements may differ from LA to LA and it is up to LAs to ensure that they are minimising the risk to fraud and error through the approach taken.

High Risk Claims: Enhanced stringency is applied to verification. Individual LAs apply a variety of checking methods depending on local circumstances. This could include Credit Reference Agency checks, visits, increased documentation requirements etc. Resource that has been freed up from the streamlined approach to low risk claims can be focused on these high risk claims.

10. We would expect no more than around 55% of claims to be assessed as low risk, with around 25% medium risk and 20% high risk. These figures could vary from LA to LA according to the LA's risk profiling. An additional expectation is that there should be more fraud and error detected in high risk claims when compared with medium risk claims and a greater % in medium risk than low risk. Where this proves not to be the case the risk profile should be revisited.

11. LAs may adopt different approaches to risk profile their claimants. Typically this will include the use of IT tools in support of their policy, however, the use of clerical systems is acceptable.

12. Some IT tools use a propensity model which assesses against a number of components based on millions of claim assessments to classify the claim into one of the three categories above. Any IT system must also ensure that the risk profiles include 'blind cases' where a sample of low or medium risk cases are allocated to a higher risk group, thus requiring heightened verification. This is done in order to test and refine the software assumptions.

13. Once the category is identified, individual claims cannot be downgraded by the benefit processor to a lower risk group. They can however, exceptionally, be upgraded if the processor has reasons to think this is appropriate.

The requirements for LAs that adopt RBV

14. RBV will be voluntary. However, all LAs opting to apply RBV will be required to have in place a **RBV Policy** detailing the risk profiles, verification standards which will apply and the minimum number of claims to be checked. We consider it to be good practice for the Policy to be examined by the authority's Audit and Risk Committee or similar appropriate body if they exist. The Policy must be submitted for Members' approval and sign-off along with a covering report confirming the Section 151 Officer's (section 85 for Scotland) agreement/recommendation. The information held in the Policy, which would include the risk categories, should not be made public due to the sensitivity of its contents.

15. The Policy must allow Members, officers and external auditors to be clear about the levels of verification necessary. It must be reviewed annually but not changed in-year as this would complicate the audit process.

16. Every participating LA will need a robust baseline against which to record the impact of RBV. The source of this baseline is for the LA to determine. Some LAs carry out intensive activity (along the lines of the HB Review) to measure the stock of fraud and error in their locality. We suggest that the figures derived from cells 222 and 231 of SHBE would constitute a baseline of fraud and error currently identified by LAs.

17. Performance using RBV would need to be monitored monthly to ensure its effectiveness. Reporting, which must be part of the overall Policy, must, as a minimum, include the % of cases in each risk category and the levels of fraud and error detected in each.

How RBV claims will be certified?

18. Auditors will check during the annual certification that the subsidy claim adheres

to the LA's RBV Policy which will state the necessary level of verification needed to support the correct processing of each type of HB/CTB claim. The risk category will need to be recorded against each claim. Normally the LA's benefit IT/clerical system will allow this annotation.

Other considerations

19. The sample selection for HB/CTB cases will not change i.e. 20 cases will be selected for each headline cell on the claim form. The HB COUNT guidance used by the external auditors for certification will include instructions for how to deal with both non-RBV and RBV cases if selected in the sample. For non-RBV cases, the verification requirements will remain the same i.e. LAs will be expected to provide all the documentary evidence to support the claim.

What are the subsidy implications?

20. Failure by a LA to apply verification standards to HB/CTB claims as stipulated in its RBV Policy will cause the expenditure to be treated as LA error. The auditor will identify this error and if deemed necessary extrapolate the extent and, where appropriate, issue a qualifying letter. In determining the subsidy implications, the extrapolation of this error will be based on the RBV cases where the error occurred. For this reason, it is important that RBV case information is routinely collected by ensuring that LA HB systems incorporate a flag to identify these RBV cases. If subpopulations on RBV cases can not be identified, extrapolations will have to be performed across the whole population in the particular cell in question.

21. We will now work with the respective audit bodies to incorporate this into the COUNT guidance. If you have any queries please contact Manny Ibiayo by e-mail HBCTB.SUBSIDYQUERIES@DWP.GSI.GOV.UK

Southern Gateway

Draft Development Brief (for inclusion in OJEU tender documentation)

[The Brief describes the opportunity and minimum requirements of the Council (and its Partners), as well as briefly touching on other elements of the overall tender process. The remaining parts of the tender pack will deal with the bid process and rules, programme/deadlines, bid requirements, evaluation criteria, financial and commercial issues, and other such matters.]

BRANDED SOUTHERN GATEWAY TITLE PAGE (including a strapline based on 1.3 below)

1. Background

INSERT AERIAL SITE PLAN

- 1.1 Chichester is an attractive, distinctive, and successful UK city with an ambitious vision. The Southern Gateway project provides an opportunity to complement current strengths and cement the city as one of the UK's top places to live, work, shop, discover and learn.
- 1.2 Southern Gateway offers a substantial mixed use regeneration opportunity in the heart of Chichester. The project seeks to transform an approximate 12 hectare/30 acre largely brownfield area into a vibrant and exciting new quarter of exceptional quality.
- 1.3 The Southern Gateway scheme, embracing the city's unique heritage, will be inspiring and welcoming, and lie at the heart of one of the UK's leading visitor destinations. The opportunity will proactively contribute to delivery of the Chichester Vision themes of living, working, and visiting and more particularly to:
 - 1.3.1 Living – to make Chichester an accessible and attractive city, with less traffic, less pollution and more priority for walking and cycling;
 - 1.3.2 Working – having a vibrant and growing economy – a city that pursues development opportunities, make better use of public sector land, retains graduate and develops a skilled workforce; and
 - 1.3.3 Visiting - making Chichester a leading visitor destination, with high quality arts, heritage, culture and leisure, an excellent retail experience and a festival and events programme.

2. Key objectives

- 2.1 Southern Gateway is a key point of access and arrival to the city. It enjoys a very well connected location, adjoining both the city centre and the bus/rail interchange. The substantial largely brownfield site includes a canal basin with associated waterside potential.
- 2.2 The development opportunity aims to create a vibrant new quarter to drive substantial economic growth and associated new/safeguarded jobs, improving the quality of the environment for residents, visitors, workers, and businesses. It will reinforce integration and linkages between the Southern Gateway and the historic city centre to the north.

- 2.3 In order to deliver the overall masterplan strategy, enhancing the character and appearance of the area, and strengthening the range and mix of uses that are present, the Council will seek a comprehensive approach to development across the Southern Gateway. Opportunistic or piecemeal development that does not comply with the aims of the masterplan will not be supported.
- 2.4 A Masterplan for the area was adopted in November 2017 as a Supplementary Planning Document. Enjoying widespread political and community support, it provides a framework for delivery comprising approximately:
- 2.4.1 365 homes, of which a minimum of 30% are to be affordable;
 - 2.4.2 New jobs associated with the potential 21,600 square metres of mixed commercial space including extensive retail, office, hotel, leisure, entertainment, visitor, and night time economy opportunities; potentially to include a 6,000 square metre proposed new community health facility, subject to confirmation and funding from the local health bodies;
 - 2.4.3 Landscaping and public space enhancements;
 - 2.4.4 Improved transport links removing non-essential traffic from the area with an emphasis on walking, cycling and public transport; and
 - 2.4.5 Improvements to highways and services infrastructure, including waste water treatment.

The adopted Masterplan is provided. It is a flexible document and is not a blue-print for the Southern Gateway. Proposals will be assessed on their own merits, having regard to guidance given in the Masterplan, the Chichester Design Protocol, the contribution they make to the vitality and viability of the city centre and the policies contained within the Local Plan. The role of the Masterplan is as a means of guiding development proposals, shaping public realm interventions, enhancing economic growth and diversity, and implementing the Vision for Chichester.

- 2.5 Southern Gateway is an opportunity for a developer to work with Chichester District Council and their strategic partners to realise the Masterplan, the key elements of which are:
- **“Make sure first impressions count as a key gateway location”** - The Masterplan proposes new land uses, enhanced streets and spaces, and better connectivity, particularly for sustainable modes of transport, providing opportunities to significantly improve the first impression of the city.
 - **“Reinforce a mix of city uses”** - The Masterplan establishes development parcels capable of delivering a strong pattern of land uses and activities. By identifying different sites that can accommodate a range of different land uses - new housing, business and employment as well as tourism and leisure opportunities - the Masterplan helps support the economic prosperity of Chichester.
 - **“Conserve and enhance the historic environment”** - The majority of the area lies within the Chichester Conservation Area and retains both historic street layouts and a number of listed, locally listed, and other historic buildings of townscape value. Development within the Southern Gateway provides a unique opportunity to make a positive contribution to the city’s unique character and distinctiveness.

- **“Contribute towards a sustainable movement strategy”** – The Masterplan aims to reinforce sustainable transport patterns through identifying enhancements to key streets and public spaces, particularly between the main city centre, the railway and bus stations and canal basin, as a means of improving the atmosphere and visual attractiveness of this key gateway to the city centre. Enhancements to bus facilities and improvements to cycling and walking routes will be achieved through targeted interventions to the public realm.
- **“Deliver design quality”** - The Masterplan strategy is underpinned by six overarching design principles. They complement the overall objectives and design principles set out within the Chichester Design Protocol. A distinctive and bold design, in keeping with existing guidance, is welcomed.

A brief summary of other relevant strategic planning documents is provided [MA to provide].

3. Strategic location

INSERT MAP FROM CHICHESTER TOMORROW PAGE 11

3.1 The City of Chichester is connected to London (mainline to Victoria), the UK and to Europe. London is 90 minutes away by road and rail.

There is easy access to three international airports:

- Gatwick - less than 60 minutes away by road and rail
- Heathrow - 90 minutes away by road
- Southampton - 45 minutes away by road and rail

Two of Britain’s largest continental ferry and freight ports are just along the coast:

- Portsmouth - just 20 minutes away
- Southampton - just 45 minutes away

The main South Coast trunk road – the A27 – runs through the heart of the area.

4. Strategic context

4.1 Chichester is a vibrant and successful city, located in a surrounding district of exceptional quality, beauty, and diversity of offer. The city boasts:

- Magnificent 12th century Cathedral;
- Extensive Roman, Medieval and Georgian heritage;
- A centre of learning including the rapidly expanding University of Chichester (including their recently opened Engineering and Digital Technology Park on its Bognor Regis campus) and the Ofsted rated “outstanding” Chichester College;
- Cultural assets including Chichester Festival Theatre, Novium Museum, and Pallant House Gallery;
- Beautiful and spacious public parks and gardens;
- A vibrant high street including a diverse range of national and independent traders;
- Excellent rail, bus, road, and port connectivity;

- It is also the county town of West Sussex hosting an associated range of public sector organisations and services including, for example, the District and County Councils headquarters and St Richard's Hospital.

4.2 Located at the foot of the South Downs National Park, Chichester is surrounded by beautiful countryside, sandy beaches, fishing villages, historical and family attractions, offering diversity to suit every visitor.

4.3 Chichester district boasts:

- Workplace population of 74,000 in more than 7,200 businesses;
- A number of major employers including Rolls Royce motor cars, Wileys, Princes Foods, Check-a-Trade and the Goodwood Estate;
- 6.2 million visitors each year;
- Two-thirds of the district is within the South Downs National Park;
- A coastline providing excellent conditions for sailing, fishing, windsurfing, birdwatching and diving;
- Chichester Harbour is designated an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;
- Home to one of the UK's largest marinas for yachting and pleasure craft;
- One of the South East's premier beaches is at West Wittering;
- World-class events and festivals including Qatar Goodwood Festival, the Festival of Speed, the Goodwood Revival and polo at Cowdray Park.

The opportunity will wish to capitalise on this range of assets that are perhaps unmatched in the South of England and further afield.

The adopted Masterplan was developed through a collaborative approach between West Sussex and Chichester District Councils. Both councils have entered a partnership, through the Chichester Place Plan and the subsequent Chichester Growth Deal, to deliver sustainable growth and provide opportunities for new homes and new commercial and retail floor space, preserving existing jobs and creating new ones.

Additionally, Homes England are a key stakeholder in the Southern Gateway project and will provide support in their strategic aim of delivering housing.

5. Residential and commercial market overview

5.1 Residential

Chichester enjoys a very buoyant residential market. Currently there is a structural undersupply of new one and two bedroom apartments in the city centre and demand for new accommodation outstrips supply. There is also significant demand for retirement accommodation.

Providing a range of residential accommodation as part of the scheme, including housing to encourage young people and graduates to live and work and in the city centre, is actively sought.

[Chichester is also considered a very good prospect by the student accommodation development sector, with excellent potential in terms of future demand, rental growth, and the attractiveness of the location.]

5.2 Leisure, Food and Beverage

Chichester is a successful tourist destination which positively skews the demand for bars, restaurants, and coffee shops above that required to meet the needs of the base population. Further, the demographics of Chichester, with a higher than average population of wealthy retirees, also helps the food and drink sector to thrive.

The Southern Gateway site benefits from excellent connectivity and footfall, with the bus and train stations being located within the Masterplan area. Redevelopment has the potential to provide a contiguous extension of Chichester's City Centre that is complimentary of its existing leisure, food and beverage offerings.

There is positive demand for new food and drink outlets in the city centre, particularly for larger premises that can accommodate the growing number of national food chains who are targeting Chichester. This demand is underpinned by a severe shortage of night time economy provision in the city, particularly for its student population and under 35s.

The boutique cinema operators have also expressed an interest in Chichester based on the demographic profile and perceived relative affluence. There is also known demand from gym and leisure providers.

A key objective for the project is to achieve a stronger evening and night time economy, including for example new arts and a multi-purpose entertainment facility.

5.3 Business

The office market is undergoing a period of rapid change in the UK and elsewhere. Flexible co-working environments continue to expand and thrive, becoming an increasingly important part of business infrastructure in the UK.

There is an emerging need for new, modern office accommodation in Chichester. Where delivered there is anticipated to be good demand from occupiers and potential relocators from London and the south east (for both leasehold and freehold space) attracted to the environment that Chichester has to offer. This demand for space is supported by the increasing flexibility from occupiers on the location of their business, as technology makes the physical presence in major centres, such as London, less critical.

Chichester also offers the quality of place to make it a very popular location for a vibrant co-working community/facility. As a university town, and with a high performing further education college, there are clear prospects for local entrepreneurial growth.

The Southern Gateway provides an excellent opportunity to provide additional business facilities in the heart of the city centre, and to encourage students and others to run their businesses from Chichester.

New occupiers of space will be able to take advantage of the local business support network which will include advice on exporting and participation in the proposed Export Ambassador Scheme, the Business Navigator Growth Hub and the Enterprise Adviser Network and build upon the relationship with our university and will be well placed to incorporate the University's proposed Knowledge Exchange Frameworks.

Furthermore, supported by funding from the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, gigabit-capable broadband services are to be built as part of the Gigabit project. The network will be

built, owned and operated by CityFibre, with no reliance on copper wires. Pure fibre networks are the next generation of digital infrastructure, capable of delivering unlimited speeds in both directions in excess of 1Gbps (1,000 Mbps).

5.4 Hotels

Chichester has a shortage of hotels and there has historically been strong demand including from budget operators. There are also a number of very high end boutique hotel operators targeting attractive cities and towns along the south coast. Quality hotel provision is seen as a very important part of scheme mix, possibly incorporating a conference or multi-use entertainment facility.

5.5 Retail

The retail markets in the UK are undergoing a period of rapid change. Chichester has proved extremely resilient (4th most resilient in the UK Source: Retail Resilience Index: Cushman and Wakefield 2018). It is a popular retail centre and attracts a significant number of tourists reinforcing the success of the retail core. Demand from retailers has always been high with few vacant units. The scale of the Southern Gateway opportunity may also generate demand for an appropriate convenience retail provision.

Southern Gateway provides an opportunity to further enhance Chichester's city centre offer with more 'experiences' combining shopping, leisure, events and social activities, with ease, value and quality. Encouraging independent shops and creative trade is also welcomed.

The improvements to highways and infrastructure should make a significant improvement to the public realm and pedestrianised areas. Ensuring that the Southern Gateway links seamlessly with the city centre will be key to attracting additional visitors and trade to the city.

5.6 Community

The health sector has identified a need for approximately 6000 square metres of space including consulting rooms and 1500 square metres of General Practice space based on population growth. The health sector are continuing to undertake work to understand how much of the new demand needs to be satisfied in the Southern Gateway development and how much will go to other strategic developments. The development partner should continue to liaise with the sector and incorporate their funded needs within the scheme as appropriate.

6. Site information

6.1 The overall Southern Gateway site area extends to approximately 12 hectares/30 acres as illustrated on the following site plan:

INSERT SITE PLAN, PROVIDING CLARITY ON WHAT IS IN AND WHAT IS OUT

The site is currently made up of a number of elements as described below.

6.2 The Law Courts

Chichester Combined Court and Chichester Magistrates Court sit within an island site to the north of the Southern Gateway surrounded by the one-way gyratory traffic system on Southgate, Market Avenue, and Basin Road. This site adjoins a terrace of Listed buildings fronting Southgate.

Chichester Combined Court comprises a number of buildings of varied styles and sizes. The Crown Court building is a distinctive monolithic structure designed in 1940 with an attractive art deco

façade fronting Southgate. To the north and connected to this building is a large single storey extension which forms the County Court. The Crown Court is locally Listed, with this listing specifically referring to the Crown Court building only. The Combined Courts provide approximately 2,000 square metres of accommodation.

The Magistrates Court lies to the north of the Combined Court. Built in the 1980's, it is irregular in shape over two storeys with a basement. There are two courtrooms and associated accommodation. The Magistrates Court provides circa 2,240 square metres of accommodation.

Both Courts are owned by and fall under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Justice (MoJ). The MoJ have now closed the Magistrates Court and are in the process of transferring the Combined Court facility to an alternative location within the city. Both buildings are in the process of being transferred by way of an inter-governmental transfer to Homes England. [This transfer is scheduled to complete before the end of 2018].

6.3 The Bus Depot and Bus Station

Stagecoach operate the bus station and bus depot in Chichester from two separate sites. The bus station is situated immediately to the south of the Court buildings and gyratory system, with the bus depot located to the east of the bus station fronting Basin Road.

The bus station site is roughly square in shape and is bordered by the gyratory system to the north, Basin Road to the east, the railway line to the south and Chichester Railway Station to the west (on the other side of Southgate). The bus station itself is situated on the west side of the site, a two storey building built in the 1960's with retail uses on the ground floor fronting Southgate and offices above.

The bus depot sits on a long narrow site bordered by Basin Road car park to the north, Basin Road to the west, the railway line to the south and residential development to the east. The building consists of a large bus garage built in the 1950's and is in poor condition. The building is locally Listed principally because of its unusual thin shell pre-stressed concrete roof that affords a completely free span space within the bus depot.

Both the bus station and the bus depot are held under a lease from the District Council dated 09 July 1954 for a period of 99 years from 29 September 1953 at a rent of £450 per annum. Stagecoach has a number of sub-tenancies.

Chichester District Council have met Stagecoach several times to discuss their aspirations for both the bus station and the depot. In principle, Stagecoach is prepared to relocate their bus depot from this site to an alternative site within the city boundary. They do not require a bus station moving forward, but rather additional bus stops within the city and a small welfare facility (wc's and tea making facilities) for staff. Discussions are being actively pursued with a view to reaching agreement as soon as possible. A letter before CPO action has also been sent to them. Working with its development partner it is the firm intention of the Council to conclude its dealings with Stagecoach so as to incorporate the bus station and depot into the Southern Gateway.

6.4 Basin Road Car Park

The Basin Road car park is owned and controlled by the Council and used as a public pay and display car park providing 117 spaces. Approximately rectangular in shape, the car park fronts Basin Road to the west, and is bordered by Chichester bus depot to the south and residential to the north and east.

The District Council is in discussion with the owner of 45 Basin Road to incorporate it within the development site. A letter before CPO action has also been sent to them.

We also understand that the owners of residential properties to the east of the Basin Road car park may be willing to sell their interests. If these properties were also acquired as part of the land assembly exercise this would afford an additional access from the east off of Cawley Road.

6.5 Royal Mail Delivery Office

Royal Mail own and occupy a delivery office and depot at the southern end of the Gateway fronting Chichester Canal Basin. Royal Mail have owned the site since the 1960's.

This 'L' shaped corner site fronts Basin Road to the east, Chichester Basin /Canal Wharf to the south and Stockbridge Road to the west. The facility is used as a delivery office for the city with ancillary vehicle maintenance, parking, and storage. The site comprises hard standing, single storey offices, garaging and a two storey building located on the corner of Canal Wharf and Basin Road.

The Council have had a number of discussions with Royal Mail and they have confirmed that in principle they are prepared to consider an alternative location for this facility within the city boundary. Discussions are being actively pursued with a view to reaching agreement as soon as possible. A letter before CPO action has also been sent to them. Working with its development partner it is the firm intention of the Council to conclude its dealings with Royal Mail so as to incorporate the depot into the Southern Gateway.

This part of the site will benefit from significant highways improvements that will create a new water front opportunity. The canal basin has been the subject of popular and attractive development in recent years and the provision of new space on its northern flank will create an attractive and active frontage around the basin's perimeter.

The Canal Society operates from a modern unit lying to the south of The Richmond Public House and consideration should be given to their operational needs for access to the basin. Further detail on this matter can be found under 3.47 of the masterplan.

6.6 Police land

To the south east of the Southern Gateway site the police have a significant landholding used as a police station, ancillary buildings and a recently developed custody suite. The police have completed a strategic review of their facilities in West Sussex. They have made a decision to dispose of a large area of grassed open space (currently only used on Blue Light open days) facing Kingsham Road and this is currently the subject of a sale from Sussex Police to Homes England. This is due to complete in [REDACTED]. The police station will remain in situ and as such is excluded from the development opportunity.

6.7 High School / Former Chichester Kingsham Lower School

The High School / former Chichester Kingsham Lower School is located immediately to the east of the police land in a predominantly low density residential area, along both sides of Kingsham Road to the north and Martlet Close to the east. The redundant former lower school building, owned by West Sussex County Council, is now closed and the buildings are principally single storey with pitched roofs. The all-weather sports pitch to the south of the lower school building it's reaching the end of its useful life and is currently let to the High School Academy located immediately to the south. The all- weather pitch will require replacement if developed.

[Confirm if the all-weather pitch consent from DfE has been obtained by WSCC obtained or in the process of being obtained]

6.8 Land at Chichester Railway Station

Land at Chichester Railway Station represents a key public transport interchange within the masterplan area. The site currently consists of the station itself and associated parking and circulation space, as well as a taxi rank. The north western part of the site contains commercial units including a restaurant. The railway station was built in the late 1950's and is locally listed.

The site provides an opportunity for carefully considered infill and redevelopment subject to maintaining the operational requirements of Network Rail and the train operating company (TOC). Options could include apartments or student accommodation, commercial floor space at ground floor, and additional car parking. This could be accommodated to the north of the existing station buildings making more efficient use of existing surface car parking. Opportunities to enhance pedestrian, cycle and public transport accessibility around the station are also an important aspiration.

We are aware that part of this site is proposed to be sold (via a long lease) to Telereal Trillium/Blackstone as part of a major portfolio sale (referred to as Project Condor). This is summarised on the plan below:

INSERT PLAN

6.9 Government Offices

This site [owned by Store Properties] comprises a building on the southern side of Avenue de Chartres on the prominent gateway junction with Southgate. The quality of the public realm is generally poor, although there are wide pavement widths on both sides of Avenue de Chartres.

Immediately to the west of the site is a footway which provides access to the railway station from Avenue de Chartres. The River Lavant also runs adjacent along the western boundary of the site. Further to the west is the Avenue De Chartres Car Park.

Given the prominent location of the site and the bland appearance of the existing buildings, there is an opportunity to consider partial or comprehensive redevelopment to introduce well-designed new buildings that better relate to this key city centre 'gateway' location. A mix of potential uses is considered appropriate for this pair of buildings.

6.10 Transport, movement and public realm

Through a process of assessment and testing, including modelling work across the wider highway network across Chichester in close collaboration with West Sussex County Council as highway authority, a preferred approach (further defined within the Transport Appraisal) has been identified as part of the adopted Masterplan.

The approach that the developer is expected to deliver comprises:

- The closure of Stockbridge Road level crossing to general traffic through the introduction of a bus gate to Stockbridge Road, limiting access to buses, emergency vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists
- Enhancements to the public realm for pedestrians and cyclists
- Realignment of Basin Road with a new junction on Stockbridge Road

- Modification of Southgate Gyrotory to reduce the width and number of lanes and improve the pedestrian environment

The estimated cost for undertaking these works was calculated at £5.3 million in March 2017.

This approach will deliver benefits in terms of pedestrian, cycle, and public transport accessibility, particularly around the station and along Stockbridge Road, Southgate, and South Street. A bus gate would limit general vehicle access through signage and potentially a barrier e.g. rising bollard. It also retains access to the Southern Gateway for vehicles but reprioritises traffic movements to allow for significant enhancements to the public realm.

The existing bus station would be replaced with a new bus and taxi interchange located immediately north and south of the Railway Station. In addition, two bus laybys would be introduced along Avenue de Chartres to provide additional coach parking capacity for events and the summer period.

The highways improvements potentially allow the Basin Road level crossing to act independently from the Stockbridge Road crossing, thus adding additional time for vehicles using the Basin Road level crossing. [Consultation with Network Rail has revealed that they would have no objection].

A transport appraisal report has been undertaken which shows an increased reassignment of traffic to the A27 and Northern Ring Road as the approach is implemented with no significant alteration to the Highway Network flows.

The masterplan also identifies four clear public realm priorities for the Southern Gateway:

- Southgate and Stockbridge Road
- South Pallant and Market Avenue
- Canal Wharf and Basin Road
- Kingsham Road

The public realm priorities are underpinned by the need to achieve a better balance between different modes of transport, with a particular focus on public transport, walking and cycling. Please refer to the Masterplan for further detail.

6.11 Supporting technical studies

A list of available technical studies is listed below:

- Topographical Study of the Southern Gateway site
- Title Documentation
- Desktop Phase 1 Environmental Assessment
- Archaeological Appraisal
- Services location study (existing facilities)
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Waste Water Treatment
- Traffic Appraisal Report
- Contamination study
- Strategic Environmental Assessment
- [others?]

7 The opportunity

The opportunity represents one of the most significant city centre regeneration projects in the south of England. The Council is inviting bids in order to select a development partner with the right skills, resources, commitment, and approach to deliver the Council's aims as expressed in the Masterplan. Working with the Council (and its partners), the development partner in summary will:

- Support the Council to complete land assembly and relocations (where required) utilising the Council's CPO powers (if needed).
- Design a high quality scheme in accordance with the Masterplan and the Council's scheme requirements, leading to planning application(s) and implementable consent(s) encompassing significant community consultation
- Focus any new office space to high growth, high value sectors identified in the C2C LEP Strategic Economic Plan such as high end finance; digital; life sciences and creative industries and publicise the local business support network
- Consider and advise on the case for focussed meanwhile uses
- Delivery of all necessary enabling infrastructure including the preferred highways approach, bus street, sustainable transport/movement enhancements and public realm
- Fund and develop the scheme
- Brand, promote and market the opportunity
- Ensure long term stewardship and management of the completed development
- Achieve best consideration for land transferred

The redline opportunity being presented to bidders includes the following sites (as summarised in the adopted Masterplan):

Site	Potential Development Capacity
The Law Courts and bus station	Approximately 50 apartments, an 80-bedroom hotel and around 3,500 square metres of mixed commercial space at ground floor
Basin Road car park and bus depot	Approximately 80 apartments
Royal Mail site	Approximately 25 apartments above ground 1500 square metres of mixed commercial space at ground floor. The smaller area to the north of the realigned Basin Road could accommodate up to 2,100 square metres of small B1 office accommodation
Police Station land and former high school	A mix of up to 144 town houses and apartments. In addition, up to 7,200 square metres of B1 office space
Small parcel of Network Rail land	A small amount of Network Rail land is required to facilitate the preferred highways/movement scheme included in the

	Masterplan
--	------------

INSERT REDLINE PLAN

In addition to the above we want to facilitate a comprehensive approach to the overall Southern Gateway Masterplan area. We therefore encourage proposals which also aim to unlock appropriate development across the remaining Network Rail land and Government office property and accommodate further development opportunities that can be delivered on adjoining sites to those included within the masterplan where the opportunity arises.

The minimum scheme requirements are further described in section 8.

8 Scheme requirements

Table [1]: Summary of scheme requirements

Comprehensive development	<i>A comprehensive development of the Southern Gateway, compatible with the Masterplan, delivered by the selected Development Partner (either itself, or in consortium, or as may be procured by it under the terms of the development agreement).</i>
Minimum land payment and other financial requirements	<i>Minimum land payments [Recovery of sunk costs] Overage Developers Profit Percentage Finance (rate of interest) [Contingency] [Prelims] [Professional fees]</i>
Transport infrastructure, public realm and utilities	<i>This is fully referenced within the adopted masterplan but includes:</i> <i>Enhanced streets and spaces, and better connectivity, particularly for sustainable modes of transport</i> <i>Sustainable transport patterns through identifying enhancements to key streets and public spaces, particularly between the main city centre, the railway and bus stations and canal basin.</i> <i>Improving the atmosphere and visual attractiveness of this key gateway to the city centre. Enhancements to bus facilities and improvements to cycling and walking routes achieved through targeted interventions to the public realm.</i> Utilities provision to accommodate the needs of the development. Maximise the potential afforded by gigabit-capable broadband services in the area.

<p>Mixed uses</p>	<p><i>Housing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 299 homes • Minimum of 30% affordable housing (shared ownership 30% and affordable rent 70%) • We would support a greater provision of 1 and 2 bedroom units (both market and affordable) on the site than the recommended SHMA <p><i>The affordable units should meet the Nationally Described Space Standards and should not be in groups of more than 10</i></p> <p><i>Commercial – approximately 18,000 sq m of employment space across a broad range of usages including, but not limited to: offices, retail¹, leisure, hotel, restaurants, bars, cinema, co-working space, conference facilities, and multi-purpose entertainment space and community health facility. Delivery of a high quality hotel is considered to be very important.</i></p>
<p>Compatibility with the character of the City</p>	<p><i>A positive contribution to the city’s unique character and distinctiveness.</i></p>
<p>Design quality</p>	<p><i>Meeting and exceeding the overall objectives and design principles set out within the Chichester Design Protocol. Delivering exceptional design quality is essential.</i></p> <p><i>The development will be expected to comply with BREEAM “very good” standard as a minimum.</i></p>
<p>Legal and commercial</p>	<p><i>Compliant with the commercial requirements of the Council where expressed as a minimum requirement, and in other respects being a justified allocation of obligations and liabilities for a project of this nature.</i></p>

9 Other project issues

9.8 The project is being progressed by the three public sector landowners (Chichester District Council, West Sussex County Council and Homes England), led by the District Council as a key landowner and as planning and CPO authority.

9.9 [The three public sector land-owners have entered into a collaboration agreement to support a comprehensive development of the Southern Gateway. This agreement covers land pooling, land draw down for development, decision-making during the procurement.

9.10 [Under these arrangements the various land interest will be committed to the scheme and catered for in the intended development agreement with the successful

¹ The emerging local plan identifies the need for 10,000 sqm of new retail floorspace over the life of the plan.

developer. This position is further described in the Heads of Terms, and elsewhere in the [tender invitation pack.]

9.11 The Council is willing to enter into a development agreement under which, as landowner, it will commit to pursuing a CPO across the Masterplan area. That commitment will not fetter the discretion of the Council or negate the requirement on the Council to satisfy itself, in the usual way, that a CPO is required and justified. A CPO indemnity agreement from the selected development partner will be required.

9.12 Homes England [*Describe role and expectations/ requirements*]

9.13 WSCC [*Describe role and expectations/ requirements*]

10 Commercial outline [*But bearing in mind that elsewhere in the ITT will be HoTs for the DA, and probably a financial section.*]

10.8 The Council is not being prescriptive about the nature of the Development Partner and is willing to consider interest from developers who can demonstrate an expertise in the development of mixed use schemes. This may be a single company or a consortium.

10.9 [It is recognised that, given the nature of the masterplan and envisaged uses, the developer or consortium may be such that certain 3rd parties may need to be brought in at a later stage of the project. This could include, for example, funders, developers, operators, etc. Where that approach is envisaged, bidders will be expected to demonstrate a sound methodology for bringing such 3rd parties into the project, and explain how project risk will be allocated to the satisfaction of the Council and other public sector stakeholders].

10.10 Draft Heads of Terms for the Development Agreement are set out in Part [D]. These are to form the basis for negotiation and a full draft agreement issued at a later (negotiation) stage of the procurement. Bidders are expected to be transparent about their commercial position and raise issues with the Council in a spirit of co-operation.

10.11 Depending on the structure of a bidder or consortium make-up, a parent company guarantee or other security may be required.

10.12 A key requirement of the Council and the other public sector landowners is for land to be transferred to the developer for payment which, at a minimum, satisfies the statutory requirement for “best consideration”. [*Say more here or elsewhere in the tender pack*]

11 Social value and engagement with stakeholders

11.8 Bidders are asked to consider approaches that will enhance the community value of the scheme to support the Council’s duty to promote the economic, social and environmental well-being of the community. Your bid should consider and set out how it will:

- i. [Support and promote SMEs in the supply chain
- ii. Support local economic well being

- iii. Undertake the development in accordance with the Council's approved Developer Charter
- iv. Promote employment and training opportunities (in development and in legacy)
- v. Support student visits, work experience and apprenticeship opportunities especially via links to the construction and Facility Management related courses at Chichester College
- vi. Enhance graduate retention in the city
- vii. *[Others?]*

11.9 [The Council, working with its public sector partners, expects to lead all community engagement up to the point that a Bidder is successfully selected. After that point the Council expects the Development Partner to lead local community engagement in conjunction with the Council. We would expect local stakeholders, residents and businesses to be consulted about:

- a. The design concept
- b. The detailed design at pre-application stage
- c. The final design

11.10 The Council has held several public meetings about the development of SPD for the wider area and has consulted land owners about the SPD. All parties who attended these discussions have expressed general interest in the principle of redevelopment.

12 Procurement outline

12.8 Under the collaboration arrangements settled between the public sector stakeholders, it is agreed that the District Council will lead the procurement process and liaise with the others as necessary throughout.

12.9 The procurement process will be run through the [describe tender portal used]. All documents for this procurement can be obtained via the portal and all bids / clarifications are to be submitted via the portal, and the District Council will respond via the same route.

12.10 The procurement will be undertaken as a Competitive Procedure with Negotiation. All interested Bidders must pre-qualify through the submission of the Selection Questionnaire (SQ) and following this stage, the District Council, working with its strategic partners, will select no more than [5] parties to proceed to tender stage. The Invitation to Participate in Competitive Procedure with Negotiation (ITPCPN) document [(part [A] of this pack)] sets out the procedure and evaluation criteria.

12.11 It is envisaged that the negotiation will proceed in successive stages by applying the award criteria specified in the ITPCPN. An indicative timetable is set out in Part [A] of this pack.

12.12 All procurement documents are available on the portal however at this stage only the SQ needs to be completed.

12.13 The deadline for submission of the SQ is [12 noon] on [xyz 2018].

This page is intentionally left blank

Project Documentation**PROJECT INITIATION DOCUMENT
(PID)****Southern Gateway
Masterplan Implementation**

Release:	9th Draft
Date:	September 2018
Author:	Paul Over Jane Hotchkiss
Approved by:	Cabinet

Note: the completion of this document is required for medium and large projects as defined by the Project Type Matrix. The final version should be saved in a sub folder on the x drive under project management / project documentation.

Document History

Revision Date	Version	Summary of Changes	Reviewer(s)
30/11/2016	1	First draft	AL/PO
16/02/2017	2	Second draft	Implementation Sub-Group and strategic land owners
06/03/2017	3	Third draft	Commercial Programme Board
07/03/2017	4	Fourth draft	CPB; HCA and WSCC
15/03/2017	5	Timescale updated	PO/JH/AL
29/08/2017	6	Timescale and outcomes updated to reflect latest masterplan position for OSC consideration	PO/JH/DS/AF
19/10/2017	7	Additional risk and outcome added & consultants input on timescales and dependencies	OSC & Jones Lang LeSalle (JLL)
29/08/2018	8	Revised timescale and personal	Growth Board
10/9/2018	9	Revised timescale and risks	Cabinet

Consideration by the Corporate Improvement Team

Date	Reviewing Officer	Comments for Consideration
11 th September 2018	Jenny Westbrook	Minor changes suggested in line with the amendments to the Project Plan.

Approvals

This document requires the following approvals:

Name of person, group or committee
SLT
Chichester District Growth Board
Overview and Scrutiny Committee (CDC)
Cabinet (CDC)
Strategic Land Ownership Group
Council – in relation to any consideration of a Compulsory Purchase Order in accordance with Article 4 of the Constitution

Distribution

A final copy of the approved document will be distributed to:

Name	Job Title
Andrew Frost	Head of Planning Services, CDC

Cllr Susan Taylor	Cabinet Member for Planning, CDC
Cllr Jane Kilby	Cabinet Member for Housing, CDC
Cllr Tony Dignum	Leader of the Council, CDC
Cllr Eileen Lintill	Deputy Leader, CDC
Paul Over	Executive Director & Deputy Chief Executive, CDC
Nick Bennett	Legal Services Manager, CDC
Gerard Overton	Homes England (HE)
Jane Hotchkiss	Director of Growth and Place, CDC
Alan Gregory	Project Manager, Estates, CDC
Mark Regan	Senior Estates Surveyor, CDC
Diane Shepherd	Chief Executive, CDC
Cllr L. Goldsmith	Leader, WSCC
Cllr P. Montyn	WSCC
Cllr J. Fitzjohn	WSCC
Lee Harris	Executive Director, WSCC
Melanie Burgoyne	Economic Development Manager, CDC
Amy Loaring	Partnership Officer, CDC
Mark Catlow	Accountancy Services, CDC
John Ward	Director of Finance and Governance, CDC
Phil Pickard	Procurement Manager, CDC
Clare Hawkin	Public Relations Officer, CDC

1. PURPOSE OF DOCUMENT

1.1 This Project Initiation Document builds on the Southern Gateway – Preparation of Masterplan PID approved by Cabinet in June 2016. It sets out why and how the implementation phase should proceed, who is involved and their responsibilities. It will provide the baseline for the projects management and for an assessment of its overall success.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 The regeneration of an area of circa 12 hectares (30 acres) of predominately brownfield land in a mix of public and private ownership with potential housing, business, leisure and commercial uses. The project will bring significant improvements to the public realm, transport infrastructure, enhancements to the quality of the environment including improved pedestrian linkages to the city centre and the regeneration of the only canal basin in West Sussex. The masterplan map shows the key development sites.

2.2 This regeneration scheme will be operating at scale. The largest regeneration project in Chichester city centre in living memory it will facilitate missing elements of provision for young people (Chichester is the only University city in West Sussex) and tourist facilities (Chichester is the strongest tourism location in West Sussex (Source: Visit England website (www.visitbritain.org)).

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. The Southern Gateway area has long been seen as an opportunity to make better use of the southern approach to Chichester city. In 2001 the Southern Gateway Framework was adopted by the District Council and retains its status

as Supplementary Planning Guidance. Whilst much progress has been made (e.g. with the former Osborne's site, the Girls High School and the Southern Sidings development) significant opportunities remain to regenerate the area. These opportunities have not been realised as a result of the recent economic downturn, the costs of relocating existing users and the extraordinary development costs associated with some of the sites. These barriers are considered to be surmountable with public sector support and investment.

3.2. Recent developments make this an opportune time to resurrect this opportunity. Those developments include:

- I. The announcement that the Law Courts are to be closed;
- II. The approval of the District Council led Chichester Vision;
- III. The adoption of a new Masterplan for the area as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD); and
- IV. The Government's emphasis on growth and jobs (with new funding streams to assist).
- V. The closure of the Kingsham First and Middle school

3.3. The regeneration area within the Southern Gateway includes the Bus Station and Depot, the Basin Road Car Park, the Courts Buildings, the Police Station, former Kingsham school and the Royal Mail depot

4. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND SUCCESS CRITERIA

4.1. Outputs

- Successful Local Growth Fund (LGF) and other funding secured which will lever in an estimated £83m of private sector investment (excluding relocation and acquisition costs).
- Purchase of any privately owned property required to deliver the project.
- Successful relocation of existing uses
- Creation of the strategic implementation partnership.
- Approval of a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) if required.
- Securing a development partner.

4.2. Outcomes

The project is estimated to deliver:

- New jobs;
- Existing jobs protected (Stagecoach and Royal Mail);
- New homes/student accommodation delivered;
- Business/retail and leisure floorspace created (onsite)
- New community health facility (subject to funding and specification)
- Possible return on investment for any capital funding provided by CDC (subject to separate reports)
- Improvements to the public realm, the transport system and the appearance of the townscape and buildings in the area.

These proposals, once delivered, will make a significant contribution to and directly support the Community Strategy and Corporate Plan especially in relation to

housing, jobs and infrastructure by unlocking predominantly brownfield sites. The redevelopment of much of this area has stalled for decades due to lack of public funding available to unlock the sites. This project will include investment in infrastructure (waste water treatment, bus/rail interchange, improved access for pedestrians and cyclists) together with enhancements to the public realm.

This project will build on current economic success in an area where performance is already good and where the private sector, by their previous involvement in nearby developments, have demonstrated that they are eager to be involved. Public funding will ensure that these final opportunities are realised.

By directly marketing the new employment space to high growth, high value sectors such as high end finance; digital; pharmaceutical and creative industries will ensure that this regeneration contributes to ensuring that the Chichester area performs well above the UK average. (GVA per head across Chichester, Arun, Adur and Worthing was £21,274 - below both the regional (£27,012) and national (£25,367) figures. Source ONS December 2015).

The project outcomes will be regularly reviewed at key milestones.

4.3. Outcome Measures

Based on a viable Masterplan and making reasonable assumptions on the mix of proposals:

- 1434 new jobs;
- protect at least 200 existing jobs (Stagecoach and Royal Mail);
- 365 new homes/student accommodation;
- 90% sold within one year of completion
- 21,600 sqm of business/retail and leisure floorspace (onsite)
- Successful relocation of existing uses comprising of 4,000 sqm of off-site relocation space.
- Return on investment on the basis of CDC "Investment protocol"
- Public satisfaction survey – at least 80% of respondents confirm they are either satisfied or very satisfied with the development
- Improved air quality
- Improved travel times

4.4. Dis-benefits

- Disturbance during construction
- Impact on business viability to existing retail offer
- Behavioural change required if traffic movements are reconfigured
- Potential loss of locally listed/listed buildings
- Potential loss of trees
- Loss of public car park capacity

4.5. Out of Scope

The project will not include:

- Master planning and associated traffic studies – this dependency is already signed off.
- Any regulatory processes (other than those associated with a CPO) or obtaining of necessary permissions and consents. This would be done by developers.
- Relocation of the railway line which dissects the southern gateway area
- Excludes management of the building contract

5. PROJECT CONSTRAINTS

- Adoption of the Masterplan as a SPD - completed
- Approval and timescales of any required CPO
- Strategic Partner Agreements
- Timing and expenditure constraints of certain funding streams
- Planning constraints
- Contaminated land
- Fragmented land ownership
- Government and local planning policy.
- Waste water treatment capacity
- Availability of suitable relocation sites

6. PROJECT ASSUMPTIONS

The delivery of the project assumes:

- A viable Masterplan, including traffic implications, adopted by November 2017 - completed
- Public and Private funding can be raised to fund development costs and funding gaps relating to relocations.
- On-going political and public support for the project
- Willingness of partners to engage in the strategic implementation process
- The Law courts to be closed and handed to the HCA by December 2018
- Waste water capacity for development can be provided.
- Road space reconfiguration is implementable.

7. PROJECT COSTS

7.1. Project Delivery Costs

The cost of the project comprises staff costs of the Project Team which are included within the existing base budget and consultancy/professional services costs which are currently estimated at up to £155,000.

	Description	Cost (£)	Comments
1	Development/marketing surveyor consultant	155,000	This funding is already approved via CDC Cabinet (January 2017) and West Sussex One Public Estate. Some of these costs might be recoverable from the
2	CPO surveyor consultant		
3	Legal CPO consultant		
4	Legal Property Consultant		
5	Waste water treatment/flooding/contamination		

	surveys		developer once selected. Additional strategic partnership funding will be sought. This excludes disposal commission at present.
6	Property relocation and acquisition costs	13,500,000	These costs will be funded from the capital receipt of the site being released plus external/partnership funding yet to be secured to fund abnormal development costs and relocation costs. The costs estimates exclude fees, VAT, contingency and SDLT. This excludes any value attributable to Sussex Police land. They assume a developable site with no abnormal costs.
7	CDC capital investment	TBC and subject to separate report	
	Total	13,655,000	

CDC has allocated Executive Director, estates, legal, finance, PR, procurement and project management support for the project. The development costs, which are not included above, will be borne by the appointed developer.

7.2. On-going Costs Following Project Completion

The only ongoing cost to the council would relate to the management function associated with any development share that the council retained. This would be subsumed into the existing role of the estates service.

It is also assumed that what is built is commercially viable and does not require any further public financial support in terms of ongoing operational revenue.

The Council will be forgoing the income from the bus depot, bus station and Basin Rd car park (circa £75,500 per year), although some of the car park income will deflect to the nearby Council owned Avenue de Chartres car park, where there is currently spare capacity. This lost income could be compensated for by the Council taking a share of the development proceeds (capital and/or revenue).

8. OPTIONS SUMMARY

The Council could allow the future development of the Southern Gateway area to be market-led. This option has been discounted since experience over the past few decades has indicated without public sector support the development opportunities that remain are unlikely to come forward. Whilst some of the sites might be capable of independent development proceeding in such a piecemeal fashion weakens the case for public funding and risks the disjointed funding of infrastructure.

There are several alternative ways in which this project could be implemented including:

- Self-Promote – CDC & partners assemble the land, obtain planning permission and undertake the development themselves
- Grant an Option – this will allow a third party to draw down the land at an agreed price during a fixed period of time
- Conditional Sale – this allows a third party to purchase the site once certain conditions e.g. an acceptable planning permission, has been obtained
- Unconditional Sale – following site assembly the site is sold at an agreed sum with no conditions
- Unconditional Contract with Planning Overage – as unconditional sale but with a clause that allows an additional payment to be made to CDC/partners if a more favourable development is achieved
- Public-Private Partnerships – the formation of a new legal entity to deliver the development. The partnership could include landowners and would define the various contributions to costs and benefit sharing arrangements.

Any of these options could proceed with or without a CPO. The major landowners: Homes England; WSCC and CDC have discussed the matter with external consultancy support and the conditional sale to a developer(s) is the agreed preferred route. This minimises financial exposure/risk to the landowners, retains a degree of control over the content of the eventual development and provides an opportunity to participate in the investment if any of the partners chooses so to do.

9. PROJECT APPROACH

The Southern Gateway implementation will involve a mix of in-house, partnership and external consultancy resources. It will be managed by a Project Team with representation from each of the Strategic Landowning Partners i.e. CDC, WSCC and HE that will drive the disposal programme, timescale and selection of development partner(s). A Partnership Collaboration Agreement will govern the way in which costs and benefits are shared. The project is also a key deliverable within the Growth Deal signed between CDC and WSCC and will be monitored at a strategic level by the Chichester District Growth Board.

10. PROJECT PLAN

Task	Task / milestone	Completion	Responsible	Dependency
------	------------------	------------	-------------	------------

No.		Date	Owner	
Stage 1- Funding Applications/ approvals				
1a	HCA (now Homes England)	November 2017	Steve Carvell	Completed
1b	LEP	November 2017	Paul Over	Completed
1c	WSCC – Growth Deal	October 2018	Jane Hotchkiss	Growth Deal signed – funding decision post procurement
1d	One Public Estate grant	November 2017	Paul Over	Completed
1e	DCLG housing bid	July 2017	Linda Grange	Completed
1f	Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF)	September 2017	Paul Over	Completed - unsuccessful
1g	Other funding streams	ongoing	Amy Loaring	
Stage 1a – Communications Strategy				
1a.1	Complete Communications Strategy	December 2017	Sarah Parker	Phase 1 Masterplan - completed
Stage 2 – Appointment of Consultants				
2a	Funding For Consultants	February 2017	Paul Over	1d - completed
2b	Procurement process to begin	April 2017	Patrick Harrison/Nick Bennett	2a - completed
2c	Appointment of Property Consultants	August 2017	Paul Over	2b - completed
2c (i)	Appointment of Legal Consultants	June 2018	Nick Bennett	2b - completed
2d	Commission studies: WWT; Contamination and Flooding	November 2017	Paul Over	1d & 2c - completed
Stage 3 – Development of Partnership				
3a	Engagement with Partners	Jan 2017	Paul Over	Completed
3b	Agree development Delivery vehicle	April 2017	Paul Over	Completed
3d	Enter into development partnership/MOU	Sept 2017	Paul Over	Phase 1 Masterplan - completed
3e	Agree strategic approach to CIL	September 2018	JLL ¹	
3c	Agree partner investment approach	September 2018	Paul Over	Phase 1 Masterplan
3c (i)	Complete formal Collaboration Agreement	September 2018	Paul Over/BJ ²	2c(i) and 3d
Stage 4 – Relocation and Acquisition of strategic partner sites³				
4a	Identification and agreement	September	JLL ¹ /Mark	2c

¹ Jones Lang LeSalle – appointed property consultants

² Browne Jacobson – appointed legal consultants

³ Timeline assumes no CPO is required.

	of relocation sites	2018	Regan	
4b	Completion of acquisition of Law Courts by HCA	December 2018	Gerard Overton (HE)	MoJ decision on release - confirmed
4c	Completion of acquisition of Police station site	September 2018	Gerard Overton (HE)	Phase 1 Masterplan
4c (i)	Completion of acquisition of 45, Basin Rd	September 2018	Mark Regan	Phase 1 Masterplan
4d	Enter into development partnership on High School site Kingsham	October 2018	Paul Jackson-Cole (WSCC)	Phase 1 Masterplan
4d(i)	Agree terms to transfer WSCC land to HE	October 2018	Paul Jackson-Cole (WSCC)	Phase 1 Masterplan
4e	Closure of Basin Road Car Park	Post June 2019	Paul Over	7c
4f	Completion of Royal Mail relocation and acquisition	October 2019	JLL ¹	1b & c
4g	Completion of Bus station/Depot relocation and acquisition	October 2019	JLL ¹	1b, c and 4a
4h	Engage with Network Rail	Sept 2018	Policy Planning	Phase 1 Masterplan
Stage 5 - CPO resolution				
5	Receive strategic CPO advice	August 2018	BJ ²	2c(i) - completed
5a	Council Resolution	Tbc	Nick Bennet	6d
5b	CPO confirmed	Tbc	Nick Bennet	6e
Stage 6 – Selection of Developer				
6a	Conclude development brief	September 2018	Alan Gregory/JLL ¹	Stage 3
6b	Soft market test	June 2018	JLL ¹ /Alan Gregory	Stages 1 & 4 - completed
6c	Invite to tender (OJEU)	October 2018	JLL ¹ /BJ ² /Alan Gregory	Stage 1 & 4
6d	Select developer	May 2019	Project team	6c
6e	Conclude conditional contract to appoint developer	July 2019	BJ ² /Alan Gregory	6c
Stage 7 – Development Delivery				
7c	Deliver development	September 2019 onwards (prov)	Development Partner/Alan Gregory	7b/Stage 4

11. PROJECT TEAM

Name	Role
Paul Over	Project Sponsor
Jane Hotchkiss	Project lead/Shadow Project Sponsor

Alan Gregory	Project manager (Estates)
Amy Loaring	Project Coordinator/Technical Support
Nick Bennett	Legal
Mark Catlow	Finance
Mark Regan	Estates (workstream lead)
John Ward	Governance
Melanie Burgoyne	Economic Development
Mike Allgrove	Policy Planning
Gerard Overton	Strategic Landowner (HE)
Duncan Barratt	Strategic Landowner (WSCC)
Paul Jackson-Cole	Strategic Landowner (WSCC)
Clare Hawkin	Public relations & Communication Strategy (as required)
Phil Pickard	Procurement (as required)

The Project Team will report to the Chichester District Growth Board, whose membership will comprise senior political and officer representation from CDC and WSCC together with the Project Sponsor providing the link between the Project Team and Growth Board. The Growth Board will provide strategic direction to the project and resolve resource issues that cannot be resolved within the resources delegated to the project team. An observer from the CDC Overview and Scrutiny Committee will sit on the Growth Board.

12. COMMUNICATION

Elected CDC members will be kept informed through the monthly Members' Bulletin, bespoke email communication, as necessary, workshops and reports, on an exception basis, to the Commercial Programme Board and Growth Board. CDC officers will be kept informed through reports to the Strategic Leadership Team (SLT).

Key stakeholders who are not strategic partners i.e. not landowners, will be kept closely apprised of progress and be offered the opportunity to feed into the process at key stages. Such groups would include the Chichester BID, City Council, resident groups and Visit Chichester.

Consultation material is available on the website and in hard copy at Council offices and public libraries. All public consultation will be carried out in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. A Communication Strategy has been developed.

Strategic Partners will utilise their own communications channels to publicise and inform their stakeholders in accordance with the collectively agreed Communication Strategy.

The normal regulatory communication and consultation process will be followed i.e. Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel and Planning Committee when planning related aspects e.g. pre-application and planning application, require consideration.

13. RISK LOG

The following risks have been identified together with an assessment of their severity and actions that can be taken to mitigate/reduce the risk. Details of all project risks will be recorded as and when they are identified.

Risk No	Risk Description	Likelihood Unlikely Possible Probable Certain	Impact Minor Significant Serious Major	Planned Actions to Reduce Risk	Responsible Officer
1	Masterplan not adopted as a SPD by November 2017	2	4	Member briefing before DPIP/Cabinet	Andrew Frost - completed
2	Law Courts not handed over to HE by December 2018	2	3	Close liaison with HE & contingency built into Masterplan.	Gerard Overton (HE)
3	Disengagement of Strategic Landowner organisations (WSCC/HE)	1	3	Steering group to sign off draft documents and on-going liaison with other partners. Completion of MOU.	Paul Over
4	Consultants don't deliver to deadline	2	2	Contract to ensure delivery	Legal
5	Demand in certain market sectors changes so as to render the Masterplan commercially unviable.	2	3	Constant updating of viability advice as implementation proceeds.	JLL ¹
6	CPO if required, is not approved	2	3	Consultancy support to ensure well founded grounds for CPO	BJ ² /Nick Bennett
7	Lack of funding to cover relocation costs	3	3	Timely reapplication to LEP/HE/WSCC and exploration of alternative funding routes	Paul Over and Amy Loaring
8	LEP terminating the funding agreement during the project	2	4	Close liaison with LEP. Try to agree rephasing.	Paul Over
9	Lack of funding to bank roll the project	2	3	Financial services to closely monitor project timescales via attendance at project team meetings	Mark Catlow
10	Excessive demands for community/public realm type uses make the	2	4	Growth Board input and regular re-appraisal of the	Paul Over/JLL ¹

	scheme overall unviable			scheme as it progresses	
11	Unforeseen abnormal costs	2	2	Key studies undertaken in advance e.g. contamination; flooding and drainage	Alan Gregory
12	Failure to agree terms and complete acquisitions of relocation sites	3	3	CPO and independent valuations	JLL ¹ /Mark Regan
13	Failure to agree terms and complete acquisition of Basin Rd property	3	2	CPO and independent valuations	Mark Regan
14	Failure to agree terms and complete acquisition of Police land	2	2	CPO and independent valuations	Gerard Overton (HE)
15	Failure to agree terms and complete acquisition of All Weather Pitch	2	2	CPO and independent valuations	Paul Jackson-Cole (WSCC)
16	Failure to reprovide All weather pitch within timescales due to s.78 delays	2	2	Effective dialogue and agreement with the Academy and early application for s78 approval	Paul Jackson-Cole (WSCC)
17	Lack of funding to implement Road space reconfiguration	2	3	WSCC Highways input to project team and funding support	Paul Jackson-Cole (WSCC)
18	Availability of consultancy advice	1	2	Use tried and tested framework agreement to source expertise; test knowledge via tendering process	Patrick Harrison & Nick Bennett - completed
19	Planning permission refused	2	3	Careful selection of development partner and adherence to adopted masterplan via development agreement controls	Paul Over
20	All locally listed buildings need to be retained	1	3	Well-argued masterplan – façade of crown court to be retained	Mark Regan
21	A27(T) proposals do not advance	2	2	Development of proposals that	Developer

				reflect the status quo; implementation of local plan proposals for A27(T) as a minimum	
22	Inability to find a development partner	2	4	Pre-marketing advice; soft market test	JLL ¹
23	Growth Deal not signed	2	4	Close liaison with WSCC officers and their members	Lee Harris (WSCC) - completed
24	BREXIT – impact on investment/construction sectors	3	2	To continually review the market and the timings linked to procurement	Paul Over/JLL ¹
25	VAT implications – opt in/opt out	2	3	Consultation with Council's vat officer and advisers	Mark Catlow
26	Loss of key personnel	2	1	Appointment of consultants and shadowing of project sponsor role by Jane Hotchkiss	Paul Over
27	Foul drainage	2	3	Commission a follow on study to supplement the local plan work	Alan Gregory

Single Use Plastics (SUPs) Action Plan

Reference	Action point	Outcome	Lead officer	Timescale / Resources
Theme – Improving the Council’s performance as an organisation				
CDC 1	<p>Staff briefings – engage with staff to raise awareness and to consider how we can address the issues at CDC</p> <p>Work with West Sussex Waste Education team on Pass On Plastic pledge and providing further information</p>	<p>Council-wide support to deliver a reduction in SUPs</p> <p>Commitment to Pass On Plastic helps to maximise waste reduction and reduce plastic material in waste stream.</p>	Andy Buckley / Tom Day	<p>November 2018</p> <p>Achievable within existing Council resources with additional WSCC input</p>
CDC 2	Working with the West Sussex Waste Education Team hold waste prevention sessions for the green champions’ network and Members.	CDC staff and members have a better understanding of sustainable, plastic free alternatives.	Tom Day / Andy Buckley / Sarah Miles	<p>Pre-Council briefing in November 2018</p> <p>Achievable within existing Council resources</p>
CDC 3	Waste and recycling bins – review numbers and locations to ensure they support recycling aims. Improve signage and advice in kitchens and above the bins to make it clearer what materials can be recycled. Introduce bags to facilitate recycling in cellular offices currently without a mixed recycling bin.	Increased recycling rates of operational buildings and reduction of recyclables in the general waste stream	Roland Robinson/ Sarah Miles	<p>November 2018</p> <p>Achievable within existing Council resources</p>
CDC 4	Supply additional glasses for staff kitchen to back up staff briefing messages. REFILL bottles provided to those volunteering as green champions.	Reduce volumes of single use water bottles brought into Council offices.	Andy Buckley	<p>November 2018</p> <p>Achievable within existing budgets</p>

Reference	Action point	Outcome	Lead officer	Timescale / Resources
CDC 5	<p>A) Identify any remaining SUPS that can be easily be removed or substituted from Council Buildings, and remove them.</p> <p>B) Review all other items procured for day to day running of buildings and work with suppliers to remove them wherever possible.</p>	Reduced volumes of SUPs used in Council buildings	Roland Robinson	<p>A) December 2018</p> <p>B) September 2019</p> <p>Achievable within existing Council resources</p>
CDC 6	Reintroduce green champions within services or office locations to give friendly encouragement to staff to avoid SUPs and recycle where possible	Location-based champions who are able to advise and educate staff.	Tom Day/ Stephanie Evans	<p>December 2018</p> <p>Meeting twice a year. Group e-mail and updates regularly between meetings. Staff time resource required – 40 hours p.a. to coordinate and 60-80 hours p.a. for the champions depending on the number required</p>
CDC 7	Work with WSCC and other West Sussex Districts and Boroughs, on a water refill scheme to reduce SUP water bottle use. Install a publically accessible REFILL water station within East Pallant House	Incentivise the use of re-usable water bottles as an alternative to SUP bottles	Roland Robinson	<p>October 2018</p> <p>Estimated cost £1-2k, Achievable within existing Council resources</p>
CDC 8	Add further guidance (which will be supplied from Environmental Protection) onto the Temporary Event Notice acknowledgement letter	So that event holders are provided with guidance on reducing SUPs that they can put into effect at their event.	David Knowles-Ley	<p>December 2018</p> <p>Minimal resource required</p>

Reference	Action point	Outcome	Lead officer	Timescale / Resources
CDC 9	Events on CDC land. Hire agreement for use of CDC land for events should ban releases of plastic balloons and other sources of litter (such as sky lanterns) and also encourage use of re-usable plastics for catering.	Reduce plastic being released into the environment, reduce SUPS use for events.	Tom Day / Ian Baker	March 2019 Achievable within existing Council resources
CDC 10	Work with procurement to establish an environmental performance specification for business tendering for CDC contracts.	An agreed set of environment pledges on Single Use Plastics and other environmental performance issues. Businesses who can demonstrate compliance will receive an additional quality assessment score.	Tom Day / Procurement team	May 2019 Some re-direction of staff time required, estimated as 10-14 hours work to set up.
Theme – Working with local businesses				
Business 1	Presentation on reducing and eliminating SUPs at the ChiBAC meetings we have with local premises owners to see what methods they are taking to reduce the use of single-use plastics and to advise them on what could be done	To gain ideas from local premises owners and give specific advice from Waste team on actions that could be implemented at their premises	Helena Giudici / Tom Day	May 2019 Achievable within existing Council resources, some officer time required
Business 2	Add guidance supplied from Environmental Protection / WSCC waste education team onto the Licensing website pages	To increase awareness of the need to reduce SUPs amongst event organisers and licensed businesses	Emma Burle	November 2018 Achievable within existing Council resources
Business 3	Raise the issue of single use plastics at Joint Advisory Group and Business Improvement District (BID) meetings to see what ideas they have and consider the use of reusable (and branded) plastic glasses and cups at events	Reduce SUPs at large licensed events	Laurence Foord (BID) and David Knowles-Ley (JAG)	December 2018 onwards Achievable within existing Council resources

Reference	Action point	Outcome	Lead officer	Timescale / Resources
Business 4	Estates - write to all tenants to encourage them to reduce their use of SUPs and increase recycling wherever possible. Consider including wording in new leases to formalise the request.	Reduced SUP use by local businesses	Catherine Day	October 2018 Temporary administrative support required
Business 5	Develop education and awareness initiatives for customers using our Business Waste and Recycling Service. Actions to consider include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education package and waste audits. • Review customer base and identify customers not recycling and where service can be provided. • Assess operational resources to expand recycling collection provision. 	Encourage businesses to put the right stuff in the right bin. Raise awareness of the cost and environmental benefits of recycling. Reduction in waste tonnages collected.	Amie Huggett	Commence early 2019 – currently focusing on implementing new disposal contract. Additional resource required from within Business Waste service to deliver this which would form part of wider business case for the whole service provision to be developed in 2019/20.
Business 6	Support Chichester Business Improvement District (BID) in their ambition to make Chichester Plastic Free.	To be confirmed – Chichester BID are currently in the early stages of developing way forward.	Tania Murphy	Timescale dependent on the BID. Resources will mainly come from the BID. The level of CDC involvement will need to be considered as the scheme develops.
Theme – Communicating the message				
Communications 1	Make information made available via social media pages and other means on organisations and businesses which offer re-usable coffee cups to buy or loan, use paper straws and wooden cutlery, or are members of REFILL.	To promote the availability of re-usable cups and increased public awareness of the premises which have them on offer. To promote the businesses which are taking a step towards using less single use plastic.	Public Relations with support from Licensing	Collation of information by Events team December 2018. Publicity: 2019 on-going.

Reference	Action point	Outcome	Lead officer	Timescale / Resources
Communications 2	Include press release in eBiz newsletter. Send press release to contacts at business associations	Awareness of campaign	Karen Neglia/Angela Reeve-Hurndall	November 2018 eBiz and subsequently. Minimal resource required
Communications 3	Formulate key messages for businesses and identify relevant business sector audiences. Ensure that advice and guidance includes a call to action and focus within the messaging [Environment Protection] Identify existing and future resources to disseminate these messages [Economic Development Service]	Reduced SUP usage by local businesses.	Economic Development Service / Environment Protection / Place (BID liaison)	December 2018 onwards Minimal resource required. Involve BID to link with their work on Plastic Free community plan.
Communications 4	Building on staff waste prevention sessions, develop staff communications plan to ensure key messages are maintained.	Maximise waste reduction and reduce plastic material in waste stream.	Sarah Parker / Andy Buckley/ Sarah Miles	November 2018 onwards Achievable within existing Council resources.
Communications 5	Expand existing waste reduction and recycling campaign communications plan for residents to include information on how to avoid single-use plastics, use of plastic free alternatives, and showcasing our own pledge at the District Council. To include key communication channels: Initiatives, social media and CDC website.	Enhance existing campaign and increase residents' awareness and better understanding of sustainable plastic free products. Encourage residents to put the right stuff in the right bin and increase recycling participation rates. Reduction of plastic material found in household waste bin.	Amie Huggett with Sarah Miles. PR support.	West Sussex Waste Partnership time October 2018 onwards Communications will be developed alongside existing communications planner for recycling messages This action could be extended through additional design and print work (estimated cost up to £1,000)

Reference	Action point	Outcome	Lead officer	Timescale / Resources
Communications 6	Expand existing Against Litter Campaign communications plan to re-focus on plastic pollution and demonstrate ways to beat it. Highlight materials recovered in litter picks which could have been recycled or not used at all.	Enhance existing campaign and increase resident's awareness of the impact littering is having on our local communities and the importance of ensuring plastics are directed to recycling streams where possible or avoided.	Amie Huggett with Sarah Miles and PR (Sarah Parker)	October 2018 onwards. Communications will be developed alongside recycling communications planner. Potentially within existing resources but subject to resource bids for PR resource being considered alongside other priorities.
Theme – Working with our community				
Community 1	Work with WSCC, other Sussex Districts and Boroughs, Chichester BID and Transition Chichester setting up a "Refill Chichester" scheme.	A co-ordinator is appointed for the District (either through a community group or at CDC) and the scheme is launched and promoted locally and nationally.	Stephanie Evans / Tom Day	March 2019 for launch Resources: this would require some re-allocation of staff time within Environmental Protection, some support from WSCC (Julie Robinson) and a bid for promotional budget of £1-2k, potentially jointly with other similar schemes locally

Reference	Action point	Outcome	Lead officer	Timescale / Resources
Community 2	<p>Youth engagement - support the Waste Buster Plastic Planet Challenge.</p> <p>Waste Buster is a UK based environmental education organisation, and a local contract is overseen by the West Sussex Waste Partnership. Waste Buster provides resources to participating primary schools to explore plastic and recycling and how plastic pollution can be prevented. The Plastic Planet Challenge will be promoted by each District and Borough via existing communication channels to encourage primary schools to take part.</p>	<p>Motivate young people and their families to reduce plastic use and recycle.</p> <p>Inspire the next generation to take care of the environment and prevent plastic pollution.</p>	West Sussex Waste Partnership	<p>Challenge has been launched. Forms part of educational focus for 2018/19. Performance monitoring reported to the Strategic Waste Group each month.</p> <p>Achievable within existing West Sussex Waste Partnership resources.</p>
Community 3	Support local groups promoting the “Plastic Free Communities” campaign.	Support at least one community campaign to complete the toolkit actions and become certified Plastic Free Community.	Tom Day / Stephanie Evans	<p>Timescale depends on the community groups, CDC support in place from December 2018.</p> <p>Resources: would require some re-allocation of Environmental protection staff resource. Level of support to be clearly defined in the form of an offer limited to one community group Level of Member involvement, if any, to be determined.</p>

Reference	Action point	Outcome	Lead officer	Timescale / Resources
Community 4	Continue Selsey Bathing Water Enhancement Project into year 2 (summer 2019) and include additional action on single use plastics, particularly around food containers and take away food at the coast	Support local businesses near the coast to use alternative packaging. Decrease the amount of SUPs found in beach cleans	Dom Henly / Sarah Hughes	Selsey Beach Clean event September 2018. Year two campaign July-September 2019. Officer time and promotional resources will be fully funded by Southern Water under existing two-year agreement.

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5, 6a, 6b of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5, 6a, 6b of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5, 6a, 6b of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5, 6a, 6b of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank